TIGHT BINDING BOOK

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_162626

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Osmania University Library

Call No. 582.1595 Accession No. 25492
B47T

Author Benthall, A.P.

Title Trees of Calcutta

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE HYDERABAD LITERARY SOCIETY

Call No. 370.6/Un58R Accession No. G.6456

Author United nations

Title Records of the General Conference.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

RECORDS

OF THE

GENERAL CONFERENCE

OF THE

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PROCEEDINGS



PARIS

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
19, avenue Kléber - 16e

NOVEMBER 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF DELEGATIONS, REPRESENTATIVES AND OBSERVERS . . 9

DELEGATES OF MEMBER STATES 9
REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER STATES 15
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED NATIONS . 15
REPRESENTATIVES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES 16
OBSERVERS OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS 16
OBSERVERS OF INTERNATIONAL SEMI-GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS 17

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE 20

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 22

LIST OF DOCUMENTS OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE . . . 24

Main Conference documents 24
Documents of the General Committee of the Conference 30
Documents of the Programme and Budget Commission 30
Documents of the Budget Committee 32
Documents of the Official and External Relations Commission 32
Documents of the Administrative Commission 33
Documents of the Nominations Committee 35
Documents of the Procedure Committee 35
Documents of the Credentials Committee 35
Documents containing general information for Delegates 35
Statistical table of documents prepared for the Fifth Session of the General Conference 36

VERBATIM RECORDS OF PLENARY MEETINGS :

FIRST PLENARY MEETING, Monday, 22 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

I. Opening of the Session by the Head of the Australian Delegation . . . 11
II. Establishment of the Credentials Committee 44

SECOND PLENARY MEETING, Monday, 22 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

III. Report of the Credentials Committee 46
IV. Adoption of the Agenda 49
V. Establishment of the Nominations Committee 49
VI. Report of the Nominations Committee and election of the President and seven Vice-Presidents of the General Conference 50

THIRD PLENARY MEETING, Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

VII. Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission to the Fifth Session of observers from international non-governmental organizations 57
VIII. Establishment of Commissions and Committees 57
IX. Presentation by the Chairman of the Executive Board of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 and discussion thereon:
Speeches by the Director-General and the delegate of Greece . . . 58

Page

FOURTH PLENARY MEETING, Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

X. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Yugoslavia, Denmark, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland and Belgium 70

FIFTH PLENARY MEETING, Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

XI. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Uruguay, Iraq, Lebanon, India, Turkey, Colombia, Pakistan and Persia 89

SIXTH PLENARY MEETING, Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

XII. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Cuba, United States of America, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Sweden and Norway 106

SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING, Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

XIII. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Mexico, Brazil, Guatemala, Israel, Egypt, United Kingdom and New Zealand 120

EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING, Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

XIV. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Australia, China, Ceylon, France, Philippines and Burma 141

XV. Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new Members 156

NINTH PLENARY MEETING, Friday, 26 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

XVI. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*conclusion*):
Speeches by delegates of Austria, Thailand, Monaco, Union of South Africa and Ecuador 160

XVII. Reply by the Director-General 168

XVIII. Proposal for the admission of Associate Members to Unesco 174

TENTH PLENARY MEETING, Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

XIX. Discussion of the Second Report of the Credentials Committee . . . 175

ELEVENTH PLENARY MEETING, Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 11.55 a.m.

XX. Discussion of the Third Report of the Credentials Committee . . . 186

XXI. Discussion of the Report of the Procedure Committee . . . 186

XXII. Election of six members of the Executive Board 187

XXIII. Decision on the place of meeting of the Sixth Session of the General Conference 189

TWELFTH PLENARY MEETING, Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 5 p.m.

XXIV. Tributes to Avicenna, J. S. Bach, Balzac, Confucius and Muratori 191

XXV. Statement by the Director-General 197

THIRTEENTH PLENARY MEETING, Friday, 16 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

XXVI. Consideration and adoption of the Reports of the Commissions and Committees:

A. Official and External Relations Commission 205

B. Budget Committee 210

C. Procedure Committee 213

Page

FOURTEENTH PLENARY MEETING, Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 11 a.m.

XXVII. Consideration of the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission . . 219
XXVIII. Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission 226

FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING, Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 5 p.m.

XXIX. Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission (*continuation*) 235
XXX. Consideration of the Second and Third Reports of the Budget Committee and of draft Appropriation Resolution and Appropriation Table for 1951 . 238
XXXI. Proposal for the establishment of a Committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture 238
XXXII. Draft Resolution on international understanding presented by the Belgian delegation 239
XXXIII. Draft Financial Resolution presented by the French delegation . . 242
XXXIV. Consideration of the Report of the Nominations Committee 243
XXXV. Tributes to Dr. Walter H. C. Laves 244
XXXVI. Final speeches of the Fifth Session of the General Conference . . . 244

SUMMARY RECORDS OF MEETINGS :

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE:

First Meeting, Monday, 22 May 1950 at 5.30 p.m. 253
Second Meeting, Wednesday, 24 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 254
Third Meeting, Friday 26 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 256
Fourth Meeting, Saturday, 27 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m 257
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 260
Sixth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 261
Seventh Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 263
Eighth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 265
Ninth Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 268
Tenth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 269
Eleventh Meeting, Friday, 16 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 271

PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION:

First Meeting, Friday, 26 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 273
Second Meeting, Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m. 277
Third Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 283
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 290
Fifth Meeting, Tuesday, 30 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 297
Sixth Meeting, Tuesday, 30 May 1950 at 6.15 p.m. 304
Seventh Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 307
Eighth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 312
Ninth Meeting, Thursday, 1 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 315
Tenth Meeting, Thursday, 1 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 321
Eleventh Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 328
Twelfth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 334
Thirteenth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 342
Fourteenth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 347
Fifteenth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 354
Sixteenth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 359
Seventeenth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 368
Eighteenth Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 376
Nineteenth Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 9 p.m. 383
Twentieth Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 390
Twenty-First Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 398
Twenty-Second Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 404

Page

Twenty-Third Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m 413
Twenty-Fourth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 420
Twenty-Fifth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 9 p.m. 427
Twenty-Sixth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 435
Twenty-Seventh Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 442
Twenty-Eighth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. . . . 447
Twenty-Ninth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. . . . 452
Thirtieth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 9 p.m. 457
Thirty-First Meeting, Friday, 16 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 462
Thirty-Second Meeting, Saturday, 17 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 469

JOINT COMMISSION — PROGRAMME AND BUDGET, OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS:

Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 470

BUDGET COMMITTEE:

First Meeting, Tuesday, 23 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 478
Second Meeting, Wednesday, 24 May 1950 at 10 a.m. 481
Third Meeting, Wednesday, 24 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 485
Fourth Meeting, Thursday, 25 May 1950 at 10 a.m. 488
Fifth Meeting, Thursday, 25 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 492
Sixth Meeting, Friday, 26 May 1950 at 10 a.m. 495
Seventh Meeting, Friday, 26 May 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 498
Eighth Meeting, Saturday, 27 May 1950 at 10 a.m. 502
Ninth Meeting, Saturday, 27 May 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 505
Tenth Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 508
Eleventh Meeting, Tuesday, 30 May 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 509
Twelfth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 2.30 p.m 512
Thirteenth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 9.30 p.m 514
Fourteenth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 516
Fifteenth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 518
Sixteenth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 522
Seventeenth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m 524
Eighteenth Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 528
Nineteenth Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 9 p.m. 531
Twentieth Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 11 a.m. 534
Twenty-First Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 537
Twenty-Second Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 541
Twenty-Third Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 543
Twenty-Fourth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 546
Twenty-Fifth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 548
Twenty-Sixth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 553
Twenty-Seventh Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 555
Twenty-Eighth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 559
Twenty-Ninth Meeting, Friday, 16 June 1950 at11 a.m. 563
Thirtieth Meeting, Saturday, 17 June 1950 at 8.30 a.m. 564

COMMITTEE OF EIGHT:

First Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 9.30 p.m. 567
Second Meeting, Thursday, 15 June 1950 at 3.30 p.m. 569

OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMISSION:

First Meeting, Wednesday, 24 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 573
Second Meeting, Wednesday, 24 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 577
Third Meeting, Thursday, 25 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 580
Fourth Meeting, Thursday, 25 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 582

Page

Fifth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 587
Sixth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 590
Seventh Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 595
Eighth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 4.30 p.m. 601
Ninth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 3 p.m. 607

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION:

First Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 610
Second Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 613
Third Meeting, Tuesday, 30 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 615
Fourth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 620
Fifth Meeting, Wednesday, 31 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 624
Sixth Meeting, Thursday, 1 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 625
Seventh Meeting, Thursday, 1 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 631
Eighth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 633
Ninth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 4.30 p.m. 636
Tenth Meeting, Wednesday, 7 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 637
Eleventh Meeting, Thursday, 8 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 641
Twelfth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 10 a.m. 645
Thirteenth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 9.45 p.m. 650
Fourteenth Meeting, Thursday, 15 June 1950 at 3 p.m. 650

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE:

First Meeting, Monday, 22 May 1950 at 4.30 p.m. 651
Second Meeting, Tuesday, 23 May 1950 at 10.15 a.m. 652
Third Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 4.30 p.m. 654
Fourth Meeting, Saturday, 17 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 656

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE:

First Meeting, Tuesday, 23 May 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 658
Second Meeting, Tuesday, 23 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 659
Third Meeting, Saturday, 27 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 662
Fourth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 666
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 5 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 669
Sixth Meeting, Tuesday, 6 June 1950 at 4.20 p.m. 672
Seventh Meeting, Friday, 9 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 675
Eighth Meeting, Monday, 12 June 1950 at 9 p.m. 678
Ninth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m. 681
Tenth Meeting, Tuesday, 13 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 684
Eleventh Meeting, Thursday, 15 June 1950 at 4 p.m. 686

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE:

First Meeting, Monday, 22 May 1950 at 12.15 p.m. 687
Second Meeting, Thursday, 25 May 1950 at 9.45 a.m. 691
Third Meeting, Monday, 29 May 1950 at 4 p.m. 693
Fourth Meeting, Wednesday, 14 June 1950 at 9.30 a.m. 694

INDEX 697

LIST OF DELEGATIONS, REPRESENTATIVES AND OBSERVERS

DELEGATES OF MEMBER STATES

AFGHANISTAN

Delegates:

Dr. Mohammed Anas Khan (President of the Delegation).
Mir Amanuddin Ansary.

ARGENTINA

Delegate:

H.E. Mr. Bernabé F. González Risos (President of the Delegation).

AUSTRALIA

Delegates:

Dr. E. Ronald Walker (President of the Delegation).
Mr. W. J. Weeden.
Mr. C. E. B. Fletcher.

Alternate:

Mr. W. G. St. C. Smith.

Advisers:

Mr. Gardner Davies.
Mr. J. E. Cummins.

Secretary-General:

Mr. J. A. Gibson.

AUSTRIA

Delegates:

Dr. Hermann Zeissl (President of the Delegation).
Professor Dr. Karl Oberparleiter.
Professor Dr. Wilhelm Marinelli.

Secretary-General:

Dr. Peter Gasser.

BELGIUM

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Léo Mundeleer (President of the Delegation).
Professor Louis Verniers.
Mr. Marcel Florkin.
Mr. Paul de Visscher.
Mr. J. Despot.

Assistant Delegate:

Mr. Delhaye.

Experts:

Baron Conrad van der Bruggen.
Mr. Jean Willems.
Mr. Marcel Maquet.

BOLIVIA

Delegate:

H.E. Mr. Adolfo Costa du Rels (President of the Delegation).

BRAZIL

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Clemente Mariani Bittencourt (President of the Delegation).
Professor Paulo E. de Berredo Carneiro (Vice-President of the Delegation).
Mr. Aliomar Andrade Baleeiro.
Professor Miguel Ozorio de Almeida.
Professor Bergstrom Lourenço Filho.

Alternates:

Professor Fernando Tude de Souza.
Dr. Jorge de Godoy.
Dr. Socrates Mariani Bittencourt.
Dr. Evaldo Simas Pereira.
Mr. Wladimir A. Murtinho.

Secretary of the Delegation:

Mr. Sergio M. Corrêa do Lago.

BURMA

Delegates:

Dr. Htin Aung (President of the Delegation).
U Ba.
U Mya Sein.

CANADA

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Jean Désy (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Milton E. Lazerte.
Mr. Garnet T. Page.
Mr. Jacques de Tonnancour.

Alternates:

Mr. Sidney Pollock.
Dr. John E. Robbins.
Mr. Paul Tremblay.

Adviser and Secretary :

Mr. J. C. Gordon Brown.

CEYLON

Delegate:

Mr. L. J. De Silva Seneviratne (President of the Delegation).

CHINA

Delegates:

Professor Li Shu-hua (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Mr. Wen Yuan-ning (Acting President)).
Dr. Hu Shih.
H.E. Mr. Tuan Mao-lan.
Professor Chen Yuan.

Special Adviser:

H.E. Dr. Yu Tsune-chi.

Secretary:

Dr. Chou Ling.

COLOMBIA

Delegates:

Dr. Rafael Bernal Jiménez (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Joaquín Piñeros Corpas.
Dr. Daniel Henao Henao.

COSTA-RICA

Delegate:

Mr. Giuseppe Tucci (President of the Delegation).

CUBA

Delegates:

Dr. Mariano Brull y Caballero (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Albertq Blanco y Sánchez.
Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie.
Dr. Natalio Chediak y Ahuayda.
Dr. Jorge L. Martí y González.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Delegate:

H.E. Mr. Adolf Hoffmeister (President of the Delegation).

DENMARK

Delegates:

Professor Jakob Nielsen (President of the Delegation).
Mr. Poul Hansen.
Miss Helga Pedersen.
Mrs. Else Merete Ross.

Assistant Delegate:

Mr. Hans Kjems.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Delegate:

H.E. Dr. Pedro Troncoso Sánchez (President of the Delegation).

ECUADOR

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Carlqs Manuel Larrea (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Rafael Alvarado.

EGYPT

Delegates:

H.E. Taha Hussein Bey (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Hamed Zaki Bey (Deputy President).
H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey (Vice-President).
Dr. Mohamed Awad Mohamed Bey.
Dr. Hassan Fouad el Diwany.

Alternate:

Dr. Hussein Fawzi.

Adviser:

Dr. Tewfik Chehata.

Secretary:

Mr. Ahmed Hilmi Ali.

FRANCE

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Yvon Delbos (President of the Delegation).
Mr. François Mauriac (Vice-President).
Mr. Léopold Sedar Senghor.
Mr. Paul Montel.
Mr. Louis Joxe.

Advisers:

H.E. Si Hassan Abdul Wahab.
Mr. Lucien Febvre.

Assistant Delegates:

Mr. Marcel Abraham.
Mr. Julien Cain.
Mr. Gabriel Le Bras.
M. Roger Seydoux.

Technical Advisers:

Mr. Raymond Aron.
Mr. Louis François.
Mr. Jacques Kayser.
Mr. Antoine Semini.
Mr. Fernand Terrqu.

Experts:

Mr. P. Fortassier.
Mr. Xavier Guignolet.
Mr. Paul Jaume.

Secretary-General:

Mr. Guy Ladreit de Lacharrière.

Assistant Secretaries-General:

Mr. Jacques Bouchard.
Mr. Yves Brunswick.

GREECE

Delegates:

Professor Alexandre Photiades (President of the Delegation).
Mr. Ghikas.
Mr. M. Kalligas.

GUATEMALA

Delegate:

Dr. Carlos Martínez Durán (President of the Delegation).

Adviser:

Mrs. Araceli Zambrano.

HASHEMITE JORDAN

Delegate:

Mr. Edmond Roch (President of the Delegation).

HONDURAS

Delegate:

Mr. Sebastianq Drago (President of the Delegation).

HUNGARY

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. Gabór Tolnai (President of the Delegation).
Mrs. Boris Fai.

INDIA

Delegates:

H.E. Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (President of the Delegation until 12 June).
Dr. Tara Chand (President of the Delegation from 14 June).
Dr. R. C. Majumdar.
Professor Homi J. Bhabha.
Dr. K. S. Krishnan.

Alternate Delegates:

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtoqla.
Miss Sarah Chacko.
Mr. P. N. Kirpal.
Mr. G. K. Chandiramani.
Sardar Khushwant Singh.

INDONESIA

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. Abu Hanifah (President of the Delegation).
Dr. R. Soerachman.
Professor H. Johannes.

Secretary-General:

Mr. Survo di Puro.

IRAQ

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. Mohamed Fadhel El-Jamali (President of the Delegation).
Sayid Hassan Jawad.
Dr. Abdul-Hamid Kadhim.

ISRAEL

Delegates:

Dr. Pinhas Kohn (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Mr. S. Ginossar.
Professor S. Sambursky.
Professor A. Dushkin.

ITALY

Delegates:

H.E. Professor Guido Gonella (President of the Delegation).
Senator Stefanq Jacini.
Senator Alessandro Casati.
Professor Maria Montessori.
H.E. F. Giorgio Mameli.

Deputy Delegates:

Professor Francesco Severi.
Professor Giuseppe Ungaretti.
Professor Bruno Borghi.
Dr. Vittorino Veronese.
Professor Vittore Branca.

Special Advisers:

Senator Guido Castelnuovo.
Professor Gustavo Colonnetti.
Professor Giovanni Calò.
Professor Mario Vinciguerra.
Professor Francesco Vito.

Advisers:

Senator M. Gaetano Pieraccini.
Senator M. Armando Sapori.
H.E. Mr. Francesco Maria Taliani de Marchio.
H.E. Mr. Nicolo Garandini.
H.E. Mr. Giuliano Cora.
H.E. Mr. Massimo Pilotti.

Experts:

Dr. Nicola de Pirro.
Professor Gaetano Napolitano.
Professor Amedeo Tosti.
Dr. Annibale Scicluna Sorge.
Mr. Salvino Sernesi.
Dr. Gilberto Bernabei.

Dr. Franz de Biase.
Dr. Francesco Gullini.
Professor Tommaso Perassi.
Dr. Giuseppe Biondelli.
Dr. Gustavo Orlandini.
Dr. Folchetto Malaspina.
Dr. Stanislas Lepri.
Dr. Romeo Montecchi.
Dr. Gennaro de Novellis.
Dr. Enricq Giustianiani.
Professor Attilio Frajese.
Professor Guido Arcamone.
Professor Guglielmo de Angelis D'ossat.
Dr. Giuseppe Petrocchi.
Dr. Francesco Pellati.
Professor Salvatore Valitutti.
Professor Luigi Fantappié.
Professor Giuseppe Vedovato.
Professor Mario Toscano.
Professor Corrado Gini.
Professor R. Bernado Cacciapuoti.
Professor Roberto Ago.
Professor Mario Salmi.
Professor Enrico Castelli.
Professor Romeo Vuoli.
Professor Giuliano Mazzoni.
Professor Cesare Cocchi.
Professor Bruno Migliorini.
Professor Anita Ferrari.
Professor Sabino Castellano.
Professor Mario Gliozzi.
Senator Ignazio Silone.
Professor Lionello Venturi.
Mr. Tullio Serafin.
Dr. Goffredo Bellonci.
Dr. Mario Matteucci.
Dr. Alessandro Pellegrini.
Dr. Mario Luisa Astaldi.
Mr. Piero Fossi.
Mr. Romano Romanelli.
Mr. Primo Conti.
Dr. Mariq Maggiora.
Dr. Marisetta Paronetto.

Secretary-General :

Mr. Alberto de Clementi.

Secretaries:

Dr. Nicola Lo Russo Attona.
Dr. Adriano Righetti.
Mr. Andrea Orsini-Baroni.

Administrative Secretaries:

Dr. Pliniq Mazzarini.
Dr. Domenico di Murro.

KOREA

Delegate:

Mr. Chin Hang Gong (President of the Delegation).

LEBANON

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Émile Khoury (President of the Delegation).
Mr. E. Abi-Jaoude.
Mr. Takieddine Sohl.
Mgr. Jean Maroun.
Mr. Sobhi Mahmassani.

LIBERIA

Delegates:

Dr. Carlo Sommaruga (President of the Delegation).
Reverend Father K. Juwle.
Mr. Nathaniel V. Massaquoi.

LUXEMBOURG

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Pierre Frieden (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Mr. Albert Calmes.
Mr. François Léon Lefort.

MEXICO

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Antonio Castro Leal (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Mr. José Gorostiza.
Dr. Alfonso Caso.
Senator Fernando Moctezuma.
H.E. Mr. Francisco A. de Icaza.

Secretary-General:

Miss Paula Alegría.

MONACO

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Jacques Rueff (President of the Delegation).
Mr. Louis Aureglia.
Mr. Paul Noghes.

Alternate Delegate:

Mr. Bocca.

NETHERLANDS

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. F. J. Th. Rutten (President of the Delegation).
Professor H. R. Kruyt (Deputy President).
Mr. M. B. J. Verhoeven.
Dr. F. Bender.
Dr. J. J. Poelhekke.

Alternate Delegate and Secretary:

Dr. C. A. Van Peursen.

NEW ZEALAND

Delegates:

Dr. C. E. Beeby (President of the Delegation).
Dr. J. C. Beaglehole.
Dr. W. Mason.

NORWAY

Delegates:

Professor Alf Sommerfelt (President of the Delegation).
Professor Ellen Gleditsch.
H.E. Mr. Sigurd Bentzon.
Mr. Odd Nansen.
Mr. Hans Mohr.

PAKISTAN

Delegates:

Dr. Mahmood Hasan (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Riazuddin Siddiqui.
Professor Mosman Ghani.

PANAMA

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. José Pezet (President of the Delegation).
Mr. Demostenes Vega Méndez.
Mr. Antonio Domínguez.

PERSIA

Delegates:

H.E. Ali Asghar Hekmat (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Gholam-Hussein Sadighi.
Dr. Zabihollah Safa.
Dr. Moussa Amid.

Advisers:

Dr. Khatibi.
Mr. E. Kazemi.

PERU

Delegate:

H.E. Mr. Ventura García Calderón (President of the Delegation).

PHILIPPINES

Delegates:

H.E. Mr. Proceso Sebastián (President of the Delegation).
Senator Gerónima Pecson (Vice-President).
Mr. Cecilio Putong.

Delegate and Secretary:

Mr. Gerardo Flores.

Adviser:

Mrs. Rizalina T. Buenaseda.

Technical Assistant:

Mr. Anastasio Z. Yabut.

SALVADOR

Delegate:

Dr. Rodolfo Barón Castro (President of the Delegation).

SWEDEN

Delegates:

Mr. Ingemar Düring (President of the Delegation).
Mrs. Ingrid Garde-Widemar.
Mr. Nils Thedin.
Mr. Nils Gustav Rosen.
Dr. C. G. Rossby.

Alternate and Secretary:

Mr. Rune Eriksson.

SWITZERLAND

Delegates:

Professor Jean Piaget (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Emil Oprecht.
Mr. Plinio Bolla.
Professor Alexandre Von Muralt.
Mr. Pierre Bourgeois.

Alternate Delegates:

Miss Hilde Vérène Borsinger.
Mr. Charles Steinhäuslin.
Mr. Maurice Bastian.

SYRIA

Delegate:

Mr. Wadji Mallat.

THAILAND

Delegates:

Luang Svastisarn Sastrabuddhi (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Charng Batanarat.
Mr. L. Manich Jumsai.

TURKEY

Delegates:

H.E. Hüseyin Ragip Baydur (President of the Delegation).
Professor Dr. Tevfik Saglam (Vice-President).
Mr. Hamdi Akverdi.
Mr. Ahmet Kutsi Tecer.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. D. B. Bosman (President of the Delegation).

Mr. T. Hewitson.
Mr. J. G. Stewart.
Mr. I. F. A. de Villiers.

UNITED KINGDOM

Delegates:

Mr. David R. Hardman, M. P. (President of the Delegation).
General Sir Ronald Adam.
Sir Henry French.
Dr. Julian S. Huxley.
Professor Sir Charles Webster.

Alternates:

Sir George Thomson.
Miss L. E. Charlesworth.
Professor R. N. Armfelt.
Sir John Maud.

Advisers:

Mr. Harry Bell.
Mr. F. J. R. Bottrall.
Mr. E. E. Y. Hales.
Mr. Alan Moorehead.
Mr. A. Ollennu.
Professor Ronald Syme.
Sir Ben B. Thomas.
Mr. W. E. F. Ward.
Mr. A. R. Ashford.

Delegation Secretariat:

Mr. F. R. Cowell.
Mr. A. Thompson.
Mr. H. C. Rackham.
Mr. A. E. W. Williams.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Delegates:

Mr. Howland H. Sargeant (President of the Delegation).
Mr. George D. Stoddard (Vice-President).
Miss Bernice Baxter.
Dr. Isidor I. Rabi.
Dr. George F. Zook.

Congressional Advisers:

Hon. Margaret Chase Smith.
Hon. William Benton.

Adviser and Member of the Executive Board of Unesco:

Mr. Luther H. Evans.

Advisers:

Mr. Herbert J. Abraham.
Mr. Eugene V. Brown.
Mrs. Esther C. Brunauer.
Mr. Arthur A. Compton.
Miss Marjorie Ferguson.
Mrs. Cordelia Spivy Gross.
Mr. Pendleton Herring.
Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt.
Mr. Kenneth Holland.
Mr. Ernest Howell.
Miss Carol C. Laise.
Miss Myrna Loy.
Mr. Robert McClintock.
Mr. Otis Mulliken.
Mr. Charles E. Odegaard.
Mr. Alvin Roseman.
Mrs. Helen Crocker Russell.
Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg.
Mr. Elvin C. Stakman.
Mr. Charles A. Thomson.
Mr. Richard F. Walsh.

Special Assistant to the President:

Mrs. Alice T. Curran.

Executive Secretary:

Mr. Stephen V. C. Morris.

Technical Secretary:

Mr. Wilbert H. Pearson.

URUGUAY

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. Cyro Giambruno (President of the Delegation).
Dr. Pedro Barcia.
Dr. Luis Giordano.
Dr. Daniel Rodríguez Larreta.

Secretary:

Dr. Eduardo M. Preve.

VENEZUELA

Delegates:

H.E. Dr. C. Parra Pérez (President of the Delegation).
H.E. Professor A. Zérega Fombona.
Dr. Alberto Arvelo Torrealba.
Dr. Carlos Guillermo Plaza.

First Secretary:

Miss Tula Osio Basalo.

YUGOSLAVIA

Delegates:

H.E. Vladislav Ribnikar (President of the Delegation).
Professor Gorazd Kusej.
Professor Radivoj Uvalić.
Professor Milan Bogdanović.
Mr. Mile Joka.

Advisers:

Mr. Ivo Sarajčić.
Mr. Drago Vučinić.
Mr. Sreten Marić.

Expert:

Mr. Josip Defrančeski.

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER STATES

BULGARIA

Observer:

Dr. Valery Petrov.

CHILE

Observer:

Dr. Jorge Valdivieso.

NEPAL

Observer:

Professor Rama Prasad Manandhar.

NICARAGUA

Observer:

Dr. Tomás Francisco Medina.

SAN MARINO

Observers:

Dr. Paolo Lepanto Boldrini.
Professor Marino Waldes Franciosi.

VATICAN

Observers:

Mgr. Francesco Borgongini-Duca.
Mgr. Mario Cagna.
Chanoine Jean Rupp.
Father Boyer.
Father Vincenzo Sinistrero.
Professor Armellini.
Professor Redig de Campos.
Professor Balladore Pallieri.

Secretary:

Mr. Jean Larnaud.

ALLIED HIGH COMMISSION FOR GERMANY

Observers:

Mr. Schmitlein.
Mr. L. Vogel.
Mr. C. S. Hudson.

Advisers:

Professor W. Hallstein.
Dr. R. Salat.
Dr. H. Rheinfelder.

SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS, JAPAN

Observers:

Dr. William K. Bunce.
Mr. Tadakatsu Suzuki.

Advisers:

Dr. B. C. Dees.
Mr. Seizo Katsunuma.
Mr. Tomqo Odaka.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Henri Laugier.
Mr. Martin Hill.
Mr. Gustavo Durán.
Mr. Louis Gros.
Mr. Bryan Mumford.
Mr. Robert Smith.
Mr. Brian Urquhart.

REPRESENTATIVES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations:

Mr. F. L. McDOUGALL.

International Labour Organization:

Mr. GALLONE.

International Telecommunications Union:

Mr. LÉON MULATIER.

World Health Organization:

Dr. E. GRZEGORZEWSKI.
Dr. G. W. MILLER.
Dr. G. MONTUS.

OBSERVERS OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Council of Europe:

Mr. ROBERT CRIVON.

Cultural Committee of the League of Arab States:

Dr. HOUSSEIN MUNIS.

International Bureau of Education:

Professor JEAN PIAGET.

International Institute for the Unification of Private Law:

H.E. M. M. PILOTTI.

International Relief Union:

Hon. GIOVANNI CIRAOLO.

Organization of American States.

Dr. JORGE BASADRE.

OBSERVERS OF INTERNATIONAL SEMI-GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Associated Country Women of the World:

Lady TIPHAINE LUCAS.

Boy Scouts International Bureau:

Mr. JEAN DE LA FRESSANGE.

Catholic International Union for Social Service:

Mr. G. MIRA.
Miss CL. VALENTE.

Commission of the Church on International Affairs [1]:

Dr. MARIO A. ROLLIER.

Council for the Co-ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences:

Professor J. MAISIN.

International Alliance of Women:

Dr. TERESITA SANDESKY-SCELBA.
Baronne ANNA MAZIOTTI.
Mrs. ELISA MALINTOPPI-COMANI.

International Association of Applied Psychology:

Dr. ALBERTO MARZI.

International Association of University Professors and Lecturers:

Professor FRANCESCO VITO.

International Committee on Modern Literary History:

Dr. CARLO PELLIGRINI.

International Committee of Scientific Management:

Mr. ROLF NORDLING.

International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers:

Mr. VALERIO DE SANCTIS.

International Conference of Large Electric Systems:

Mr. LEGNAIOLI.

1. Representing the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council.

International Council of Museums:

Mr. CHAUNCEY J. HAMLIN.
Mr. GEORGES HENRI RIVIÈRE.

International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies [1]:

Professor FAWTIER.

International Council of Scientific Unions:

Professor F. J. M. STRATTON.
Dr. Ronald FRASER.

International Council of Women:

Marquise LUDOVICA NICOLINI.
Comtesse FLAVIA DELLA GHERARDESCA.
Mrs. ADA FERRIERI-BAISINI.

International Federation for Documentation:

Mr. JULIEN CAIN.

International Federation of Library Associations.

Dr. P. BOURGEOIS.

International Federation of Musical Youth:

Mr. MARCEL CUVELIER.

International Federation of Newspaper Proprietors and Editors:

Mr. CLAUDE BELLANGER.

International Federation of Organizations for School Correspondence and Exchanges:

Mr. P. BARRIER.

International Federation of University Women:

Miss DOROTHY LEET.
Miss S. CHARROT.
Professor MARIA SIMONETTA.

1. Representing the following organizations:
International Academic Union;
International African Institute;
International Commission on Folk Arts and Folklore;
International Committee on Historical Sciences;
International Committee on History of Art;
International Federation of Philosophic Societies;
International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies;
International Institute of Philosophy;
Permanent International Committee of Linguists.

International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations:

Mr. MARIO MELINO.

International Folk Music Council:

Mr. FAUSTO TORREFRANCA.

International Institute of Political and Social Sciences concerning Countries of differing Civilizations:

H.E.Mr. GIULIANO CORA.
Professor GIUSEPPE VEDOVATO.

International Law Association:

Professor TORQUATO CARLO GIANNINI.
Professor GIUSEPPE VEDOVATO.
Professor ROBERT SANDIFORD.

International Organization for Standardization:
Mr. TAVERNIER.

International Relief Committee for Intellectual Workers:

Mrs. FANNY SILBERSCHEIN.

International Statistical Institute:

Mr. G. GOUDSWAARD.
Mr. HENRY P. CAUFIELD Jr.

International Student Service:

Mr. ROBERT S. SMITH.
Mr. HENRY JACQZ.

International Studies Conference:
Mr. JACQUES VERNANT.

International Theatre Institute:

Dr. EMIL OPRECHT.
Mr. PIERRE VAGO.
Mr. JEAN-BAPTISTE CEAS.
Mr. ALBERT LAPRADE.
Mr. HUGO VAN KUYCK.
Mr. GIACOMO PICCARDI.

International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues:

Miss F. DE SAINT-MAURICE.
Miss MARGUERITE PINGAUD.
Mrs. FLANAGAN.
Miss ORSINI-BRANDIN.

International Union for Child Welfare:

Mrs. J. M. SMALL.

International Union of Family Organizations:

Mr. A. M. COLINI.

International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and History of Art:

Dr. CHARLES R. MOREY.
Dr. OTTORINO MORRA.
Dr. JAL POELHEKKE.

International Union for the Protection of Nature:

Mr. MARCEL FLORKIN.

International Voluntary Service for Peace :

Mr. LUCIANO FRANZONI.

Inter-Parliamentary Union:

Mr. GIOVANNI PERSICO.

Joint Committee of International Teachers' Federations:

Miss L. E. CHARLESWORTH.

League of Red Cross Societies:

Dr. VITTORIO MINNUCCI.

New Education Fellowship:

Mr. JAMES HENDERSON.

O.R.T. World Union:

Mr. RENZO LEVI.

O.S.E. Union:

Professor JACQUES BLOCH.

« PAX ROMANA »: International Movement of Catholic Students, International Catholic Movement of Intellectual and Cultural Affairs:

Mr. MICHEL FOURNIER.
Dr. CARLO ALBERT MASTRELLI.
Miss SYBILLE DE MIRIBEL.

Rotary International:

Mr. PIERRE YVERT.

Soroptimist International Association:

Miss B. WIND.

World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations:

Dr. DONALD LOWRIE.

World Engineering Conference:

Mr. A. FERRARI-TONIOLO.

World Federation for Mental Health:

Dr. J. R. REES.
Professor ALBERTO MARZI.

World Federation of Trade Unions:

Professor LUCILLA JERVIS ROCHAT.
Mr. CESAR FASQLA.

World Federation of United Nations Associations:

Professor ROBERTO AGO.
Mr. HENRY COCHAUX.
H.E. Mr. GIULIANO CORA.
Mr. JOHN F. ENNALS.
Mr. FRANÇOIS DAUSSET.
Miss NANÇOZ.

World Jewish Congress:

Dr. A. STEINBERG.
Mrs. A. KLAUSNER.
Dr. G. RIEGNER.

World Organization for Early Childhood Education:

Mrs. HERBINIÈRE-LEBERT.

World Organization of the Teaching Profession:
Mrs. ERMA PIXLEY.

World Power Conference:

Sir GEORGE THOMSQN.

World Student Relief:

Mr. ROBERT S. SMITH.
Mr. HENRY JACQZ.

World's Young Women's Christian Association:

Miss MARION V. ROYCE.
Miss MADELEINE BAROT.
Mrs. P. W. MARTIN.

Young Christian Workers:

Mr. HENRI FABRE.

Rockefeller Foundation:

Mr. JOHN MARSHALL.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

PRESIDENT OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

H.E. Count Stefano Jacini (Italy)

VICE-PRESIDENTS

H.E. Mr. Clemente Mariani Bittencourt (Brazil).
H.E. Taha Hussein Bey (Egypt).
H.E. Mr. Yvon Delbos (France).
Mr. Mahmoud Hasan (Pakistan).
Mr. David R. Hardman (United Kingdom).
Mr. Howland H. Sargeant (United States of America).
H.E. Dr. C. Parra Pérez (Venezuela).

Secretary-General:

Mr. Jaime Torres Bodet.

Secretaries:

Mr. M. Montagnier.
Mr. M. Jiménez.

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE

Chairman:

H.E. Count Stefano Jacini (Italy).

Secretary:

Mr. M. Montagnier.

PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

Chairman:

Mr. Roger Seydoux (France).

Vice-Chairmen:

Dr. C. E. Beeby (New Zealand).
Dr. Tevfik Saglam (Turkey).

Rapporteur:

Mr. Marcel Florkin (Belgium).

Secretary:

Mr. J. Chevalier.

JOINT COMMISSION — PROGRAMME AND BUDGET, OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Chairman:

Mr. Roger Seydoux (France).

Secretary:

Mr. J. Chevalier.

Rapporteur:

Mr. Marcel Florkin (Belgium).

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Dr. F. Bender (Netherlands).

Vice-Chairman:

Mr. Sidney Pollock (Canada).

Rapporteur:

Professor S. Sambursky (Israel).

Secretary:

Mr. J. Robinson.

OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Chairman:

Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba).

Vice-Chairmen:

Professor Jean Piaget (Switzerland).
Dr. Htin Aung (Burma).

Rapporteur:

Professor Alf Sommerfelt (Norway).

Secretary:

Mr. S. G. Gebelt.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

Chairman:

Dr. Tara Chand (India).

Vice-Chairman:

Professor Alex Photiades (Greece).

Rapporteur:

Mr. W. G. St. C. Smith (Australia).

Secretary:

Mr. W. Hodson.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Dr. E. Ronald Walker (Australia).

Secretary:

Miss L. McPhee.

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Professor Jakob Nielsen (Denmark).

Vice-Chairman:

H.E. Mr. Proceso Sebastián (Philippines).

Rapporteur:

Mr. N. Thedin (Sweden).

Secretary:

Mr. W. J. Garcin.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Chairman:

H.E. Mr. Jean Désy (Canada).

Secretary:

Mr. W. J. Garcin.

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

		Plenary Meetings of the General Conference	General Committee of the Conference	Programme & Budget Commission	Drafting & Co-ordination Committee of PRG & BUD Commission	Budget Committee	Official & External Relations Commission	Administrative Commission	Nominations Committee	Procedure Committee	Credentials Committee
May											
Monday 22	a.m.	1									X
	p.m.	2	X						X		
Tuesday 23	a.m.	3							X	X	
	p.m.	4				X				X	
Wednesday 24	a.m.	5	X			X	1				
	p.m.	6				X	2				
Thursday 25	a.m.	7				X	3				X
	p.m.	8				X	4				
Friday 26	a.m.	9	X			X					
	p.m.			1		X					
Saturday 27	a.m.		X	2		X					
	p.m.					X				X	
Monday 29	a.m.		X	3		X		1			
	p.m.			4				2			X
Tuesday 30	a.m.			5	X			3			
	p.m.	10		6							
	eve.					X					
Wednesday 31	a.m.		X	7	X			4			
	p.m.			8		X		5			
	eve.					X					
June											
Thursday 1	a.m.			9	X			6			
	p.m.			10				7			
Monday 5	a.m.		X	11	X	X		8		X	
	p.m.			12		x		9		X	
Tuesday 6	a.m.			13	X		5				
	p.m.			14		X	6			X	
Wednesday 7	a.m.		X	15	X			10			
	p.m.			16		X					
	eve.			17							
Thursday 8	a.m.			18	X			11			
	p.m.			*		X	*				
	eve.			19		X					
Friday 9	a.m.		X	20	X	X					
	p.m.			21		X	7			X	
	eve.			22	X	X					
Sunday 11	a.m.				X						
	p.m.										
Monday 12	a.m.			23	X			12			
	p.m.			24		X	8				
	eve.			25		X				X	

	Plenary Meetings of the General Conference	General Committee of the Conference	Programme & Budget Commission	Drafting & Co-ordination Committee of PRG & BUD Commission	Budget Committee	Official & External Relations Commission	Administrative Commission	Nominations Committee	Procedure Committee	Credentials Committee
Tuesday 13 — a.m.		×	26	×	×				×	
Tuesday 13 — p.m.			27		×				×	
Tuesday 13 — eve.			28							
Wednesday 14 — a.m.			29	×	×					×
Wednesday 14 — p.m.					×	9		×		
Wednesday 14 — eve.			30				13			
Thursday 15 — a.m.	11			×						
Thursday 15 — p.m.	12						14		×	
Friday 16 — a.m.	13	×			×					
Friday 16 — p.m.			31							
Saturday 17 — a.m.	14		32		×			×		
Saturday 17 — p.m.	15									
Total	15	11	32	14	30	9	14	4	11	4

* Joint Meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission and the Official and External Relations Commission.

OTHER MEETINGS

Sub-Committees of the Programme and Budget Commission:

(1) To examine the Draft Agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural material: 8 June, p.m., 9 June, a.m. and p.m., 12 June, a.m. and p.m., 13 June, a.m. and p.m., 14 June, p.m.;
(2) To examine the texts concerning Human Rights: 14 June, a.m.;
(3) To adjust the 1951 programme to the total budget figure (Committee of Eight): 14 June, eve. and 15 June, p.m.

Sub-Committees of the Official and External Relations Commission:

(1) To consider the relations of Unesco with international non-governmental organizations: 25 May, a.m., 26 May, a.m. and p.m., 27 May, a.m., 29 May, a.m. and p.m., 30 May, a.m., 31 May, a.m. and p.m.
(2) To examine the reports of Member States: 7 June, a.m. and p.m. 8 June, a.m. and p.m.

Sub-Committees of the Administrative Commission:

(1) To consider staff and financial questions;
(2) To consider the currency of contributions of Member States: 30 May, p.m., 31 May, a.m. and p.m., 1 June, a.m., 5 June, a.m. and p.m., 6 June, a.m. and p.m., 7 June, p.m., 8 June, a.m. and p.m., 9 June, a.m. and p.m., 15 June, a.m.

Twenty-first Session of the Executive Board: 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 May, 1, 8, 14 and 17 June. *Twenty-second Session* also on 17 June.

Interim Committee of Universities: 16 May, a.m. and p.m.

Second Session of Representatives of National Commissions: 17 May, a.m. and p.m., 19 May, a.m. and p.m., 20 May, a.m., 27 May, a.m. and 29 May, eve.

Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations attending the Fifth Session of the General Conference: 23 May, a.m. and p.m.

Conference on the needs of devastated countries: 31 May, a.m. and p.m.

Conference on the Unesco Coupon Scheme: 13 June, a.m.

Note. — Meetings of Drafting Committees are not shown.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

MAIN CONFERENCE DOCUMENTS

5C/1.	Provisional Agenda.
5C/1 (rev.).	Revised Agenda (*printed*).
5C/1 (rev.) Addendum.	Revised Agenda - addendum (Procedure Committee).
5C/1 (rev.) Corrigendum.	Revised Agenda - corrigendum Programme and Budget Committee (*English text only*).
5C/2.	Establishment of a committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between peoples.
5C/3.	Report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization from November 1949 to May 1950 (*printed*).
5C/3 Add.	Report on activities presented by Mr. Torres Bodet, the Director-General, as a supplement to document 5C/3.
5C/4.	Reports of Member States: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Egypt (Corrigendum), France, Haiti, Honduras, India, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Persia, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela.
5C/5 (I).	The Programme of Unesco proposed by the Executive Board.
5C/5 (I) Add.	Addendum: Statement of the Executive Board concerning the Programme.
5C/5 (I) Corr.	Corrigenda.
5C/5 (I) Corr. II.	Corrigenda II (Activities in Germany and Japan) (Social Sciences).
5C/5 (I)(rev.).	The Programme of Unesco proposed by the Executive Board (Revised text) (*printed*).
5C/5 (I)(rev.) Add.	Draft resolutions to be inserted in document 5C/5 (I)(rev.).
5C/5 (rev.) Add. 2.	Draft resolution 2.25.
5C/5 (I)(rev.) Corr.	Draft resolution 4.253.
5C/5 (II).	Budget estimates for the Financial Year 1951 (*printed*).
5C/5 (II) Information I.	Temporary posts in the Secretariat as of 30 April 1950: A report by the Director-General.
5C/5 (II) Information II.	Vacant posts: A report by the Director-General.
5C/5 (II) Information III.	Questions submitted by various delegations to the Budget Committee.
5C/6.	Work Plan for execution of the 1951 Programme.
5C/7 (I).	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan to membership of Unesco.
5C/7 (II).	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia to membership of Unesco.
5C/7 (III).	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of the Republic of Korea to membership of Unesco.
5C/8.	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of

	international non-governmental organizations to the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/9.	Recommendation of the Executive Board on the place of meeting of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.
5C/10.	Programme for 1951: *Arts and Letters; Libraries and Documentation Services.* Draft amendment presented by the United Kingdom delegation.
5C/11.	Draft international convention for the protection of monuments, centres of historic interest, cultural institutions and works of art in the event of armed conflict (presented by the Italian Government).
5C/11 Add. 1.	Draft resolution on the same subject presented by the Italian delegation.
5C/12.	Presentation of the Annual Programme and Budget of the Organization: Draft resolution presented by the delegation of the United Kingdom.
5C/13.	Programme for 1951: *Cultural activities; Copyright*: Proposed amendments to draft resolutions 4.62 and 4.621 (presented by the Swiss delegation).
5C/14.	Draft amendments to Regulations 25 and 26 of the Financial Regulations (proposals presented by the Government of Australia).
5C/15.	Programme for 1951 - *Education: Documentation General Enquiries.* Draft amendment to resolution 1.122 (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).
5C/16.	Draft resolution on biennial sessions of the General Conference (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).
5C/16 Annex.	Explanatory note on the foregoing.
5C/16 (rev.).	Revised version of the United States draft resolution.
5C/16 Add.	Statement by the Director-General on the holding of biennial sessions of the General Conference (Procedure Committee, 13 June 1950).
5C/17.	Draft resolution inviting all workers in the fields of Education, Science and Culture to give their full support to the World Movement of the Defenders of Peace (presented by the Czechoslovak delegation).
5C/18.	Comments by the Chairman of the Executive Board on the Report of the Director-General.
5C/19.	Draft resolution for the convening of a Congress of Intellectual Co-operation (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).
5C/20.	Draft resolution concerning the status of associate membership of Unesco (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).
5C/21.	Draft resolution submitted by the Austrian delegation: Pilot project with the aim of demonstrating how the various methods for the popularization of science can bring home to the masses the importance of the protection and appropriate use of natural resources.
5C/22.	Project for an international convention for the protection of historic monuments and art treasures (submitted by the Mexican delegation).
5C/22 Add.	New text of the Conclusion of the foregoing.
5C/23.	Programme for 1951: *Exchange of Persons. Promotion:* Proposal of the International Student Service to promote the organization of a committee to administer an International Scholarship Fund.
5C/23 (rev.).	Draft resolution concerning an International Fellowship Fund (submitted by the Netherlands delegation).)
5C/23 (rev. 2).	Revised version of the foregoing project.
5C/24.	Proposal by the Cuban delegation concerning the qualifications of a "Unesco journalist".
5C/25.	Draft resolution on the conse-

quences of modern warfare (presented by the Belgian delegation).

5C/26. Resolution proposed by the French and Swiss delegations: International Documentation Conference (1951).

5C/27. Programme for 1951: *Cultural Activities* : *Literature* : Draft amendment to resolution 4.255 (presented by the Persian delegation).

5C/28. Draft resolution on the selection of central Unesco themes (presented by the Canadian delegation).

5C/29. Proposal by the Venezuelan delegation for the establishment of a Supervisory Commission.

5C/30. Programme for 1951: *Education*: Draft resolution 1.136 on the education of adolescents (submitted by the Italian delegation).

5C/31. Programme for 1951. *Education*: Draft resolution 1.213 on the education of the blind (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/32. Programme for 1951. *Education*: Draft resolution 1.22 on maladjusted children (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/33. Programme for 1951. *Education*: Draft resolution 1.2142 (*a*) on social service schools (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/34. Programme for 1951. *Natural Sciences*: Draft resolution 2.21 on an International Computation Centre (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/35. Programme for 1951. *Natural Sciences*: Proposal for the establishment of an International Research Bureau (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/36. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences:* Draft resolution on legal studies (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/37. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences*: Draft resolution on an international definition of Social Service (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/38. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities:* Draft resolution on library exchanges (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/39. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities*: Project for an international catalogue of museums (Draft resolution 4.35) (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/39 (rev.). Revised version of the foregoing.

5C/40. Progamme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Visual Arts* (Town planning) (Proposal presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/40 (rev.). Revised version of the foregoing.

5C/40 (rev.) (Corr.). Corrigendum to the foregoing.

5C/41. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Visual Arts* (Colour reproductions). Draft amendment to resolution 4.244 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/42. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities.* Restoration of works of art. Draft resolution (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/43. Programme for 1951. *Cultural activities. Copyright.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.61 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/44. Draft resolution concerning the Junior Red Cross (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/45. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Literature.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.255 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/46. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Visual Arts.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.241 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/47. Programme for 1951. *Exchange of Persons.* Equalization fund for study tours. Draft amendment to resolution 5.11 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/48. Programme for 1951. *Mass Communication. Action through Press,*

Film and Radio (University Broadcasts). Draft resolution 6.351 (*a*) (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/49. Programme for 1951. *Relief Assistance Services. International Voluntary Work Camps.* Draft resolution (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/50. Draft resolution on teaching about the United Nations (presented by the delegation of the Dominican Republic).

5C/51. Draft resolution on assistance to Arab refugees in Palestine (presented by the Iraq delegation).

5C/52. Broadcasting material. Draft resolution (presented by the delegate of India).

5C/53. Draft resolution on the cultural activities of the Field Science Co-operation Office in the Middle East (presented by the Lebanese delegation).

5C/54. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities, Arts and Letters.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.213 on an International Congress on the Arts (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/55. Draft resolution on increased programme activities in Germany (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/56. Draft resolution on an expanded programme on education about human rights (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/57. Programme for 1951. *Education. Extension of Education.* Draft amendment to resolution 1.22 on the education of young children (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/58. Draft resolution on Unesco's role in the organization of international research centres (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/59. Draft resolution on extraordinary projects (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/60. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Libraries and Documentation Services.* Draft resolution completing proposal 5C/26 (presented by the French and Swiss delegations).

5C/61. Programme for 1951. *Exchange of Persons. Promotion.* Draft resolution 5.24 (*a*) on scholarships (presented by the French delegation).

5C/62. Programme for 1951. *Education, Mass Communication and Relief Assistance Services.* Draft resolution to concentrate activities affecting Youth (presented by the French delegation).

5C/63. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Museums.* Draft resolution on the function of museums in education (presented by the French delegation).

5C/64. Programme for 1951. *Natural Sciences.* Draft resolutions and amendments concerning items 2.111; 2.35, 2.36, 2.371; 2.22, 2.23 (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/65. Programme for 1951. *International voluntary work camps.* Draft resolution aimed at transferring section 7.4 to the chapter on Education (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/66. Programme for 1951. *Education.* Draft resolutions and amendments concerning items 1.361, 1.142; 1.313; 1.321 (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/67. Amendment to the Belgian draft resolution (document 5C/25) on the effects of modern warfare (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/68. Basic Programme. *Education.* Draft resolution on the co-operation with public and private Organizations concerned with education (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/69. Programme for 1951. *Education.* Draft resolution on the forming of a civil conscience for the defence of freedom and peace (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/70. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Theatre.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.2214 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/71. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities.* Draft resolution for an economic history from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/72. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences.* Draft resolution 3.14 (*a*) on studies of Agrarian Law (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/73. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences.* Draft resolution 3.15 concerning the establishment of an International Social Science Institute (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/74. Draft resolution to launch a project of developing a friendship flag among the children of the world (presented by the Philippine delegation).

5C/75. Programme for 1951. *Mass Communication.* Draft resolution on educational films (presented by the Venezuelan delegation).

5C/76. Programme for 1951. *Education.* Draft resolution on humanistic studies (presented by the Venezuelan delegation).

5C/77. Draft resolution on the training of men and women of brilliant intellect (presented by the Venezuelan delegation).

5C/78. Programme for 1951. *Natural Sciences.* Symposium on the conquest of the desert (presented by the delegation of Israel).

5C/79. Text of the decree promulgated by the Colombian Government granting customs exemption for the importation of educational, scientific and cultural material.

5C/80. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Visual Art.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.244 (presented by the French delegation).

5C/81. Programme for 1951. *Mass Communication.* Draft resolutions 6.141 - 6.143 (presented by the French delegation).

5C/82. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Museums.* Draft amendment to resolution 4.33 (presented by the French delegation).

5C/83. Establishment of an International Meteorological Research Institute under Unesco or United Nations auspices (Proposal presented by the Government of Sweden).

5C/84. Basic Programme: *Mass Communication. Action through Press, Film and Radio.* New resolution F.33 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/85. Programme for 1951. *Mass Communication. Action through Press, Film and Radio.* Draft amendment to resolution 6.325 (pesented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/86. Programme for 1951. *Education. Technical Aid to Fundamental Education and Adult Education Undertaking.* Draft amendment to resolution 1.2121 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/86 Corr. Corrigendum to the foregoing.

5C/87. Programme for 1951. *Education. Maladjusted children.* New resolution 1.2213 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/88. Programme for 1951. *Education. Experimental Research.* Draft amendments (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/89. Programme for 1951. *Relief Assistance Services. Information on Needs.* Draft amendment to resolution 7.11 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/90. Basic Programme. *Mass Communication.* Draft amendment to Preamble F (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/91. Basic Programme. *Social Sciences.* Draft amendment to resolution C.21 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/92. Statement of Methods. Draft amendment to paragraph 14 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/92. Statement of Methods. Draft amendment to paragraph 12 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/94. Programme for 1951. *Education. Special Research and Studies.* Draft resolution concerning information on school buildings (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).

5C/95. Programme for 1951. *Education. Documentation.* Draft amendment to resolution 1.122 (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).

5C/96. Credentials of the Chinese delegation. Draft resolution (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/97. Basic Programme. Draft resolution (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/98. Programme for 1951. *Education. Extension of education.* Draft amendment to proposal 5C/57 (education of young children) (presented by the Danish delegation).

5C/99. Basic Programme. Draft amendment to proposal 5C/97 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/100. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Sciences. Studies of Social Tensions.* Draft amendments to resolutions 3.21 and 3.22 (presented by the Yugoslav delegation)

5C/101. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Copyright.* Draft amendments to resolutions 4.62 and 4.621 (presented by the Swiss delegation).

5C/102. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences.* Draft amendments to resolutions 3.13, 3.27, 3.33 and 3.34 (presented by the French delegation).

5C/103. Programme for 1951. *Social Sciences. Aid to International Scientific Collaboration.* Draft amendment to resolution 3.11 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/104. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities.* Draft amendment (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).

5C/105. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Libraries and Documentation Services.* New resolution concerning bibliographical projects (presented by the French and Swiss delegations).

5C/106. Draft amendments to Rules 25 and 26 of the Financial Regulations (presented by the French delegation).

5C/107. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Libraries and Documentation Services.* Draft amendments to resolutions 4.52 and 4.521 on ex-German libraries in Italy (presented by the delegation of the United States of America).

5C/108. Programme for 1951. *Cultural Activities. Libraries and Documentation Services.* Draft amendments to resolutions 4.52 and 4.521 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/109. Memorandum presented by the President of the Argentine delegation.

5C/110. The problem of peace. Draft resolution (presented by the Yugoslav delegation).

5C/111. Draft amendment to document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1 (presented by the Egyptian delegation).

5C/112. Draft amendment to proposal 5C/16 (presented by the Italian delegation).

5C/113. Programme for 1951. *Education. Teaching about the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.* Draft resolution 1.3512 (presented by the Persian delegation).

5C/114. Draft resolution on the technical and financial assistance for the restoration of the archaeological and historic monuments of Cuzco (Peru) (presented by the Mexican and Venezuelan delegations).

5C/115. Programme for 1951. *Relief Assistance Services.* Employment of refugee intellectuals for the technical assistance programme. Draft resolution (presented by the Belgian delegation).

5C/116. Draft resolution concerning the Arab refugees of Palestine (presented by the Lebanese delegation).

5C/117. Draft resolution on the dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (presented by the Sub-Committee of the Programme and Budget Commission).

5C/118. Motion of confidence in the Director-General (presented by the Heads of delegations).

5C/119. Draft resolution on the execution of the progamme (presented by the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Italy, United Kingdom, United States of America).

5C/120. Draft resolution on behalf of children of the Near and Middle East (presented by the Greek and Lebanese delegations).

5C/121. Draft addendum to the resolution proposed on page 7 of the report of the Administrative Commission (document 5C/ADM/25) (presented by the United Kingdom delegation).

5C/122. (*Docs not exist.*)

5C/123. Draft resolution on Unesco's contribution to the cause of peace (presented by the Belgian delegation).

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE

5C/BUR/1. Proposed organization of work.

5C/BUR/1 Add. & Corr. Terms of reference of the Budget Committee and Corrigendum to the draft time-table.

5C/BUR/1 Annex I (rev.). Draft time-table (revised).

PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

5C/PRG/1. Provisional Agenda.

5C/PRG/2. Report on the project for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind.

5C/PRG/2 Annex I. Observations and suggestions of Member States: Canada, France, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom.

5C/PRG/2 Annex II. Observations and suggestions of Member States: Swedish Unesco Committee.

5C/PRG/3. Report on the freedom of the artist.

5C/PRG/4. Annual Unesco Awards (Report on the possibility of instituting Unesco Awards).

5C/PRG/5. Measures for preventing duplication in the organization of international exhibitions of works of art (in collaboration with the International Council of Museums).

5C/PRG/6. Measures for ensuring the cooperation of interested States in the protection, preservation and restoration of antiquities, monuments and historic sites; and possibility of establishing an international fund to subsidize such preservation and restoration.

5C/PRG/7. Report and proposals on the procedure to be adopted for the convening of an Inter-Governmental Conference to

	prepare a Universal Convention on Copyright.
5C/PRG/7 Add. 1.	Addendum.
5C/PRG/8.	Report on the project for an International Institute of the Press and Information (Resolution 7.21141).
5C/PRG/8 Add. 1.	Annex to the foregoing report: Meeting of the Committee of Experts on Press and Publications (24-28 April 1950).
5C/PRG/8 Amendment 1.	Draft amendment to the draft resolution proposed in document 5C/PRG/8 (French delegation).
5C/PRG/9.	Measures to promote uniformity on Braille notation.
5C/PRG/10.	Proposals for the recommendation to Member States of measures to eliminate obstacles to the free movement from country to country of persons and educational, scientific and cultural material.
5C/PRG/11.	Report on the Draft Agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials.
5C/PRG/11 Amendment I.	Amendment to the Draft Agreement (United States delegation).
5C/PRG/11 Amendment II.	Amendment to the Draft Agreement (United Kingdom delegation).
5C/PRG/11 Amendment III.	Amendment to the Draft Agreement (Swiss delegation).
5C/PRG/11 Amendment IV.	Amendment to the Draft Agreement (French delegation).
5C/PRG/11 Amendment V.	Amendment to the Draft Agreement (Australian delegation).
5C/PRG/12.	Report on the action taken by Member States regarding national regulations and practices governing the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials.
5C/PRG/13.	Report on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
5C/PRG/14.	(*Does not exist.*)
5C/PRG/15.	Report on past and present activities and on the policy to be followed as regards publications.
5C/PRG/15 Corr.	Corrigendum to Section II (Publications for 1950).
5C/PRG/16.	Interim Report on Unesco's expanded programme of Technical Assistance for Economic Development (Part I and Annexes I and II).
5C/PRG/16 Annex III.	Interim Report, Part II.
5C/PRG/17.	Regulations concerning Economic and Social Rights in the International Covenant on Human Rights.
5C/PRG/17 Add. 1.	Addendum: Resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights of the Economic and Social Council (Sixth Session).
5C/PRG/18.	Fundamental Education: Regional Training and Production Centre for Latin America.
5C/PRG/18 Annexes I, II, III.	Annexes to the foregoing.
5C/PRG/18 Annex II, Corr.	Corrigendum to Annex II.
5C/PRG/19.	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Report of the Rapporteur).
5C/PRG/19 (I).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part I): Preamble.
5C/PRG/19 (II).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part II): Basic Programme.
5C/PRG/19 (III).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part III): Programme for 1951.
5C/PRG/19 (IV).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part IV): Resolutions concerning

	the activities of Unesco in Germany during 1951.
5C/PRG/19 (V).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part V): Resolutions concerning the activities of Unesco in Japan during 1951.
5C/PRG/19 (VI).	Report of the Programme and Budget Commission (Part VI): Statement of Methods.
5C/PRG/20.	Report of the Sub-Committee of the Programme and Budget Commission on the Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials.
5C/PRG/21.	Adjustments in the 1951 Programme and Budget: A report by the Special Committee of Eight.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

5C/BUD/1.	Interim Report of the Budget Committee.
5C/BUD/2.	Detailed Report of the Budget Committee to the General Conference. Report No. 1.
5C/BUD/2 Corr.	Corrigendum to the foregoing.
5C/BUD/3.	Final Report of the Budget Committee to the General Conference. Report No. 2.
5C/BUD/4.	Appropriation Resolution and Table for 1951. Report No. 3.

OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

5C/OXR/1.	Provisional Agenda.
5C/OXR/2.	Recommendations submitted to the General Conference by the Second Meeting of Representatives of National Commissions.
5C/OXR/3.	Consideration of reports by Member States and form of future reports.
5C/OXR/4.	Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the programmes and budgets of the Specialized Agencies: Draft Report from the Executive Board to the General Conference.
5C/OXR/4 Corr. 1.	Corrigendum to the Report of the Executive Board.
5C/OXR/5.	Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on educational problems in the non-self-governing territories.
5C/OXR/5 Annex I.	Use of indigenous languages in instruction.
5C/OXR/5 Annex II.	Eradication of illiteracy.
5C/OXR/5 Annex III.	Unesco activities regarding non-self-governing territories.
5C/OXR/5 Add. 1.	Draft resolutions submitted by the Executive Board.
5C/OXR/6.	Collaboration with the Trusteeship Council.
5C/OXR/7.	Consideration of the provisional agreement between the International Bureau of Education and Unesco.
5C/OXR/7 Add.	Note by the Secretariat concerning relations between Unesco and the International Bureau of Education.
5C/OXR/8.	Agreement between the International Committee of Weights and Measures and Unesco.
5C/OXR/9.	Recommendations of the Executive Board regarding the first general review of the list of international non-governmental organizations with which Unesco has made consultative arrangements.
5C/OXR/10.	Report by the Executive Board on the experience acquired by Unesco in the

	matter of relations with international non-governmental organizations under the directives at present in force, and consideration of the Board's proposals regarding future policy in this field.
5C/OXR/10 Add. 1.	Addendum - Resolutions adopted by the Conference of Observers of International Non-governmental Organizations attending the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/OXR/10 Add. 2.	Addendum to the foregoing: General Resolution.
5C/OXR/11.	Report on the result of the negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement for co-operation with the Organization of American States.
5C/OXR/12.	Formal agreements concluded with certain international non-governmental organizations.
5C/OXR/13.	Report of the Director-General on contracts concluded with international non-governmental organizations and grants-in-aid made in 1949.
5C/OXR/14.	Triennial report by the Executive Board on the employment of the sums paid to international non-governmental organizations under grants-in-aid or contracts.
5C/OXR/15.	Co-operation with the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER).
5C/OXR/16.	Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions.
5C/OXR/16 Add. I.	New draft rules of procedure.
5C/OXR/16 Add. II.	Draft resolution submitted by the Belgian delegation.
5C/OXR/17.	Cultural agreements and conventions now in force and proposals likely to facilitate the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral cultural conventions.
5C/OXR/17 Add.	Addendum to the foregoing: Draft resolution submitted by the Belgian delegation.
5C/OXR/18.	Agreement with the French Government on Unesco's privileges and immunities.
5C/OXR/19.	Recommendations of the Executive Board concerning action by Unesco in Germany in 1951.
5C/OXR/20.	Recommendations of the Executive Board concerning action by Unesco in Japan in 1951.
5C/OXR/21.	Report of the sub-committee for relations with international non-governmental organizations to the Official and External Relations Commission.
5C/OXR/22.	Report of the committee appointed for the study of the reports submitted by Member States.
5C/OXR/23.	Report of the Official and External Relations Commission.
5C/OXR/23 Corr.	Corrigenda to the foregoing Report.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

5C/ADM/1.	Provisional Agenda.
5C/ADM/2 (I).	Report of the Auditors on the Accounts of the Organization for the year ended 31 December 1949.
5C/ADM/2 (I) Add.	Comments of the Executive Board on the Report of the Auditors for 1949.
5C/ADM/2 (II).	Financial Report of the Director-General on the Accounts of the Organization for the year ended 31 December 1949.
5C/ADM/3.	Scale of Contributions of Member States for 1951.
5C/ADM/3 -	Illustration of the application

Add. I.	of the formula proposed for the assessment of Member States based on present membership.
5C/ADM/3 Add. II.	Illustration of the application of the formula proposed for the assessment of Member States based on present membership and with the contribution of the United States of America fixed at 35 per cent.
5C/ADM/3 Corr. I.	Proposed resolution on the scale of contributions for 1951.
5C/ADM/4.	Currency of contributions by Member States.
5C/ADM/5.	Member States whose contributions are in arrears.
5C/ADM/5 (*b*) Add. I.	Addendum to point (*b*) of the foregoing document: Recommendation regarding consequential sanctions that might be applied by the General Conference to Member States whose contributions are in arrears.
5C/ADM/5 Corr. I.	Status of Contributions of Member States (23 May 1950).
5C/ADM/5 Corr. II.	Status of Contributions of Member States: Member States in arrears.
5C/ADM/5 Corr. III.	Status of Contributions of Member States (20 May 1950).
5C/ADM/5 Corr. IV.	Status of Contributions of Member States (29 May 1950).
5C/ADM/5 Corr. V.	Status of Contributions of Member States (7 June 1950).
5C/ADM/5 Corr. VI.	Status of Contributions of Member States (15 June 1950)
5C/ADM/6.	(*Does not exist.*)
5C/ADM/7.	Administration of the Working Capital Fund.
5C/ADM/8.	Annual Report by the Director-General on action taken in application of the Staff Regulations.
5C/ADM/9.	Unesco Salary and Allowance System: A report by the Director-General.
5C/ADM/9 Add. 1.	Representation Allowance for Department Directors.
5C/ADM/9 Add. 2.	Comparative Annual Salary Figures.
5C/ADM/9 Corr. 1.	Corrigendum to Annex V of document 5C/ADM/9.
5C/ADM/10.	Report on the application of the Medical Benefits Scheme, with detailed actuarial statement.
5C/ADM/11.	Report on the International Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.
5C/ADM/12.	Distribution of Members of the Secretariat by nationality.
5C/ADM/13.	Report on the Organization of the Secretariat.
5C/ADM/14.	Report of the Headquarters Commission.
5C/ADM/15.	Provision of space and facilities at Unesco to Member States and International Organizations.
5C/ADM/16.	Reimbursement of State Income Tax paid by Staff Members.
5C/ADM/17.	Effects of devaluation on the 1950 Budget. A Report by the Director-General.
5C/ADM/18.	Report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission.
5C/ADM/19.	Second Report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission.
5C/ADM/20.	Replies of the Administrative Commission to the enquiries of the Programme and Budget Commission.
5C/ADM/21.	Report of the Committee on Currency of Contributions.
5C/ADM/22.	Memorandum from the Danish delegation on the question of sanctions.
5C/ADM/23.	Note by the United Kingdom delegate.

5C/ADM/24.	Report of the Committee to the Administrative Commission.
5C/ADM/25.	Report of the Administrative Commission to the General Conference.
5C/ADM/25 (rev.).	Revised version of the foregoing.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

5C/NOM/1.	Provisional Agenda.
5C/NOM/2.	Nominations for the Offices of President and Vice-Presidents of the General Conference, and Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of its various organs.

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

5C/PRO/1.	Provisional Agenda.
5C/PRO/2.	Draft amendment to Paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution.
5C/PRO/3.	Draft amendment to Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure.
5C/PRO/4.	Draft amendment to Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of Procedure.
5C/PRO/5.	Draft amendments to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure.
5C/PRO/6.	Report on the interpretation of certain provisions of the Rules of Procedure.
5C/PRO/6 Amendment 1.	Amendments submitted by the delegation of New Zealand.
5C/PRO/6 Amendment 2.	Amendments to Rules 31 and 32 of the Rules of Procedure (Belgian delegation).
5C/PRO/7.	Amendment to Article 22 of the Rules of Procedure: Draft text proposed by the Drafting Sub-Committee.
5C/PRO/8 (I).	Report of the Procedure Committee.
5C/PRO/8 (II).	Second report of the Procedure Committee.
5C/PRO/8 Add.	Addendum.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

5C/CRE/1.	Report of the Credentials Committee.

INFORMATION FOR DELEGATES

5C/INF/1.	Documents for the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/INF/1 (rev.).	Revised version of the foregoing.
5C/INF/2.	Invitations to the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/INF/3.	Handbook of the Fifth Session of the General Conference (*Printed*).
5C/INF/4.	Provisional list of delegations to the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/INF/4 (rev. 1).	Revised list of delegations to the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/INF/5.	Privileges and immunities granted to Unesco by the Italian Government in connexion with the Fifth Session of the General Conference.
5C/INF/6.	Distribution at Florence of documents published during the period of the General Conference.

STATISTICAL TABLE

Showing approximate total number of documents, pages and copies prepared for the Fifth Session of the General Conference

Document Reference	Nature of Series	Number of Documents in Series	Number of pages in series				Hundred of copies produced					
			English	French	Spanish	Italian	Bilingual	Total	English	French	Spanish	Italian	Bilingual	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
5 C	Main Conference documents	181	1,009	1,072	166			2,247	1,907.5	2,043	15			3,965.5
5C/VR	Provisional verbatim records of plenary meetings (trilingual)	15					585	585					103.5	103.5
	General Committee :													
5C/BUR	Documents	3	11	13				24	37.5	38.5				76
5C/BUR/SR	Summary records	12	74	64				158	88.5	82				165.5
	Programme and Budget Commission:													
5C/PRG	Documents	42	463	491	41			995	408.5	448	34			890.5
5C/PRG/SR	Summary records	31	25	68			610	703	6	20			179	205
	Budget Committee:													
5C/BUD	Documents	5	33	37				70	44	44				88
5C/BUD/SR	Summary records	26	267	274				541	163	178.5				341.5
	Official and External Relations Commission:													
5C/OXR	Documents	38	331	455				786	378	419				797
5C/OXR/SR	Summary records	4					59	59					30.5	30.5
	Sub-Committee on Relations with International Non-Governmental Organizations:													
5C/OXR-NGO/SR	Summary records	4	39	45				84	22	25				47
	Administrative Commission:													
5C/ADM	Documents	34	274	272	10			556	385	383	33			801
5C/ADM/SR	Summary records	14					150	150					78	78
	Nominations Committee:													
5C/NOM	Documents	2	4	4				8	18	18				36
5C/NOM/SR	Summary records	4					11	11					18	18
	Procedure Committee:													
5C/PRO	Documents	12	43	47				90	120	130				250
5C/PRO/SR	Summary records	5	22	21			31	74	13.5	13			26	52.5
	Credentials Committee:													
5C/CRE	Documents	1	5	5				10	10	10				20
5C/CRE/SR	Summary records	1	5	5				10	7	7				14
5C/DG	Speeches delivered by the Director-General at the occasion of the General Conference	5	48	56	23	43		170	49	50	12	18.5		129.5
5C/INF	General information series for Delegates	8	37	43			73	153	58	56			40	154
5C/FLO	General information series for Staff	3	18	19				37	9	9				18
5C/FORM	Forms for Fifth Session of the General Conference.	19	5	11			19	35	11	41			63	115
5C/Programme	Daily Programme of Meetings	13					15	15					98	98
5C/Agenda	Daily Agenda of Meetings	13					26	26					94	94
5C/D	Miscellaneous documents	20	22	11		3	28	64	38	45		3	36	122

SUMMARY

Total number of documents in each language 515

Total number of pages in one set (four languages) 7,641

Total number of copies 861,000

In all, approximately 7,725,000 pages were produced.

VERBATIM RECORDS
OF
PLENARY MEETINGS

FIRST PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 22 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Opening of the Session by the Head of the Australian Delegation	41
II.	Establishment of the Credentials Committee	44

President: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia).

I. Opening of the Session by the Head of the Australian Delegation.

[1] The PRESIDENT — Mr. President, it is my privilege to express, on behalf of the General Conference of Unesco, our deep appreciation of the honour which you have conferred upon this Organization through your presence at the opening of the Fifth Session of the General Conference. We are most grateful for the invitation of the Italian Government, which has enabled us to convene our annual Conference in Florence, thereby continuing in most happy fashion Unesco's policy of holding the Conference in a different part of the world each alternate year. This policy is designed, on the one hand, to bring the activities of Unesco visibly before the people of our Member States, and on the other, to afford to delegates and members of the Secretariat an opportunity of learning more, at first hand, about the problems and achievements of our Member States of Unesco. The implementation of this policy of holding our Conference in various contries depends, however, upon the desire of Member States to receive the Conference on their own soil and, following our most successful visits to Mexico and Lebanon, we were overjoyed when the Italian Government invited us to come to Florence in 1950. Of all European countries, Italy offers to Unesco an unexcelled opportunity to draw inspiration from the traditions and monuments of the past, and at the same time to appreciate the problems of reconstruction in the post-war world. This city of Florence, so long a centre of international pilgrimage on account of its exceptional beauty, its unique artistic treasures and its historic role in the development of the modern mind, offers to our eyes today tragic evidence of man's capacity for destruction. If need there were to impress upon our minds the seriousness and urgency of Unesco's task, what reminder could be more telling than the daily contact with the life of this war-scarred city?

[2] Between the acceptance of an invitation and the practical realization of an international conference on this scale, lie many difficulties, and we are glad to have this opportunity of expressing our thanks to the Departments of the Italian Government and of the City of Florence that, along with the Italian National Commission for Unesco, have borne the burden of preparing the material arrangements for the functioning of the Conference, and for the accommodation of the delegations and Secretariat. In this connexion we are happy, on the occasion of your visit to the Conference, Mr. President, to have with us, in addition, the Honourable Professor Guido Gonella, Minister of Education, the Ambassador Vittorio Zoppi, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representing the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Sindaco Fabiani, Mayor of Florence. The excellence of the material arrangements for our meetings, combined with the inspiration that we shall all draw from the beauty and the historical associations of this city, will undoubtedly assist the Conference to take wise and bold decisions on the important questions coming before it. But the General Conference of Unesco is not merely an occasion for transacting the business of the Organization and for planning its future work. The Conference is also in itself an essay in international understanding. At every session friendships are made between delegates of different nationalities, races and creeds. I am sure that all the delegates from other countries look forward to strengthening the ties between their own countries and Italy through friendships developed at this Conference in this city over the coming weeks.

[3] Mr. President, our appreciation of the honour of your presence on this occasion as Head of the Italian State is enriched by our admiration for the distinguished economist, who in addition to making outstanding technical contributions to

his own branch of learning, has always, even in most difficult circumstances, worked for the recognition of the human rights and fundamental freedoms which Unesco, like the United Nations, is pledged to defend. It is because, to our respect for your high office, and to our friendly feelings towards your country, there is added profound admiration for your own intellectual achievements and your life of service to the ideals for which Unesco stands, that your presence at this inaugural session, Mr. President, is a source of great encouragement as the Conference begins its labours.

[4] Mr. Luigi EINAUDI, President of the Republic of Italy — [*Translation from the Italian*] Mr. President, I am indeed grateful to you for your kind words; but my country will be even more grateful when it learns of those of your words which moved me most, words which expressed to us once more your deep regard for Italy and the strong and compelling reasons which induced you to accept the Italian Government's invitation to hold your Conference in Florence. Conscious of the contribution it has always made to cultural progress, and proud of the century-old traditions represented by its monuments, and of the charm exercised by its landscapes, Italy is extremely sensible of your eloquent praise. But it is particularly touched by the sincerity of your sorrow at the wounds inflicted on Florence during the recent conflict. These wounds are part of innumerable material and spiritual ruins which impose on men the duty of carrying out a reconstruction that must be moral as well as physical. Delegates, my country has devoted itself to this task of reconstruction with faith and determination. Many, and by no means unimportant, results bear witness to its efforts. But the magnitude of the tragedy we have lived through, and the exigencies of a complete rebirth, which seems impossible when ideals and interests are irremediably opposed, have convinced us of the necessity of co-operating in that work of spiritual unity which is one of the fundamental aims of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[5] As the host of your Conference, and as a participant in its work, Italy has a double reason for turning all its attention to Florence today. It is fully aware of the progress which Unesco has already made along the path it has traced out for itself, and is ready to help it not only in word, but also in deed; for it is convinced that the problems of education and of scientific and cultural progress, for which you are endeavouring to find solutions, are the very essence of the most vital of all problems: the spiritual and social improvement of all peoples.

[6] In accordance with your universal mission, and after holding Conferences in Mexico and Lebanon, you are now meeting in the city whose most distinguished son, Dante Alighieri, said, more than six centuries ago, that men are born in order to pursue virtue and knowledge. I would like to regard Dante's wanderings in the netherworld as a happy presage for the future of mankind, which, after re-ascending from the abyss of hatreds and wars to a work of purification and reformation, of which your Organization is one of the noblest proponents, will not fail to respond to the appeal of those supreme ideals to whose service it has been dedicated by that "love which moves the sun and the stars".

[7] [*The speaker continued in English*] Dr. Walker, international friendships are quickly made in international meetings, and those friendships are, as you say, the best part of those meetings. But our acquaintance, Dr. Walker, did not begin today. Seventeen years ago two people met in Turin in a room filled with books, old and new. One was a distinguished young Australian student in his twenties who was visiting Italy and Europe as a Fellow of the Rockefeller Foundation for the Social Sciences, the other was from Turin University, and representative for Italy of the said Rockefeller Foundation. That meeting was short, perhaps too short for men who live in such distant countries. Then as now, the position is the same. Science is not parochial but universal. Today, myself President of Italy, you, Dr. Walker, in this Conference of this great international Organization, we are working again for truth. Truth is progress—material and spiritual progress—and truth means also peace.

[8] The PRESIDENT — I am sure the delegates would desire me to say again how grateful we are for the inspiring words which the President of the Republic has pronounced on this occasion, and I would like to thank him also for his good memory extending over so many years. I will now ask Professor Gonella, Minister of National Education, to address this Conference.

[9] Professor Guido GONELLA [*Translation from the Italian*] Mr. President of the Republic, the Italian delegation, over which I have the honour to preside, is deeply sensible of the honour conferred on us by your presence and we regard it as a good augury for the work of the Conference which is about to begin.

[10] Mr. President of the Conference, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, who have come from all parts of the world, I have the honour to extend

to you on behalf of the Italian Government the most cordial welcome. The Italian Government hopes that your brief stay in Florence will remain one of your happiest memories.

[11] The Government and people of Italy are deeply attached to the principles upon which the Constitution of Unesco is based. From the day when, in 1948, Italy became a member of the Unesco family, it has been daily conscious of its duty of making a positive contribution to the development of the Organization's activities, both in the national and in the international fields. The presence of Italian delegations at the sessions of the General Conference at Beirut and in Paris, the participation of Italian experts in the various committees assembled by Unesco, and the work done by the Italian National Commission, which includes among its members the most outstanding figures in the fields of education, science and culture—all these are so many concrete proofs of the interest felt by the Government and people of Italy in Unesco's ideals and activities. The unanimous and enthusiastic approval, by the fifty-four Member States of Unesco, of the proposal to hold the Fifth Session of the General Conference in Italy was, for us, both an encouragement and a tribute.

[12] It is of some significance that the work of this Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should have begun, in all solemnity, in this hall, where the genius of art has left so conspicuous a mark and where history seems to have left behind at once a warning and a suggestion. We have here the traces left by the Florentines, who were ready to die for freedom and who dedicated this sanctuary of their civil life to Christ, their only King; and we have here too, across the ages, the memories of the dawn of our national unity, which was consecrated within these walls. The history of these Conferences of recent years and the words, with their very human appeal, spoken by Mr. Maritain at Mexico City, and now here today in the temple of Italian renown, in this Hall of the Five Hundred, show, I think, that the spiritual tasks falling to our Orzanization are ever increasing, both in breadth and depth. The hallmark of this history is the search for a culture and a science that spread throughout, and nourish themselves upon, human life; there is, and should be to an ever greater degree, a concern to make the intellect an instrument of understanding and union, and not an instrument of dissension and war, as has too often happened in recent years. This wholehearted furtherance of the mission of peace and brotherhood which the peoples expect of Unesco and which alone can make our Organization into something truly living and constructive, is, it seems to me, a process to which the very human formula "veritatem facientes in caritatem" may be applied.

[13] These words, used by that great spirit that was the first to postulate the need for an understanding between souls and intellects, across all the barriers of race and nationality, are, in a way, a pointer to the spirit in which all our work should be performed. It is, too, the simplest and most mandatory message that can be devised to speed our present work.

[14] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I should like to thank the Minister for what he has said and will now ask Mr. Fabiani, Mayor of Florence, to address you.

[15] Mr. FABIANI — [*Translation from the Italian*] Florence is delighted to welcome Unesco's General Conference, not only for the honour it confers upon her, but because she is convinced that she is worthy of that honour. In her name, I thank you, the revered head of our young Italian Republic, the members of the Government and the Unesco Committee, which has worked so hard and so patiently to have Florence chosen as the seat of this very important Conference. There is no doubt that the work of this important cultural organization will find a worthy setting in a city which for centuries has been a centre of culture, from long before the Middle Ages, up to the Renaissance and to the Risorgimento. Not only has Florence produced geniuses whose names are inscribed in the golden book of man, and adorned herself with works of art admired by the whole universe; but she has produced those geniuses and created those works because of a deep awareness of the value of culture and of beauty in all their forms. Today, once again, Florence is making every effort to be worthy of her noble tradition, so much so that, after the horrors of the war, one of her first concerns has been to heal, so far as possible, the wounds inflicted on her scientific institutions, and to re-equip her museums.

[16] If, in the past, this city has achieved conquests which have left their mark upon civilization, it was undoubtedly because the Florentines were ever aware of the need, both spiritually and intellectually, of transcending their own narrow confines, even such wondrous confines as are formed by the walls of their city and the soft hills surrounding it. The Florentines were among the first to make long journeys, not only to find an outlet for the exuberance of their temperament and for the products of their arts, but also in order to get to know other men, other countries, other customs and other places; in order to gain experi-

ence and, at the same time, to extend their understanding and their tolerance. Culture—that has been the main preoccupation of Florentines throughout the ages, and it is that of this youthful organization, Unesco. Culture, which means freedom for the individual, presupposes, over and above the individual, universal brotherhood. Only when the mode of life of other peoples is known, with their needs, their sufferings, their errors, ideals and efforts, will the barriers of misunderstanding which lead inevitably to armed conflict disappear. It is in this sense that culture can be an inexhaustible source of good: material good, giving all men the feeling that they can live without fear of sickness and poverty; spiritual good, which is based on the former and realizes itself in universal understanding and fellowship. It is in this sense that peace can be won and safely conserved until all peoples adopt the same attitude towards life and the same system of mutual relations.

[17] Men of culture from many different parts of the world have assumed this noble task, which is not only mentioned in the first Article of Unesco's Constitution, but is also dictated by their conscience, and expresses the will of countless masses without distinction of race, nation, party or ideas. May Unesco's Conference find in Florence serenity and inspiration. It is with my whole heart that I express this wish on the city's behalf.

[18] The PRESIDENT — The words of welcome which we have heard from the President of the Republic, the Minister of Education and the Mayor of Florence, make, I am sure, every one of us feel very much at home in the city of Florence, and give us very great heart as we embark upon the labours of the Conference.

[19] I therefore declare open the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco. We shall suspend the meeting for a few minutes to permit the President of the Executive Board, the Director-General and myself to accompany His Excellency the President of the Republic. I should ask delegates to remain in their places and the plenary meeting will resume its regular work within a few minutes.

The meeting resumed at noon.

[20] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I have great pleasure in welcoming to our Conference Mr. Laugier, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations. He has come here as representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and will address you after the Conference has elected its President.

II. Establishment of the Credentials Committee.

[21] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We will now proceed with the agenda: Establishment of a Credentials Committee. In accordance with the revised Agenda and the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, we have to set up the Credentials Committee which will meet immediately afterwards. Under Rule 27 of the Rules of Procedure, the Credentials Committee consists of nine members elected by the General Conference on the proposal of the Acting President. I propose that the Committee be formed by the delegates of the following countries: Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Yugoslavia. I request the Conference's approval for the appointment of this Credentials Committee. Are there any objections? I declare the members of the Credentials Committee elected and will now ask the delegate of Czechoslovakia to address you.

[22] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — [*Translation from the French*] As I was not appointed a member of the Credentials Committee, I have the honour to present the latter with a recommendation. It is well known that the Central Government of the People's Republic of China has informed the United Nations Organization that it refuses to recognize the representative of the Kuomintang group as having the right to represent China and to speak on behalf of the Chinese people. Hence the presence of a delegate of the Kuomintang at the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco, a Specialized Agency of the United Nations, is illegal. Instructed by my Government, I demand the exclusion of this group from Unesco, and I have therefore the honour to present this request, first of all as a recommendation to the Credentials Committee and then, after the verification of credentials, in the form of the following draft motion:

The Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco has decided to exclude the Kuomintang group from membership of Unesco.

[23] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I intend, or rather I hope to be able, in a few minutes to adjourn the meeting so that the Credentials Committee may meet and start work. The Czechoslovak delegate has submitted a recommendation on behalf of his Government. He has also presented the terms of a motion he would like to place before the Conference. This motion cannot, of course, be debated until the credentials of all delegations met here have been approved by the Conference. At this moment no

delegation's credentials have been approved by this Conference. Our first task therefore is to hold a meeting of the Credentials Committee so that our credentials may be examined and the delegations duly accredited to this Conference. The leader of the Hungarian delegation has asked to speak. I give him permission to do so on condition that he addresses himself solely to the matter of procedure and the situation as I have just explained it.

[24] Dr. Gabór TOLNAI (Hungary) — [*Translation from the Italian*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the People's Republic of Hungary, and after listening to the address of Mr. Hoffmeister, the Czechoslovak Ambassador, we delegates of the Hungarian People's Republic declare that we too are unable to speak at the Conference in the absence of delegates of Free China. The delegates of the Kuomintang are not the delegates of China.

[25] The PRESIDENT — The delegate of Hungary has stated his views on the question of the admission of one of the delegations at the Conference. That matter, however, is not open for discussion at this time. The only business before the Conference has been so far the appointment of the members of the Credentials Committee. The Committee has been elected by the Conference on the proposal of the President in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and I would ask the members of the Committee whose names were read, and whose names I shall read again, to meet immediately upon the conclusion of the present meeting. The members of the Committee are Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia. It is for the head of each delegation to designate a member of his delegation among those that I have read to serve on the Credentials Committee. This Committee will meet, immediately on the conclusion of this session, in the Room of the Two Hundred. I would request that the members of the Committee lose no time in meeting. There is no further business before the plenary meeting at this moment. We propose to meet again this afternoon at 3.30.

[26] The first business this afternoon will be to receive the report of the Credentials Committee, and to take action upon its report. When that has been done the Conference will be properly constituted and we will then proceed to the election of the President of the Conference. In order that that may take place it will be necessary for us, after we have dealt with the report of the Credentials Committee, to call a meeting of the Nominations Committee, consisting of the heads of delegations. That Committee will then bring back into the plenary session in the course of the afternoon, proposals for the election of the President and the Vice-Presidents of the Conference.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

SECOND PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 22 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
III.	Report of the Credentials Committee	46
IV.	Adoption of the Agenda	49
V.	Establishment of the Nominations Committee	49
VI.	Report of the Nominations Committee and election of the President and seven Vice-Presidents of the General Conference	50

President: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia),

later: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

III. Report of the Credentials Committee.

[1] The PRESIDENT — We shall now take up the report of the Credentials Committee. I will call upon Ambassador Désy, the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, to present his report.

[2] Mr. Jean DÉSY (Canada) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour to present the report of the Credentials Committee, which met this morning after the plenary meeting:

The Credentials Committee, set up by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at the meeting on 22 May 1950 during its Fith Ordinary Session, met to-day, its members being representatives of Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, Lebanon, India, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Yugoslavia. As its Chairman the Committee elected the head of the Canadian delegation. It then proceeded to examine the credentials submitted to it by the Director-General of the Organization, from the States named below, and decided, firstly, that the delegates of the States thus named had been duly accredited in conformity with Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference by instruments under the hand either of the Head of the State or of their Ministers of Foreign Affairs. The States in question are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Persia, Philippines, Switzerland, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The Committee recommends that the delegations of the Member States aforesaid be admitted to participation in the Fifth Session of the General Conference with full voting rights.

[3] Credentials have been submitted by those representing the governments of the States named below in the form of letters, telegrams or other documents issued either by some Minister of the country they represent other than the Minister of Foreign Affairs or by heads of diplomatic missions, or by senior officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The States in question are the following: Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Monaco, Peru, Sweden, Turkey and Uruguay. The suggestion of the Committee is that these documents should be deemed to constitute provisional credentials for those named as representatives of the countries aforesaid, subject to later presentation of credentials in due form, and that meanwhile the said delegations be admitted to participation in the Fifth Session of the General Conference with full voting rights.

[4] The Committee then examined the credentials of the observers representing the following States or entities not being members of Unesco: Bulgaria, Indonesia, Korea, Nepal, Nicaragua, San Marino, the Vatican, and the Allied High Commission.

[5] Regarding the credentials of the Chinese delegation, to which objections have been raised by the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, the Committee, following a discussion to be continued at a later meeting, has decided to suggest to the General Conference, for the avoidance of delay in the opening of the same, that it approve this Committee's report regarding the powers of the remaining delegations and apply Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference in the case of the Chinese delegation.

[6] The PRESIDENT — I call on the delegate of China, who has asked to speak on the Credentials Committee's report.

[7] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — Mr. President, fellow-colleagues, before the adoption of the recommendations of the Credentials Committee I would just like to say one word. So far as my delegation is concerned, our position is clear beyond any doubt whatsoever. My Government has been invited to send a delegation to attend this Conference of Unesco. The members of my delegation have been sent by that Government which has been invited. Now the only business of the Credentials Committee is to examine whether these credentials are genuine or not. That is to say, whether these credentials have really been issued by that Government which has been invited by the Director-General of Unesco. To do anything more than that is *ultra vires* and not within the competence of the Credentials Committee.

[8] The PRESIDENT — The Conference has heard the report of the Credentials Committee. Are there any objections to the adoption of the report? I call on the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

[9] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour to offer my formal greetings to the delegates to the Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. May I draw your attention to the word "Scientific" in this Organization's title. In my view it would be a clear contradiction of the scientific spirit to regard the non-existent as existing in order to serve the interests of a particular policy. Having met here on the strength of being men possessing education, science and culture, it is our duty to draw logical conclusions and not to fear to call things by their true names. The existence of China as one of the largest powers in the world physically is a geographical, historical and political fact. Through the heroic endeavours of the Chinese People's Army and by the will of millions upon millions of that country's people, a People's Republic under a central government has been set up over the whole of the Chinese territory. A different China exists only in the schemes of those whose policy is to protect the enemies of Democratic China, and in the persons of the Kuomintang representatives still ensconced in various international bodies. We are not prepared to tolerate this false and illogical situation any longer, nor to cover ourselves with ridicule in the light of present realities and in the eyes of history; and further we ask for the exclusion of the Kuomintang group from Unesco because we consider that its continued participation constitutes a threat to peace and to all constructive work towards that supreme goal. As previously, so now again, we demand categorically that this source of disagreement and possible war be removed from our society. Observing that the report of the Credentials Committee does not accept the motion I had the honour to propose this morning, and that the measures adopted are no more than a temporary and regrettable compromise, the Czechoslovak delegation is not prepared to accept such a provisional solution. Unesco has deemed itself entitled to grant membership to States, including Italy itself, which are not members of the United Nations, and therefore Unesco is just as much entitled to expel China, that expulsion being no more of a political act than the admission of Italy, Austria, and Hungary. If the General Conference lacks the courage itself to decide a question ripe for decision, so much the worse for Unesco. As far as the Czechoslovak delegation is concerned, we are not prepared to be party to diplomatic delaying actions or to a policy of postponing all problems to the Greek Calends.

[10] Mr. President, I must formally request that the motion I presented this morning be put to the vote in this honourable assembly.

[11] The PRESIDENT — The Conference heard a few minutes ago the report of the Credentials Committee. The report stated that the Committee was still engaged on a discussion which had not been completed, relating to the objections made by certain delegations to the credentials of the Chinese delegation. The Credentials Committee's proposal, which I thought was made quite clear by the Chairman of the Committee in his report, is that the Credentials Committee should continue its discussion, which it had not completed, in order not to slow up the work of the Conference. I would remind the Conference that at the present time, no delegation's credentials have been accepted, and the Conference is not yet in a position to transact business. It is a matter of the utmost urgency that the Conference establish itself by recognizing the credentials of delegates seated at the table. Under Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure, when objection is taken to the presence of any delegation, provision is made for the delegation to be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives. The Credentials Committee—referring to Rule 24—has suggested that this Rule should be applied. Personally, as Chairman of this meeting, I can see no other alternative than to apply that Rule until such time as the Conference takes some other decision.

[12] The Credentials Committee has informed us, through its Chairman, that it has not yet completed its examination of the objections raised

against certain representatives here, and in those circumstances Rule 24 would clearly apply. It seems to me, therefore, that the appropriate stage for the Conference to consider what further action might be needed in connexion with the proposal read this morning by the delegate of Czechoslovakia would be when the Conference receives the subsequent report of our Credentials Committee on that matter. The only matter before the Conference at the present time, therefore, is the adoption of the Credentials Committee's first report, which was read a few minutes ago by its Chairman. There is not before the Conference at this stage—particularly before the credentials of any delegation have been established—a proposition of substance which could be the subject of a debate on this occasion.

[13] I would ask again, therefore, as I asked previously, whether there is any objection to the adoption of the Report of the Credentials Committee as read by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee. The delegate of Czechoslovakia wishes to speak. I can hear him on a question of procedure or on the question whether or not we now adopt the Credentials Committee's report, but not on the substance of the matters which were referred to in his recent statement. I did not previously wish to interrupt him, although I did have the feeling that his remarks were not strictly in order as a comment on the Credentials Committee's report.

[14] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — Mr. President, what I want to ask is just whether there is a date fixed for the final decision of the Credentials Committee.

[15] The PRESIDENT — According to the Rules of Procedure, it is the function of the General Committee of the Conference to fix the hour, the date and the order of business of plenary meetings of the Conference, to co-ordinate the work of the Conference, its Commissions, Committees and subsidiary bodies, to consider a request for supplementary items and to assist the President in directing the general work of the session. It would appear to me that in accordance with Rule 36 it would be for the General Committee to decide when the next meeting of the Credentials Committee should be held, provided always that sufficient delegates' credentials have been adopted by the General Conference to enable the Conference to proceed with its work.

[16] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — Is this your final decision concerning my request about the vote on China? I asked you whether the China decision will be taken very soon, say, tomorrow, or whether it had already been decided to postpone it until some later date.

[17] The PRESIDENT — Unless the General Conference decides otherwise, the Credentials Committee will meet again and resume its discussion, its incomplete discussion, of the resolution proposed by Czechoslovakia in relation to the Chinese representatives at a time and date to be fixed by the General Committee. In my personal opinion the General Committee should arrange for that discussion to proceed at the earliest possible date, but that is for the decision of the General Committee, which still has to be elected by the General Conference after the credentials of delegates have been approved.

[18] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — [*Translation from the French*] In view of the President's statement I have no choice but to indicate that, as long as the Kuomintang representatives remain in any organ of Unesco or in Unesco as a whole, the Czechoslovak delegation can take no part in the proceedings of this Conference.

[19] The PRESIDENT — Does anybody else wish to speak? I call on the delegate of Hungary.

[20] Mrs. Boris FAI (Hungary) — [*Translation from the French*] The delegation of the People's Republic of Hungary entirely concurs in the attitude of the delegation of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. It is absolutely impossible for us to accept a postponement of this question. As the Kuomintang representatives in fact represent no one, their presence at the proceedings of any Conference or in any organization can never serve to bring us any nearer to the fine goal we have set ourselves as members of Unesco—that of the attainment, through the co-operation of the nations of the world, of peace among the nations and the general prosperity of all mankind. While peace is threatened by the dreadful armaments race initiated by the imperialists, by the atomic bomb, and by the H-bomb, while the culture of humanity is menaced, it is not for us, who are members of an organization designed to defend peace by the means suited to men of culture, to seek for solutions in a form of words—we must rather put out our fullest effort to raise the cultural level of the greatest possible numbers of the masses. That is being done in actual fact by the People's Democracies, headed by the great Soviet Union; and the new People's China has given us a glorious example of the same high endeavour in conquering, as it has, the atavism of centuries and giving to the masses so far denied it the chance of drinking from the springs of

culture and science. We of the People's Democracies favour deeds, not words. We can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that in the People's Republic of Hungary as in the other People's Democracies, whether we attend this Conference or not, our work goes on; we shall continue to redress the evils committed by our former feudal lords, who kept culture as the prerogative of a small privileged class. In our country the building of schools, universities and theatres, the giving of culture to the masses who have never had it goes on, and I feel that Unesco, an organization serving culture, pursuing closer friendship between the peoples through culture, will lose much more if it loses the democracies that are working effectively for culture's increase than if it excludes the members of a delegation whose government has never done anything to raise the culture of the masses and never will. I repeat again that we of the Hungarian delegation support the proposal of the Czechoslovak delegation and that we cannot remain at these proceedings side by side with a delegation representing no one.

[21] The PRESIDENT — The only proposal before the Conference is that made by the Credentials Committee. A verbal objection has been made to the Committee's report. I think perhaps I had better put the report to the vote. The report, which you have already heard, validates the credentials of certain delegations, admits other delegations provisionally, and notifies us that the question of the Chinese delegation is under consideration by the Committee and that meanwhile the provisions of Article 24 should apply. The Conference will now vote by a show of hands.

[22] The PRESIDENT — (*The vote was taken by a show of hands.*) The votes recorded are: 32 in favour of the acceptance of the report, 1 against and 1 recorded abstention. I therefore declare the report of the Credentials Committee adopted by the Conference.

[23] I should also just mention in passing that there is a provision in the Constitution relating to the right to vote being dependent on the financial status of the members of the Organization and I understand information has been circulated to the delegations showing the state of contributions. My impression is that there is no delegation present which is not eligible to exercise the vote on these grounds, but it was envisaged that in the event of any such problem arising, such delegation should address, if it so desired, a communication to the President of the Conference, which would be submitted to the General Committee, since the Constitution provides that in certain circumstances, this particular restriction may be waived. I merely mention that in passing in order that the procedure may be known to any delegation at any stage which finds that its power to vote at a conference is rendered doubtful by the state of its financial contributions to the Organization.

[24] The next point on our Agenda is the adoption of the Agenda of the Conference, and I will call on the Chairman of the Executive Board to present the Agenda.

IV. Adoption of the Agenda.

[25] Sir John MAUD (Chairman of the Executive Board) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, under our Constitution, it is the duty of the Executive Board to prepare the Agenda of the General Conference. That your Executive Board has done on your behalf, and it is my privilege, as Chairman of the Executive Board, to present for consideration and, I hope, for adoption by the General Conference, the Agenda which is set out in the first number of the Journal of the Conference, issued this morning. It is also set out in a Conference document, 5C/1 (rev.), but I think it will be for your convenience to consider it as it is set out in the Journal of the Conference for 22 May, pages 1 to 5. Mr. President, I beg to submit that Agenda for the approval of the General Conference.

[26] The PRESIDENT — The Conference has heard the proposal of the Chairman of the Executive Board that the Conference adopt the Agenda as set out in the Journal for today. Is there any objection to that proposal? Are there any further proposals? If not, I shall declare the Agenda, as set out in the Journal, *adopted.*

V. Establishment of the Nominations Committee.

[27] The PRESIDENT — The next point on our Agenda is to establish two Committees: the Nominations Committee and the Procedure Committee. These Committees consist of all delegations. The Procedure Committee will not meet until tomorrow morning at 10.30 at the Palazzo Pitti in Room P.21, but it is proposed to call the Nominations Committee immediately in this room. I shall therefore suspend the meeting and ask delegations to remain seated in order that we may hold a meeting of the Nominations Committee, which will have as its task to prepare recommendations for the Conference

with a view to the election of the President and seven Vice-Presidents of the Conference. The members of the Nominations Committee are the heads of delegations or, in their absence, another member of the delegation appointed by the head. After the meeting of the Nominations Committee, the plenary meeting will again be called in order to receive the Nominations Committee's report. The plenary meeting of the Conference is now suspended.

The meeting adjourned at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

VI. Report of the Nominations Committee and election of the President and seven Vice-Presidents of the General Conference.

[28] The PRESIDENT — At this stage in our proceedings in the plenary meeting, the Acting President should call on the Chairman of the Nominations Committee to report on the proceedings of his Committee. However, as the Nominations Committee has graciously invited myself to act as its Chairman, I am under the obligation of delivering the report of the Chairman of the Nominations Committee from the Chair of the Conference itself.

[29] The Nominations Committee has considered the proposals which it wishes to recommend to the Plenary Session for the position of the President of the Conference and for the seven positions of Vice-Presidents. The Nominations Committee desired unanimously to offer the presidency to the delegation of Italy. The leader of the Italian delegation, Professor Gonella, has informed the Nominations Committe that owing to his other duties as Minister of Education, he would find it difficult, if not impossible, to assure the continuous attention to the work of the Conference which he felt the position of President would entail, and he therefore proposed that the Italian delegation should be represented in the person of Senator Jacini, Italian member of the Executive Board and leader of the Italian delegation at previous sessions of the General Conference.

This proposal was adopted by the Nominations Committee with acclamation, and it gives me, as retiring President of the Conference and as leader of the Australian delegation, very special pleasure to propose to the plenary meeting that we now follow the good example of the Nominations Committee and elect our friend and colleague, Count Jacini, President of the General Conference, by acclamation.

[30] Before I call on Count Jacini to take the Chair, I should complete my report as Chairman of the Nominations Committee by informing you that the Nominations Committee recommends the following elections to the positions of Vice-Presidents of the Conference, namely, the delegations of Brazil, Egypt, France, Pakistan, United Kingdom, United States of America, and Venezuela. The President, at a later stage, after he has assumed the presidential Chair, will communicate to the plenary meeting the names of the delegates who have been indicated by the leaders of the delegations as the persons to serve in the position of Vice-Presidents.

[31] Now I have the very pleasing duty of asking my friend and colleague, Count Jacini, to come to the platform and to take over the duties of President of the Conference.

The Chair was taken by H.E. Count Stefano Jacini.

[32] The PRESIDENT — *[Translation from the French]* It is not without warm emotion and a deep sense of gratitude that I assume an office made honourable by my distinguished predecessors in it, the late Miss Ellen Wilkinson and Mr. Léon Blum, H.E. Mr. Manuel Gual Vidal, H.E. Mr. Hamid Bey Frangie, and Dr. Ronald Walker. It is in vain for me to tell myself that the high distinction fallen to me is in no sense personal but merely an honour done to my country in conformity with a tradition of courtesy obtaining since Unesco's earliest days; the honour still remains as great as the responsibility it carries is heavy. I could enlarge on how I shall strive to be worthy of it by diligence and impartiality, but none of you will ever have expected anything else, least of all our good Director-General and my distinguished colleagues of the Executive Board. They have seen me at my work for two years past and have thus had proof that, whatever I lack in talent and authority, I have brought to my work all the faith and all the energy that are in me. So it is not on this point that I want to speak to you.

[33] What I should like to explain briefly are the reasons for which my friends and I have so ardently desired that this Conference should meet in Italy and specifically in Florence; why we have brought such devotion to its preparation—though only the future can show with what success—and why we repose such fervent hopes in a happy issue to our labours. Believe me, our motives are far other than the desire for a sop to our self-esteem, however well deserved, and an understandable outburst of pride in our country.

[34] The supreme goal of the United Nations' policy is peace—and that too is Unesco's goal, which it seeks, in its own sphere, by the way of science, culture and education. After five years of endeavour and praiseworthy experiment, of success and failure, both alike useful and instructive, we have come, as it were, to a turning point in

Unesco's history; I think I am right in saying that we must now adopt once and for all a particular line and method, that we must pick a star to steer by and plot our course in successive stages planned in advance with full regard for the means at our disposal.

[35] Obviously, fundamental education, mass communications, the relief of depressed areas and the restoring of the moral and material destruction everywhere wrought by the war are the very essence of our duty and our most obvious task: when the house is on fire and its occupants lack bread to eat, it would be fatuous to discuss redecoration. On one condition only can we hope to perform the work we have to do, that of drawing strength into ourselves through roots striking deep into the rich soil of the cultural traditions common to mankind. Whether the task be building up a body of teachers worthy of the name, or preparing textbooks for the masses at once accurate and comprehensive, or giving currency to a clear, simple and wholesome view of life in general, we must rely on a chosen few, and these can draw their sustenance only from the living sap of the great humanistic traditions.

[36] Thus at the beginning of a new stage in our work we have felt the need to bathe anew in the springs of our past, to look once more on the majestic relics of the Renaissance here assembled before our eyes in unmatched richness. As I have said repeatedly, these traditions and these monuments of other days belong to you as fully as to us: the sole special privilege we in Italy enjoy is to be their natural guardians. Here the past still lives, and works on our innermost feelings with a force unknown elsewhere: that is why we have sought to have you, for a brief month, breathe this air with us that our work may thereby be freshened and vitalized. Among us the past does not die and the pattern retains its unity from the enigmatic smile of the carven figures reclining on Etruscan sarcophagi, in the halflight of ancient burial vaults, down to the revolutionary popular upsurge of the Risorgimento, which a century ago brought freedom and union to our country.

[37] This morning, on the Ponte Vecchio, you might have thought you met the young Dante in scarlet tunic and snowy capeline, as Giotto painted him, pretending absorption in the goldsmiths' windows but following out of the corner of his eye the slim figure of a girl, almost a child, at the bridge's farther end, who as she passed had given him frank and friendly greeting:

Tanto gentile e tanto onesta pare
La donna mia quand'ella altrui saluta. . .

Farther on, the echo of fresh laughter which you seemed to hear from behind an ancient wall thick with wistaria came to you down the centuries from the lips of Florentine beauties, whose minds Boccaccio was distracting from the horrors of the plague. The mighty voice, resounding through vast cloisters adorned by Fra Angelico, was Savonarola's condemning the vanities of the age of the Medici; and the pungent scent which steals down the hill towards you comes from Arcetri, where old Galileo, almost blind, lay in his bed of state debating with his disciples the fundamental laws of nature.

[38] That is humanism, living and eternal. Nor is it something exclusive to our land, Montaigne was its heir in France, Bacon in England and Erasmus in the Netherlands. The philosophers of the Arab world had sown its seed and the earth's most distant lands were to gather the harvest; in West and East alike, to Europe's farthest confines, the hoard of treasure was to grow. And so it was that over the centuries there spread throughout the world—like a Unesco born before its time—the worship of beauty, truth and learning, eternal and victorious, which devastation, internal discord or bloody conflict can never utterly destroy.

[39] It is from that past, so alive to our hearts and spirits, that you are to draw life. Nor will it blind you to your present tasks. When, in the leisure left you by our meetings, you visit the towns of Tuscany and Italy in rivalry for the honour of receiving you, you will be able to see the daily toil of a hard-working people, sober and intelligent, absorbed in rebuilding the commerce and agriculture damaged by the war, in the defence of its currency and in a work of social renewal which does not hesitate at the boldest reforms, though rejecting all that is totalitarian, whether Left or Right. In such a society only accurate knowledge is needed of Unesco's role as the trustee of a world-embracing notion of peace and progress for it to cover the land like a life-giving dew and to win the suffrages that count the most, those of the lowly and the humble. Our work begins with fair auguries. May the Eternal Source of all wisdom aid it and may the great spirits of humanism which haunt the shadows of this Palace, look on it with favour. Let us then to work.

[40] I shall now read out the list of the countries allocated Vice-Presidencies and the names of those members of delegations appointed to those Vice-Presidencies. Brazil: H.E. Mr. Clemente Mariani Bittencourt; Egypt: H.E. Taha Hussein Bey; United States of America: Dr. Howland H. Sargeant; France H.E. Mr. Yvon Delbos; Pakistan: Dr. Mahmoud Hasan; United Kingdom: Mr. D. R. Hardman; Venezuela: H.E. Dr. C. Parra-Pérez. I have the honour to declare the President

of the Conference and the delegates just named duly elected. I call on Mr. Laugier, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations.

[41] Mr. Henri LAUGIER (Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the first time that circumstances have permitted my representing the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the General Conference of Unesco. I am deeply sensible of the honour fallen to me in bringing, in the Secretary-General's name, the greetings and good wishes of the United Nations to the distinguished organization whose task in this troubled world is to secure the general increase of education, science and culture in every part, and to dedicate the work, research and achievements of thinkers. educators, scientists, philosophers and artists to the maintenance of the peace which, though still precarious and in constant peril, is yet the enduring hope of all peoples in the world's four corners.

[42] Ladies and gentlemen, Unesco has before it an almost unlimited programme, which it is very properly endeavouring to cover in its entirety through laying down the priorities and the timetable made necessary by its extent. I cannot of course discuss nor even enumerate, on this occasion, all the items in your specialized programme which are of joint interest to the central organs of the United Nations and to Unesco itself and where accordingly co-operation is necessary and the concentration and marshalling of our forces are essential. However, I do wish to mention how warm and unclouded the co-operation between the United Nations and Unesco has been, and for it I offer my sincerest thanks to Unesco, to its Director-General and to its governing bodies. There is one matter on which I should like to dwell a little, that of the struggle for respect for human rights throughout the universe. It is a field in which joint action has been specially fruitful in the past and which, in the near and distant future alike, requires both of Unesco and of the United Nations a new and determined effort.

[43] Ladies and gentlemen, the history of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the short space of time which divides us from the date of its proclamation, the story of how it has taken root in the thought and practice of individuals, non-governmental organizations and governments themselves in that brief period, is among the most suggestive, the most abundant in lessons and the most encouraging of our age. We all remember the memorable evening eighteen months ago on 10 December 1948 when the Universal Declaration was adopted in Paris. That Declaration was the work of thousands of men and women; not of delegates alone or jurists alone, but of the common folk of our own age and the past who in a thousand battles made safe the victory of Human Rights. You remember the appeal by the Assembly in Paris to the governments of Member States, to the Specialized Agencies and to non-governmental organizations, asking them to neglect no means in their power to forward the publication of the text of the Declaration and to ensure that it be distributed, read and expounded in schools and other educational establishments. It will be Unesco's glory, and it will be deemed one of Unesco's best achievements, that it has used all the means of communication available to the modern world to bring the message of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to the knowledge of the peoples, so that its principles may inform their throughts and their whole lives and inspire their daily striving for the liberation of mankind. During the month which followed the Declaration's adoption, your distinguished Director-General summoned all your Member States to emulation in the tasks of spreading that message. The last Conference of Unesco in Paris laid down the general lines for a vast programme of publications and of action. Human Rights Day was celebrated on 10 December 1949, the first anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration, in 42 countries. From every quarter reports come in that teaching about the Declaration has been included in the syllabuses of primary, secondary and higher schools. In the launching of all these undertakings Unesco has co-operated closely and strongly with the United Nations. Since then, the work undertaken and the results achieved make an impressive total which bears witness to the effectiveness of education joined with action. In numerous decisions by major organs of the United Nations, the moral authority of the Universal Declaration is the basis for recommendations designed to redress violations of Human Rights. There are signs that the Declaration is becoming a source of law and increasingly incorporated in national or international systems. The annex to the Instrument establishing the Netherlands-Indonesian Union includes nineteen articles closely resembling those of the Universal Declaration and setting out the fundamental rights and liberties vesting in the Union's members. The newly drafted Statute of Jerusalem includes many of the rights and liberties proclaimed in the Declaration. In the new Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland, the Declaration affords a basis for guarantees of Human Rights. A special Commission of the Canadian Senate, with the task of "reporting on Human Rights and fundamental liberties", has had before it a bill

or draft declaration on Human Rights consisting of 18 articles, mostly borrowed from the Universal Declaration, and in the Conference, Governing Body and expert committees of the International Labour Office, days and weeks are devoted ot the impassioned discussion of such questions as the protection of trade union rights, forced labour, slavery, statelessness, freedom of information, and the fight against discriminatory measures, all of them matters involvings Human Rights.

[44] If I have detailed at such length the results achieved in a field which is truly of vital importance, it is because those results are evidence of the effectiveness of close co-operation between the United Nations and Unesco and because they also point to the need for further joint action. The peoples forming the United Nations have barely begun the struggle for respect for Human Rights. They cannot close their eyes to the iniquities which are the hallmark of our tragic age, to the chains which still bind the limbs and souls of men in so many lands, to the discrimination still so widespread, to the unequal position forced on women, to the multitude of arbitrary arrests and condemnations or to the disregard of the economic and social rights to which men and women should be entitled.

[45] Of all these evils there is one to which I want to draw your attention, because it has already been the subject of recommendations by the United Nations and because an enquiry into it is already on the stocks in your own Organization: I refer to discrimination. There can hardly be a duty more urgent today than that of inculcating into the conscience of the world the basic principles of non-discrimination affirmed in all the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To do this we must publish abroad the truth, the facts which science has established, and drag into the light the mendacious quibbles of the theories which are advanced to justify racial, religious or any other prejudice. You will recollect that in March of 1949 the Economic and Social Council suggested that Unesco "consider the desirability of initiating and recommending the general adoption of a programme of disseminating scientific facts designed to remove what is commonly known as racial prejudice". Effect was given to this suggestion in your 1950 programme and the launching of the enterprise appears to be progressing satisfactorily. But however active you may be, can this gigantic and vitally important task be completed in 1950? I find that difficult to believe, and if I am right I want to impress on you how greatly it is to be desired that this investigation be retained in your 1951 programme. This is a question in which the United Nations, and more particularly the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commissions, have urgent need of Unesco's support. This is not merely a personal view. As lately as 4 May last, the Commission on Human Rights stated that it was anxiously awaiting the next documents from Unesco on race considered in the light of contemporary scientific knowledge; and it went on to ask Unesco, to "proceed as soon as practicable with the preparation, publication and dissemination of simple and readable books or pamphlets, based on scientific facts, explaining the fallacies of mistaken race theories" on which discriminatory prejudices are based. I draw your special attention to this recent request, being persuaded that, here as everywhere else, the United Nations will receive Unesco's generous support and co-operation.

[46] Ladies and gentlemen, I may perhaps have dwelt too long on the question of Human Rights, but before Unesco in council I do not apologize; I still recall the noble words of your Director-General on the Declaration: "The authors of that document did not see themselves as historians submitting for the applause of specialists a survey of our legislative inheritance. They threw down a challenge, and in that challenge, though in the language of lawyers, lives the cry of man. Every right is a basic demand of the individual or of society; it is an act of defiance of the forces of injustice". And that is just what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is: it is a long-range manœuvre by the United Nations in their fight for peace and a permanent declaration of war in all theatres of the world against all such causes of strife as injustice, oppression, tyranny, discrimination, prejudice, the poverty and the suffering of men. Let us but advance shoulder to shoulder and together we shall see the triumph of this great and noble cause.

[47] Ladies and gentlemen, Unesco's programme is so abundant, so rich in projects pregnant with hope for the future of mankind, that it would be vain on this occasion to seek to comment, even superficially, on all its sectors. But I do want to take up your time for a few more minutes to attempt to express as faithfully as possible the ideas of the Secretary-General on certain items of immediate urgency, of which a part but not the whole is within your competence and in which Unesco is intimately concerned. Ladies and gentlemen, had he been able to be among us today the Secretary-General, knowing the high tasks entrusted to the Specialized Agencies and the great responsibilities which are theirs, would without doubt have appealed to the States here represented for their warm support, within their national spheres by all the means at their disposal, of the Specialized Agencies, which are all in varying degrees suffering from the consequences of the

cold war. As it is, I make the appeal in his name. To be more explicit, in Unesco's case, it is my earnest hope that National Commissions may receive full support in every Member State. I pray that thus they may become active allies, your critics, and creators in their own right, bringing powerful aid from the perimeter to Unesco at the centre, devising national programmes inspired by Unesco's resolutions and assisting towards the mobilization of the resources, material and spiritual, of Member States for the achievement of those programmes. Thus Unesco's influence would reach far out to all departments of intellectual activity in all Member States and this close network would contribute effectively to intellectual co-operation for peace throughout the world.

[48] Nevertheless, gentlemen, if circumstances had allowed him to come here today, the Secretary-General would also have given voice, as he did a few days ago before the World Health Assembly, to the uneasiness he shares with all men of feeling at the present state of the world. He would have told you, as he told the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination in Paris, of his deep distress that so many seats of Member States remain empty in the Specialized Agencies, and others vacated, though let us hope but temporarily, in so many of the central organs of the United Nations. He would have told you that the close connexion between economic, social and cultural matters and political affairs means that there must be total solidarity between the Specialized Agencies and the United Nations in the world's effort to ensure peace. He would have read you the Joint Declaration signed in Paris by the Directors-General of 11 Specialized Agencies, which associates all members of the great family of the United Nations in a common faith, in a common hope and in total solidarity. May I read that declaration now:

The present division of the world and increasingly serious conflicts of policy among the Great Powers have gravely impaired the prospects for world peace and for raising the standard of living of the peoples of the world.

The United Nations and the Specialized Agencies are founded upon the principles that lasting world peace can only be achieved and maintained by world organization, and that world problems like disease, hunger, ignorance and poverty, which recognize no frontier, can never be overcome unless all the nations join in universal efforts to these ends.

We reaffirm the validity of this principle of universality. The United Nations system makes ample room for diversity within a universal framework. We believe it would be a disaster if efforts to realize the principle of universality in practice were to be abandoned now.

We believe that the greatest efforts should, on the contrary, be directed towards achieving in fact true universality in the membership and programmes of the United Nations and of those of the Specialized Agencies which are founded on that principle.

We also believe that it is necessary for all governments to renew their efforts to conciliate and negotiate the political differences that divide them and obstruct economic and social advancement.

Specifically we believe that it is essential to the future of both the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies that the present political deadlock in the United Nations be resolved at the earliest possible moment.

The peace and well-being of all peoples demand from their governments a great and sustained new effort by the nations of the world to achieve a constructive and durable peace.

That is the conclusion of the Declaration unanimously adopted by the heads of the Specialized Agencies represented at the Conference in Paris a few weeks back.

[49] Ladies and gentlemen, had the Secretary-General come to Florence, he would have told you how heavily the years through which we are living weigh upon our leaders at a time when their policies must combine boldness and imagination, intellectual courage, speed of decision and prudence; at a moment when their slightest gesture may tighten or relax the tension and when everything proclaims that humanity is passing through a decisive period in its tragic history. I repeat, "decisive"; that is what I said at Cleveland at the meeting of the American National Commission and I repeat it here today: in the course of a few centuries the discovery of fire, steam, the internal combustion engine, electricity, chemical explosives and the mechanics of nuclear fission have put into the hands of men immeasurable and overwhelming power which can be used to destroy almost in a matter of seconds all the human civilization created by the effort of the ages, or slowly but surely to build a golden age for all men. The days to come are decisive because in them men will be required to make a decisive choice whether their ideal shall be the vise man, the *homo sapiens* of the zoologists, or the stupid man, *homo stultus*. Whether the choice will be made next month, next year, or in the years to come no one can say; yet there can be no doubt that it will be within the lifetime of this generation that humanity must elect for wisdom or folly, for union or extinction. Ladies and gentlemen, the United Nations claim no monopoly. They welcome with gratitude every endeavour designed to end the cold war and to ensure a just and living peace, enduring because it can be adjusted to meet the changing conditions of the world. The United Nations pray for a happy outcome to all such efforts fathered by good will, even if they by-pass or disregard the United Nations. Yet when voices

are raised on many sides calling for the restoring of the bridges between East and West or for the building of new causeways, we who are the sworn servants of the United Nations deem it our duty to remind all men that one bridge still stands, built by the will and with the consent of all, the Charter of the United Nations signed by all Member States, binding on all of them, and containing all the mechanisms needed for negotiation and for adjudication of the differences arising in the world today. The most urgent present need is to restore the normal functioning of the United Nations system, and it is in an endeavour to accomplish that high task that the Secretary-General is travelling from capital to capital, a pilgrim in the cause of international co-operation and the world radius of international institutions, placing his final trust in the wisdom of governments and knowing that in all countries, in East and West alike, the common people follow him with their prayers for the success of his mission of peace. Through my unworthy lips he asks that all of you whatever your task in life, should support him an should bring your united strength to help the effort to restore the full effectiveness of the United Nations as an agency for peace.

[50] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, your applause makes it unnecessary for me to seek to express your thoughts, your gratitude to M. Laugier and the Secretariat of the United Nations for the powerful and masterful contribution he has just made to our proceedings. The President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference and the Chairmen of the Nominations and Credentials Committees having been elected, a part of the General Committee of the Conference is now in being. Its numbers will be completed later when the Chairmen of the Commissions and Committees have been elected. I shall ask the members already appointed to the Committee and the Chairman of the Executive Board, as an *ex-officio* member, to attend a preliminary meeting to take place at the end of this meeting in the Sala dei Duecento.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

THIRD PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
VII.	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission to the Fifth Session of observers from international non-governmental organizations	57
VIII.	Establishment of Commissions and Committees	57
IX.	Presentation by the Chairman of the Executive Board of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 and discussion thereon: Speeches by the Director-General and the delegate of Greece	58

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As I am sure the Conference is anxious to hear the Director-General's Report, we will despatch the secondary questions before us as quickly as possible. I have the following announcements to make:

(1) The General Committee of the Conference held its first meeting late yesterday afternoon. It examined the proposed organization of the work of the Fifth Session, which, in accordance with the Constitution, was prepared by the Executive Board, and without discussing in detail the proposals and time-table contained in the document, it asked the General Conference to accept it provisionally as a working basis. The General Committee approved, in particular, the draft

resolution adopted by the Executive Board at its Twentieth Session, defining the composition and terms of reference of the Budget Committee. The text of this resolution is reproduced in document 5C/BUR/1, Addendum and Corrigendum. The General Committee recommended the General Conference to adopt this draft resolution subject to the following amendments :

Paragraph 1: The membership of the Committee, originally given as eleven, has been corrected to twelve. With the nomination of Iraq, the paragraph should now read: "The Budget Committee shall consist of thirteen members."

Paragraph 3 (*c*): Read: "Prepare, in the light of the recommendations of the three Commissions, and submit to the Conference through the Programme and Budget Commission ...". The rest remains unchanged.

This Committee must start work as rapidly as possible. The General Committee therefore recommends that it should hold its first meeting this afternoon. Lastly, the General Committee has fixed its next meeting for tomorrow morning, Wednesday, at 10.30, and the second meeting of the Credentials Committee for Thursday at 9.30 a.m. Does the General Conference accept the proposals of the General Committee? As there are no comments, these proposals are *adopted*.

(2) Declaration by the World Health Organization and the International Labour Office. It is a tradition that the representatives of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies shall address the Conference before the consideration of the Director-General's Report. Yesterday, we had the pleasure of hearing Mr. Laugier, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I now call upon the representative of the World Health Organization, Dr. Grzegorzewski.

[2] Dr. E. GRZEGORZEWSKI (World Health Organization) — Mr. President, on behalf of the Director-General of the World Health Organization, I have the honour to address the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco. The World Health Organization is grateful for the opportunity to be represented at this General Conference, for, as the Health Assembly is in session at this moment in Geneva, the Director-General of WHO regrets that he is unable to come here in person. I need not dwell upon the significance of this Conference for our common effort. Besides the projects in which our Organizations are to co-operate, we share a broad concern for the development of scientific knowledge and for its application in such a way as to advance the cause of peace and human dignity. We have also a particular sense of responsibility with regard to this Conference because the Director-General of Unesco has invited WHO to comment upon the health aspects of the Unesco draft Programme for 1951. By so doing he has made a positive contribution towards the effort to use to best advantage the slender resources of both Agencies by planning together in advance and pooling our resources when we can. We shall bring such suggestions as WHO has to offer to the attention of the Programme Commission. WHO values any action to advance health either directly or indirectly. One of our constitutional obligations is to collaborate in all such activities and we are eager to fulfil this obligation, provided, of course, that the activities are properly co-ordinated. It is a satisfaction to report to you that such collaboration is taking place in several fields which have often been mentioned by the representatives and in the reports of both Agencies. With the ideas which are presented in the Unesco Programme for 1951 WHO agrees wholeheartedly.

[3] Concerning the implementation of this programme, we wish to assure you of our willingness to collaborate so far as there is adequate provision in the approved programme of WHO or so far as our activities can be adjusted to Unesco projects which relate to health. As you are well aware, certain activities of either Specialized Agency must be reviewed and approved by this Conference or by the World Health Assembly before they can be put into effect. They must first be worked out by the Director-General, then included in a draft Programme and Budget for consideration by Member States and the Executive Board. Necessary appropriations must be made well in advance. The procedure for approving the project so that it can go into action takes considerable time. It sometimes happens that, although there may be full understanding and great sympathy for a project, it cannot be implemented, simply because the necessary formal steps could not be taken in good time.

[4] The synchronization of all such steps would appear to be the most practical way of achieving fuller collaboration. The aim would be that the participating organizations should have proposals for collaboration before their General Conferences at the same stage of development of the project and at the same time. This in turn would require joint planning at an earlier stage by the technical services of the interested Agencies. We hope that, as our experience increases, we may soon reach the point where the plans of each Agency for participation in the work can be submitted for approval in their respective programmes and budgets for the same year. Such a procedure may also assist the delegations sent by a gov-

ernment to each of the collaborating Agencies in adopting a co-ordinated position with regard to each Agency's part of the project. May I say that Unesco's co-operative attitude towards other Agencies gives us the certainty that joint effort will efficiently serve the needs of member nations, which is our common aim and duty.

VII. Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission to the Fifth Session of observers from international non-governmental organizations.

[5] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I thank the delegate of the World Health Organization for his excellent speech. We shall now pass on to item 6 of the Agenda: Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission to the Fifth Session of observers from international non-governmental organizations (document 5C/8). I call upon Sir John Maud, Chairman of the Executive Board.

[6] Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, there is a small but rather important point which the Executive Board now wishes you to consider. Under our Constitution, organizations which have consultative status with Unesco are automatically invited to send observers to our General Conference, but the Constitution provides for the Executive Board to suggest certain other organizations which are of international scope. The Conference can then decide, if necessary by a two-thirds majority vote, whether to invite observers from such bodies. The Board on this occasion wishes to propose to the Conference that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation should be invited to send observers. I think, Mr. President, that the Conference may particularly welcome this prophetic gleam on the part of the Executive Board in having suggested, in the Rockefeller Foundation, a body which, in fact, laid the foundation many years ago of that personal relationship between the President of the Republic of Italy and the late Acting President of this Conference—that relationship to which the President of the Italian Republic paid such moving tribute when he addressed us yesterday and particularly delighted his English-speaking friends.

[7] And so, Mr. President, I have the honour on behalf of the Board to propose the following resolution that

Having regard to Article IV, paragraph 13, of the Constitution and to Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure, and to the recommendation of the Executive Board:

The General Conference decides to admit observers of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and of the Rockefeller Foundation to the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

I beg to move this resolution.

[8] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Does anyone wish to comment on the recommendation by the Chairman, Sir John Maud? The recommendation is seconded? The Chinese representative has asked to speak.

[9] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — Fellow colleagues, I think it is a very good proposal and I heartily second it.

[10] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] If there are no objections, the proposals of Sir John Maud will be considered as approved by the Conference. The two organizations are therefore authorized to participate in the work of the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

VIII. Establishment of Commissions and Committees.

[11] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, the Nominations Committee met this morning and considered proposals which it desires to make to the General Conference regarding the composition of the Budget Committee and the officers of the various Commissions and Committees of the Conference. The decision on these matters rests with the appropriate bodies—that is to say, it is for the plenary Conference to nominate the members of the Budget Committee; on all the other Committees all delegations are represented and it is for the Commissions or Committees to appoint their officers.

[12] The proposal of the Nominations Committee with regard to the membership of the Budget Committee is as follows: delegates of Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America. The Nominations Committee will propose to the Budget Committee that the Chairman of that Committee should be Dr. F. Bender of the Netherlands, that the Vice-Chairman should be the representative of Canada, and the Rapporteur should be the representative of Israel, and we are informed that in that event the person in question for Israel would be Dr. Pinhas Kohn.

[13] With regard to the other Commissions, the following are the proposals of the Nominations Committee:

Programme and Budget Commission:
Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX, of France; Vice-Chairmen: Dr. BEEBY of New Zealand, and Mr. ALI HEKMAT of Persia; Rapporteur: Professor FLORKIN of Belgium.

Official and External Relations Commission:
Chairman: Dr. MARIANO BRULL of Cuba; Vice-Chairman: Professor PIAGET of Switzerland, with a delegate of Burma as second Vice-Chairman; Rapporteur: a delegate of Norway, whom we understand would be Professor SOMMERFELT.

Administrative Commission:
The Nominations Committee proposes, as Chairman, the delegate of India, as Vice-Chairmen, the delegates of Greece and Thailand, and as Rapporteur, Mr. ST. CLAIR SMITH of Australia.

Procedure Committee:
For the position of Chairman the Nominations Committee recommends Professor NIELSEN of Denmark, for Vice-Chairman the delegate of the Philippines, and as Rapporteur the delegate of Sweden.

[14] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As the General Conference has approved the recommendations of the General Committee concerning the constitution of the Commissions and the Budget Committee, and has heard the recommendations of the Nominations Committee, it is necessary to establish these bodies immediately so that they may elect their Chairmen and begin work. We shall adopt a shortened procedure similar to that adopted last year in Paris. I shall convene here the three Commissions in turn and invite them to elect their Chairmen. We shall then resume the meeting and revert to the Agenda of the General Conference. The meeting is therefore temporarily suspended.

The meeting resumed at 11.15 a.m.

IX. Presentation by the Chairman of the Executive Board of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization, and discussion thereon.

[15] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We still have to consider item 5 of the Agenda: Presentation and discussion of the Director-General's Report. In accordance with the Constitution, the Chairman of the Executive Board will present to the Conference, with or without comment, the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization. Printed copies of this Report, which is numbered 5C/3, have been distributed to delegations, as well as a stencilled supplement, 5C/3 Addendum, containing the most recent information concerning Unesco's activities. I now call upon Sir John Maud, Chairman of the Executive Board.

[16] Sir John MAUD (Chairman of the Executive Board) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, as Chairman of the Executive Board I have the honour, under the provisions of the Constitution, to present to you, as the General Conference, the Report of the Director-General on the activities of Unesco in the period between November 1949 and May 1950, and the first comment that I want to make on behalf of the Board is that we think the Director-General's Report a first-rate document. We think that what he says is true, and that he has rendered all of us an important service, not only in telling us so clearly what has happened since the General Conference's last session, but also in speaking with such honesty and openness about certain mistakes; all of us in Unesco must try to improve on our past practices.

[17] My second comment on behalf of the Board is that we are convinced that in the author of this first-rate Report we have a first-rate Director-General. We want to tell the General Conference quite frankly that we have always had confidence in our Director-General, but the events of the last eight months which are recorded in this Report have greatly strengthened our confidence both in the Director-General, and in his colleagues who form the rest of the Secretariat. And here, Mr. President, I must say how greatly indebted we think the Organization is, and always will be, to Dr. Laves, the Deputy Director-General.

[18] Now on behalf of the Board, I would next like to pay special tribute to the closeness and continuity of the collaboration between the Director-General and his colleagues on the one hand, and us eighteen members of the Executive Board on the other. Most partners have sometimes treated each other with brutal frankness, as any partners in a great democratic organization must do, and naturally we have often expressed different points of view. But I cannot remember any point of substance on which we have not finally found agreement, and what I think is still more important is that in the process of this democratic collaboration we members of the Board have become personal friends of the Director-General.

[19] Now, these last eighteen months the Secretariat has really had an almost impossible task. Besides playing their part in the execution of the Programme, they have had to prepare for two

Sessions of the General Conference, not to mention eight Sessions of the Executive Board. In our opinion the Secretariat has succeeded to an extent which we had no right to expect in discharging that almost impossible task, but we must not ask them to continue to compete against such heavy odds. The amount of sick leave in the Secretariat, to which the Director-General draws attention, is clear evidence of something wrong, and the Director-General himself has taxed his physical powers much more than he should. He has been sick quite often and he has taken far too little sick leave. That makes us all the more delighted that he is obviously fighting-fit today. But we must do what we can as a General Conference to relieve the strain in future for him and his colleagues, and I would here pay respectful tribute to that senior member of the Secretariat who died in harness, Dr. Ramos, at the head of the Social Science Department.

[20] Now before speaking further of the health of the Secretariat, I want to turn, on behalf of the Board, to the health of that great part of Unesco which is not housed in Unesco House in Paris, I mean, the health of the national States who are the members of Unesco. The Board entirely agrees with the Director-General when he says in his Report:

> Only through the will and acts of Member States can Unesco fulfil its true purpose, to be a network of mutual services and a directive force working for the transformation of the world.

Now we are all of us delighted that the number of Member States is now fifty-six, and has increased by six since the last session of the General Conference. We welcome most heartily our new colleagues from Ceylon, Guatemala, Panama, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Costa Rica, and we are glad that three more States are applying for membership at this Session of the General Conference. For our purpose, if I may again use the Director-General's words:

> Co-operation from the most diverse quarters is indispensable and it is only on the widest possible international basis that our mandate to transform the ideal of universal intellectual and moral solidarity into a living reality can be fulfilled.

[21] Within the Member States, there is also some welcome evidence of increasing activity. At the beginning of 1949 there were thirty-one National Commissions and today there are forty-three. Well, what of the health of these Member States? We believe in the Board that that health is better than it has ever been before, but we also believe that it must be vastly improved. It is, in our opinion, a fact and the Director-General had the courage to report it, that except in a few fields in a few countries, the action of Member States is still unsatisfactory. Now let every one of us delegates, if I may become a delegate for a moment, ask ourselves a few straight questions like this: in my country does public opinion support Unesco with the energy and enthusiasm that it should do? How much account does my government take of Unesco's purposes (which it, that government, solemnly endorsed when it joined Unesco) in framing the government's educational policy, its customs policy and its taxation policy, and so on? Does the National Commission in my country, if there is one, mobilize as it might all those forces of teachers, for example, scientists, artists, churches, trade unions, and the private citizen? Well, no member of the Executive Board could give entirely satisfactory answers to any of those questions. I think we must all agree with the Director-General's verdict which I quoted just now, and yet we are all convinced that it is on the increased intensity of the activities inside Member States that Unesco's future largely depends.

[22] What should our response be to this challenge, the Board has asked itself? Well, first, if I may be brutally frank, on behalf of the Board, by paying our subscriptions in full and promptly. No club can be satisfied with itself unless all its members pay their dues, and certainly no organization can be business-like unless its annual expenditure is matched by the annual income which it has a right to expect, and on which it has based the scale of its activities. That is the first point.

[23] And the second response. We feel we must correct the disproportion between Unesco activities in Member States which, as the Director-General rightly says, should be fundamental, and the activities of the Secretariat which, as he says, cannot be anything but instrumental. We must agree, ladies and gentlemen, upon a rate of work which is within the reasonable capacities of both the Secretariat and Member States, and then we must do our utmost, all of us, to keep in step.

[24] Now the Director-General foreshadows some abatement in the pace at which the Secretariat has been working in recent months. It has been a bit too hot, even for him, and it has certainly been a bit hot for some of the Member States. But we delegates from Member States, I believe, must pledge ourselves to step up the pace of activity inside our national frontiers to whatever degree we realistically think possible. That is the only way in which the Secretariat and the Member States can help each other as they should and so help Unesco. If I may put it in this way, we are all of us, Secretariat and Member

States, in the same boat. Now what sort of boat, I am not quite sure, but I think the Board would agree the boat is not a gondola, and our good Director-General is not a gondolier. We cannot expect to be paddled along by the Secretariat. The delegate for Greece knows more about those ancient Greek vessels, the triremes, than I do, and you, Mr. President, know more than I do about those ancient Roman vessels, the quinquiremes, but I think myself that if we are in the same boat the boat is perhaps rather like a quinquireme or a trireme, with a lot of people bending and sweating away at the oars, and a steersman. And what matters, what will determine our pace through the water and whether this voyage of exploration is well directed, depends on all of us responsible for getting that boat moving, rowing in tune and keeping our bodies swinging together.

[25] The third response which the Board suggests we should make to this challenge is that we should develop what the Director-General has rightly said has perhaps been Unesco's greatest success so far—collaboration with international organizations. First in the natural sciences, and now in cultural activities and reconstruction, Unesco has found it possible in practice to join hands and keep in step with these independent international organizations and, we think, with palpably valuable results. Incidentally, no other organ of the United Nations—I hope Mr. Laugier will check me if I am wrong—has the advantage that Unesco has of consultative agreements with over a hundred non-governmental organizations.

[26] We on the Board have spent a lot of time reviewing the results of this particular method of work and we believe that the money and manpower expended by Unesco in this way have made and are making a notable contribution to increased understanding and collaboration across frontiers. And we are convinced that the technique can be used by Unesco to still greater effect in future. We agree with the Director-General that one of the invaluable characteristics of this collaboration is that it respects the freedom of the human spirit and enables Unesco to foster independent research and helps to secure for the world more of the inestimable benefits of free enquiry. Incidentally, it transfers from the Secretariat responsibility for various kinds of work (work on which scholars and scientists working in their private capacities are probably far more likely to do well than even the finest international civil servant) though I think that in this great trireme there are a few small shells or racing vessels which we can send out from the main boat, Unesco probably providing the boat itself and keeping an eye on the way in which it is directed, but letting the international organizations and these independent bodies of scientists and artists get on with the work and increase the scope of our total exploration.

[27] Now to return for a moment to the Secretariat. Its manning and organization is primarily the business, of course, of the Director-General. He is our chief administrative officer. But on behalf of the Board I want to draw attention to three respects in which the Member States and the General Conference have got to help the Director-General in his efforts to make the Secretariat a fully effective instrument of our common will.

[28] First, we must help him to recruit first-rate men and women. Now there never are, and I suspect there never have been, enough first-rate men and women to do the work either in national or international efforts for peace. The Director-General very frankly tells us that he had to increase the size of the Secretariat and quite frankly for filling these posts in the Secretariat, second-rate men and women are worse than useless. But each Member State also needs all the first-rate people it can lay its hand on and so let us honestly try and answer the question: how many of the right people must be spared for service in the Secretariat? How large do we want the Secretariat to be? And then when we have agreed on that, do our utmost to make that number of people available to the Director-General.

[29] Particularly I think we must try and take the Director-General's advice and accept his most reasonable request that universities and government departments should be prepared to second members of their staff for service in the Secretariat with the certainty of a job waiting for them when it is time for them to return to their own country. On his side the Director-General is doing his part by offering relatively long-term contracts nowadays, and in that way reducing the insecurity of tenure which certainly has limited the possibilities of recruiting good people in the past. So the first way we can help him is by recruitment.

[30] Secondly, the General Conference can do many things to enable the Director-General to carry further the process of simplifying his administrative organization. He has simplified it since our last Conference, but if he is to simplify it more, it largely depends on the General Conference. Each time we are tempted to escape from the odious need to reach a firm decision at the General Conference by inviting the Director-General to study the question further and produce a report, just let us remind ourselves of the increased burden that such cowardice on our part would place on the Secretariat. And each time we are tempted to elaborate financial regu-

lations, let us pause and remember that by such regulations we may well be enhancing the thickness of the bureaucratic jungle, which at other times we find it quite easy to deplore. Instead of that, let us do everything we can to make it possible for the Director-General to establish conditions in which all members of the Secretariat can be responsible public servants, and at the same time exploit their capacities for creative and lively work. Let us help him to make the Organization still more simple and the Secretariat still happier people.

[31] And the third response is this : when we come to consider our programme, which we are not doing today, do let us make sure that there is nothing in it which we do not honestly think indispensable to Unesco's purpose. Because, unless our programme is concentrated on work that we really think essential, we shall be only half-hearted in our efforts to help the Director-General to obtain the staff he thinks he needs.

[32] But the main purpose of the Director-General's Report is not to guide our future steps. It is to report upon what Unesco has been doing these last eight months and is doing now. And so with this debate on the Director-General's Report which we are now to have, our chief business is to take stock of what Unesco has already done and search our consciences accordingly. Later we shall be debating the Programme and the Budget and that will be the time to consider the future and try to apply such lessons from the past as our heart-searching has taught us.

[33] Now as to what is recorded as having happened and has happened in this Report, the Board finds good reason for the friends of Unesco to be glad and take new heart. Here is a record of real achievement by Unesco after four years of unremitting efforts, first under the leadership of Dr. Julian Huxley, whom I know we are all very glad to have with us again, and for the last eighteen months under the leadership of the present Director-General. And it is a record of achievement, the Board feels, not on paper or in plans only, but literally in the minds of men. Today I dare to say the minds of many men are at least slightly different from what they would have been if Unesco had not existed. Thanks to Unesco there are some men, women and children in almost every one of the Member States who have rather more understanding of their neighbours across the frontiers, and even some experience of working with them in practice as fellow members of a society wider than their own nation. Let me give you one or two examples from the multitude mentioned in this Report. There are the men and women of many nations who work together for several weeks on particular concrete problems in those seminars which Unesco has organized or helped to organize in Mysore, in Rio de Janeiro and in Elsinore, to give three examples. And there is the much larger number of people in all those countries who are now being influenced and will continue to be influenced by the follow-up of the work of those seminars. And then there are more than a hundred men and women who have been enabled by fellowships or travel grants to visit countries other than their own for study or research or further self-education, the wandering scholars of the twentieth century. And there is the far larger number — an unknown number — of all those who have gained similar benefits by using the information which Unesco has collected and made available in its publication, *Study Abroad*, recording the thousands of opportunities offered in different countries to the wandering scholars. And then there are tens of thousands who have read articles in those 400 newspapers which now regularly make use of Unesco features made available every fortnight by Unesco to editors throughout the world. And there are hundreds of thousands who hear broadcasts from those 490 radio stations which make use of a similar service rendered each fortnight by the Unesco Secretariat.

[34] I will not prolong the list, but I would draw your special attention, on behalf of the Board, to the many kinds of aid which, through Unesco, men and women in the technically more developed parts of the world are enabled to bring to men and women in the less developed areas. This has been happening throughout these last eight months through educational missions and the follow-up of these missions to Afghanistan, Thailand and the Philippines, for example; through the seminars; through all the work of fundamental education; and through a large part of the work of the exchange of persons and the reconstruction programme.

[35] Now all this diversity of work is, I believe, animated by one purpose, to change our minds, so that we understand each other a little better and learn to work together and live together as neighbours in one world. And as that purpose is spiritual, I know no way in which the achievement of it can be proved or measured except by our personal experience. Now, I am personally convinced, and I believe all my colleagues on the Executive Board would say the same for themselves, that I am different today from what I would have been if I had not had the experience of working with colleagues from many countries for four years on the Executive Board and at four sessions of the General Conference. I do not for a moment mean to suggest that I am better, but I am different from what I would have been if I had not

had that experience. And I believe that all of us, whether we have been fortunate enough to have the experience that I have had on the Board and at General Conferences, or at those seminars, or in the scientific conferences and congresses which Unesco enables to take place, I believe all of us are slightly different; and in that experience, if we have it, I think we can find proof that Unesco does in fact help to change men's minds and spirits, proof that it can in fact make the world in the end rather more friendly, more civilized, and more delightful.

[36] For these reasons, Mr. President, I do believe, myself, that at this moment Unesco is making a contribution to peace. We on the Board, and the Director-General, want to leave the delegates to this Conference in no doubt that we must see at this Conference whether we cannot make that contribution to peace a little bigger, a little more immediate. But whatever new things we find to do, whatever new methods we may decide to try, do let us anyhow pledge ourselves to do better what we know from past experience we can do well. Let us wield with greater courage and perseverance the weapons that have already proved their worth.

[37] We have come to this Conference, to this City of Florence, to this Palazzo Vecchio, from fifty-six parts of a distracted world. Since the Constitution was drafted in 1945 the peace of the world does certainly seem to have become even more precarious than it was then. The atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, the conflicting policies of the Great Powers, these are facts, and we in Unesco must face them. We must remember the wise words of Mr. Laugier which he spoke to us yesterday on behalf of the Secretary-General, and accept our responsibilities as an integral part of the United Nations. But surely our very presence in Florence in the Palazzo Vecchio is some response to that challenge. This Conference itself is an act of faith in the teeth of much evidence that men in the modern world cannot long live at peace with one another. We believe the opposite, otherwise our governments would not have troubled to send us here and we should not have troubled to come. In the teeth of the evidence we believe that men *can* learn through mutual understanding and collaboration. In the teeth of the evidence we dare to assume that there is still time for men to learn these lessons. Against those other facts of fear and hatred and misunderstanding we set the facts recorded in this Report, the modest but solid achievements of Unesco, the result of countless acts of faith wrought by men and women all over the world over the last four years. And do not let us be dismayed by the comparison of these two sets of facts. Of course, we are a minority movement —let us accept that; but all movements which have ever moved the world were minority movements once. Let us on no account be *content* with what has so far been done by Unesco. But do not let us be ashamed of it. In the Board's opinion we have no reason to be ashamed of what Unesco has done and is doing. And so it is with modesty, but also with some pride, and in high spirits, that on behalf of the Board I have the honour to present this excellent Report on the activities of the Organization by my friend, our excellent Director-General.

[38] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] After the very interesting address just made by Sir John Maud, I have great pleasure in calling upon the Director-General, Mr. Jaime Torres Bodet.

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. Chairman, I wish to tell you to begin with how deeply touched I was by your magnificent address. I sincerely thank you for your generous words. You have greatly facilitated our task. I venture to see in this fact powerful encouragement; indeed, to use one of your own expressions, first-rate encouragement. In greeting you at the opening of this Conference, may I be allowed to express to the eminent statesman who is presiding over our Assembly the gratitude of the Unesco Secretariat to the Italian Government and people, who have welcomed us in so friendly a way and have so ably and effectively simplified our work? I should like, equally, to express our gratitude to the Florentine authorities for the hospitality they are according us here. Humanism, like Antaeus, has but to renew contact with this soil to draw fresh strength.

[40] What a lesson in humility for Unesco is this visit to Florence! And at the same time, as always when humility is sincere, what a splendid spur to ambition! All around us in front of our dwellings, in the streets along which we pass, we see examples of what men can do when they live according to their hearts, rather than in a spirit of passive adhesion to official injunctions—which no artists ever accept without demur and without heart-searching. There are not many places in the world where one realizes so clearly as on the banks of the Arno that wisdom and beauty are the twin arches of that invisible bridge which leads from the individual conscience—ever rebellious against its destiny—to man's collective conscience—ever in search of general progress. This city's greatest citizen was an exile. His *Divine Comedy* confirms it for us: for free men the longing for the lost fatherland is but the

aspiration to another fatherland that may always be won—humanity itself. Every statue, every picture, that we stop and wonder at here, every Florentine stone we look at, would give us the lie were we so arrogant as to conceive our mission as a substitute for the original creative mission of educators, artists, poets, and scholars. Happily, we think no such thing. Our Organization does not so mistake its role. We know that to seek to impose uniformity on the infinitely diverse and spontaneous life of culture would be illusory. If Unesco should attempt, by bureaucratic methods to sap the originality and individuality of the different national cultures, it would be unfaithful to its very origin, born as our Organization was of a free covenant in which the representatives of the Governments strove to speak on behalf of the peoples. The reason for our existence is not to create what none can create by order, by rules and laws. The clear intent is rather to serve the creative minds among mankind by putting them in more direct relation with the problems of the masses, and at the same time to serve those masses, who, in the longing of the unsatisfied needs, aspire towards education, and through it towards freedom. Culture is produced by the world's élites. They, of course, themselves issue from the people; but culture is slow in returning to the people, from whom it ultimately comes and to whom it rightly belongs. In an inter-governmental institution such as ours, we could never vie with life's infinite and anonymous multiplicity. Our aim is much more modest: we seek to open the channels of communication with the people in every domain of culture; for without such channels, culture itself must become impoverished and in the end perish in isolation.

[41] Thus, in clearly recognizing our limitations, we become the better aware of our ambitions. There is no Unesco science, no Unesco art, no Unesco philosophy. But there are many dark places among men; to light up these places requires a joint effort on the part of all the different countries: a faith which no individual State can furnish, a truth of which no State is the sole repository, a wisdom and knowledge which no one single State possesses.

[42] Our greatness will lie in serving. But how? What can fifty-six assembled countries do to strengthen peace by means of education, science and culture? What more can they do —some will ask—than they were doing before they joined Unesco? I could not accept such a sceptical attitude. Fifty-six countries working together in the pursuit of so lofty an ideal can together do infinitely more than each in isolation, within its own boundaries and by its own unaided means. First of all, countries working together in this manner can regularly exchange information, and can agree simultaneously to take the most effective measures to surmount or remove obstacles to the free flow of culture. Again, they can study and try out together the various modern means of helping men to participate actively in the progress of the international community. They can undertake together to further all steps which may help educators to form citizens conscious of their rights and yet equally conscious of their duties towards their fellow-men of every nation, language, race and religion. Above all, they can infuse a spirit of justice and concord in their domestic and foreign policies, so that there may prevail between peoples and governments that atmosphere of mutual confidence which is essential for peace. Such an atmosphere is indispensable for the success of Unesco's mission also. Only in a world free from the continual threat of war can culture, science and education bear their finest fruits. Fear can corrupt the very aim and essence of education and of research. It can distort them entirely to meet the demands of another war. It can transform these factors of peace into instruments of hate and destruction. It is thus of the most fundamental importance that governments should do everything that lies within their powers, to fight against the obsession of war, to act as members of Unesco not only when they speak at Unesco, but also and still more when, outside the Organization, they are taking decisions with regard to all those questions which may affect our aims and ideals—and unfortunately do them harm. These are some of the things which fifty-six countries cannot undertake seperately but which, working together, they could achieve.

[43] This would be a great achievement. Yet it would not be enough. If for instance education does not provide equality of prospects to all men and women—the same men and women who, on the political plane, guarantee collective security with their lives—then collective security will rest upon bases which are fundamentally unjust, and therefore unstable and precarious. So that all countries may provide this equality, there exists a sacred duty of reciprocal help, on some aspects of which Unesco has already made a beginning. Such assistance must not remain merely a supplementary activity, designed to promote the economic development of the less fortunate countries. Our co-operation with the United Nations in the technical work which it is proposing to undertake does not free us from the duty of carrying out —indeed of extending—our own specific programme of direct aid.

[44] According to our Constitution, we are an institution whose guiding purpose it is to ensure peace by means of international understanding,

and to help to promote that international understanding by means of education, science and culture. These are our ultimate aims. Nothing that we undertake must deflect us from them. None the less, if we would not have Unesco founded in empty phrases, we must admit that peace will not be won by us alone. Our authority is only of a moral character. It cannot by itself produce the political and economic decisions which could limit armaments and halt preparations for war. The path which is set for us is assuredly long and hard. Far from discouraging us, the difficulties of the present hour should rather strengthen our resolve. Are not freedom of the individual, and respect for the dignity of man, the very bases of the system set up by the United Nations? Without the support of the common will of all the peoples of the world, peace would be no more than a truce, under constant threat of new conflagrations.

[45] I said: "The peoples of the world" and I want to make it clear that I mean all the peoples of the world, without distinction of ideological tendency or party. Yesterday you heard from Mr. Laugier of the concern of the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the fact that, whether from permanent abstention or what I hope are temporary withdrawals, not all the peoples are represented at our meeting. I share his concern, for an organization dedicated to education, science and culture cannot attain the kind of universality essential to it merely by increasing the number of its Member States. The universality of the human spirit is not a matter of arithmetic, but consists essentially in a unity with diversity of opinions, systems and points of view. Without that diversity, Unesco will not be universal and unless in fact it does seek to be universal I can see no significance in it.

[46] Our work, then, does not lie in the domain where diplomats erect the legal groundwork of peace. Our work is less spectacular. We are dealing with the very stuff of culture. Yet, will culture ever be separable from the political and social circumstances which condition it? For us peace is not something taken for granted, international understanding is not a postulate. On the contrary, we regard both one and the other as the result of a series of efforts which must be combined and harmonized, so as to satisfy the longing for justice which burns in man.

[47] As every year, the fate of our Organization is in your hands. You have before you three main documents. The first condenses, in the form of specific resolutions, the programme which the Executive Board proposes to you for 1951. The second gives you the budget estimates which the Secretariat considers necessary for carrying out the resolutions the Board proposes. The third document, the Basic Programme, justifies and explains the other two.

[48] The 1951 programme gives us, in a certain measure, a picture of Unesco as it now is. The Basic Programme, on the other hand, should give us a picture of what Unesco may become. The one limits and circumscribes our work. The other defines our ambitions and, by defining them, gives us encouragement. I must not fail to point out to you that these two documents are still separated by an immense gulf. The Secretariat will never be able to bridge that gulf unaided. It is for Member States and their peoples, by their unselfish and resolute efforts, to do so. I do not know what view you will take of the programme submitted to you by the Chairman of the Executive Board. But I am bound to tell you that, however concrete and consistent it may appear to you when it leaves your hands, it will remain a frail thing until we frankly acknowledge that the malaise from which Unesco suffers is due not so much to a surfeit of international "resolutions" as to a lack of national resolution in each country to put them into effect. I will not go into the arguments developed in the introduction to my Report; but it is my duty, I think, to draw your attention to at least one of them. Unesco's programme must not be reduced almost entirely to a plan of work for the Secretariat. The programme of an organization like ours must be something more than a set of instructions to the Director-General; and the Director-General's Report should in future cease to be the sole starting point for the general debate with which the annual Conference of Unesco opens its plenary meetings. In my opinion it is important and urgent to see that the programme effectively combines the constructive work that devolves upon Member States with the function of liaison, stimulation and co-ordination which is the Secretariat's. Similarly, in order to understand Unesco's real situation, it would be desirable not only to judge it by the Director-General's Report, but to illuminate its conclusions by an impartial study of the reports sent in to the Organization by Member States. In this way the Member States and the Secretariat would be linked more closely both by the programme and by the various reports of activities.

[49] Until these two conditions are fulfilled, public opinion may look upon our annual meetings as no more than occasions for administrative exchanges of views between the Governments and the Secretariat. However indispensable, however cogent, such exchanges may be for myself and my collaborators, Unesco's mission cannot be measured by the efforts of the Secretariat alone. For that reason it is of the first importance that these general debates should also provide the opportunity

for another fruitful encounter—the bringing face to face before the Organization as a whole of the true instruments of our programme, namely the States which founded Unesco and which maintain it. Only a confrontation of this kind will enable every programme, present or future, to be firmly rooted in international fact. The concentration of our work would be of no avail if it failed to satisfy the needs of the peoples as they should find expression in the Reports of Member States. To be more practical, our resolutions must be based upon a study of those Reports. But for that purpose, if you will allow me to say so, the Reports must be at once fuller and more precise than most of those —and there are not very many of them—that we have so far received. An examination of what each country is doing for Unesco, of how it is applying the recommendations of the Conference, and of the response evoked in the men for whom we work, would provide a more solid basis to our discussions. It would help us to dispel the idea that our work is too theoretical, and above all, it would allow us more effectively to adapt means and ends.

[50] Doubtless many projects will be submitted to the present session. All those which promise to be valuable to Unesco will assuredly be warmly welcomed. Nevertheless, I hasten to urge, even before I know them—for later you might think that I was taking exception to some specific project—that, before presenting new proposals, you should ask yourselves in all sincerity: "Will the delegations who approve this or that proposal be able to count upon their governments for the full effort that will be needed if the proposal is not to be rendered fruitless by niggardliness in its execution?"

[51] The effort I refer to must first of all be financial. A programme without a budget is a voice crying in the wilderness. The day will come —I hope so for the sake of my successors—when critics will be astonished that in May 1950 men who believed in Unesco asked for only a little more than eight million dollars in order to carry out for a year, in fifty-six countries, a great international work of culture, science and education. The Budget that you will be discussing, however, was one that had to accord with the resolutions proposed by the Executive Board. It had to take account of the spirit of the discussions of the General Conference and, lastly, it could not disregard the financial situation created by the failure of certain countries to pay their contributions. If it was possible in Paris, when considering an increase of $220,000, to accuse the administration of Unesco of being "expansionist", what, I wonder, would have been said of an increase larger than that which I am proposing to you? Yet how could I do other than strongly recommend this increase, believing as I do that in the present circumstances any curtailment of the Secretariat's activities would delay for several years the coming into being of that living Unesco, of which the Secretariat must in future be only the centre of liaison? As I pointed out in my introduction to the Budget Estimates, the small increase of $150,000 over the 1950 Budget is not quite enough to maintain the Secretariat's activities at their present level. In fact it means a reduction in the funds available for those activities, because of the increase in the unavoidable overheads of a developing organization.

[52] It is not only a matter of appropriations for the Secretariat. Many of the National Commissions can have only a paper existence until they too are in possession of a budget allowing them to undertake the surveys and the work of information, consultation and sometimes practical action, which our Organization urgently requires of them. Additional resources for the National Commissions are more than ever necessary when the Secretariat's budget remains static—and this at a moment when the growing number of States Members opens up new possibilities for the Organization and at the same time increases its responsibilities.

[53] The time has come to redouble our endeavours to embark resolutely upon constructive work. The stage of growth reached by the Organization, the experience it has acquired in these early years, the documentation it has assembled and the surveys it has carried out with regard to numerous questions, added to the network of non-governmental international organizations which collaborate with us, place Unesco now and henceforward in a position to undertake tasks on a scale beyond that of the advice, the suggestions, the token services, to which it has hitherto been confined. I mean tasks which, in a given field and for a particular area, would involve a transformation of existing conditions. Shall we for ever be content to be a mere laboratory of model techniques? The peoples of the earth do not respond to formulae, but to achievements. And if international collaboration is to appear ever more desirable to States, before all it must show that it is effective. This battle for effectiveness, in which the whole future of our Organization is engaged, we can never hope to win with the sole resources of the Secretariat on their present scale. On the other hand, unless the National Commissions develop very vigorously, there is no certainty that the participation of Member States at the national level will make itself felt in time to avert general disillusionment. It may therefore be necessary to try out fresh methods, committing Unesco's collective action to

more immediate work in connexion with specific problems of international importance

[54] The work of the Secretariat, as defined in the programme, answers in the main to a permanent need for intellectual co-operation in the exchange of information, comparative research and the dissemination of knowledge. As such, and with the help of the National Commissions and non-governmental international organizations, it makes up a system of basic services which an institution dedicated to the promotion of the intellectual and moral fellowship of man could not rightly reduce. But besides these permanent services, which, though in the long run certainly effective, are slow and indirect in their results, there may be room for collective undertakings by Member States—along the lines worked out for technical assistance for economic development—for the solution of certain problems which may arise in a particularly acute form in one or another part of the world and which present an obstacle to the general progress of mankind, if not a potential threat to peace itself. As in the case of technical assistance, we should have to draw up a programme of specific objectives to be realized in a given number of years. Participation in this scheme would be entirely voluntary and States could contribute to it in the form of money, supplies or services; it would further be understood that States directly benefiting from the scheme would agree to fulfil the conditions necessary for the success of this international assistance. Such schemes would benefit from the services of the Secretariat as a whole, and from any outside help that might be forthcoming. All these efforts would have to be co-ordinated and combined for the purposes of a concrete undertaking, and no longer be scattered, as they so often are today, over different specialized fields of work. In this way Unesco would give proof of unity in action, and at the same time realize its true vocation. In any case, for my part I do not see any other way in which the Organization can advance from the stage of investigation and stimulation to the stage of practical accomplishment, so long as its ordinary budget remains at the present figure or until Member States play a very much larger part in the carrying out of the programme.

[55] I have spoken of the financial effort that devolves on Member States. There is also the moral effort without which nothing can be achieved. Participation in our work cannot consist solely in paying a subscription into the Secretariat's account. Without the moral contribution of every people, the financial contribution by their governments would be ineffectual. Can we fail to see that the spiritual conditions in which Unesco works have changed since 1945? The breath of human fellowship that we felt about us when we met in London has steadily weakened. A dark cloud of anxiety has veiled the high hopes that inspired us when, while the nations were joined in the last battles for liberation, we laid the moral and intellectual foundations of permanent co-operation in the cause of peace.

[56] In several respects the situation today is worse than that which faced the world at the end of the first world war. Compare the obstacles which the 1918 Armistice imposed upon victors and vanquished, with the barriers that the present situation has raised not only between the enemies, but between the allies of yesterday! Never, in time of peace, has travel been so necessary and physically so easy, yet administratively so cumbersome and difficult. The frontiers, closed with barbed wire in the war, are still dotted with firmly-entrenched customs posts and wearisome controls of currency and passports. Before, it was the armaments merchants who were suspect; now even scholars and poets are regarded with mistrust. Everywhere we see conflict, or provocation to conflict, between ideologies which consider themselves irreconcilable. We are trying to remove from children's history books a few tendentious pages, a few prejudiced versions of events. Yet we show no particular alarm when we see grown-up people applauding in the newspapers and on the screen, in books or on the stage, everything that flatters nationalist self-esteem, even though it must wound the answering sensibilities of other nations. Here, at this Conference, we are recommending close co-operation between the Member States. But are we prepared solemnly to acknowledge that this co-operation, if it is to bear fruit, must be total, and that co-operation in things of the spirit demands the spirit of co-operation everywhere?

[57] Because of the fields in which it operates, and of the nature of its methods, Unesco, in carrying out its mission of peace, must mainly focus upon the future. The deeper it enters into its tasks the more time will it take to show results; for habits of thought and feeling call for patient and difficult adaptation. But are we sure that we have all the time we need? That is a question we cannot escape from. And even if peace is maintained, is it fitting that we should not have helped in maintaining it? The future is the child of the present. If we stand aside today, we shall forfeit the authority to win acceptance for our ideal tomorrow.

[58] As I said to you in Beirut when accepting the position to which you had elected me, it is our duty to make of Unesco the conscience of the United Nations, and conscience can never stand aside from the main streams of history. Therefore

Unesco must associate more closely in the work of the United Nations. Admittedly, its strictly technical sphere is different from that of the political organization at Lake Success of which it is a Specialized Agency. But that should not prevent it from taking its part today in the defence of peace—remembering that never before have education, science, culture and mass communication been such important factors in political action and practice.

[59] It is said that Leonardo da Vinci once uttered these despairing words: "Hate sees more clearly than love." Let us not be defeated by such pessimism, against which Leonardo himself so ardently fought. Were not the smiles of the Gioconda and of St. Anne in the Louvre painted after he had said this? We ask ourselves today what suffering he had to endure in order to give being to those two smiles, which have in them such infinite wisdom and forgiveness. No!—for Leonardo, hate was not more clairvoyant than goodness. Nor will it be so for us. After all, if civilization has continued it is because, like the smiles of those unforgettable faces, every culture contains the message of a hope that has been tempered and purified by grief.

[60] When I consider the troubles of our contemporary world, in turn avid, then repentant, I am reminded of Raphael in Balzac's story *La Peau de Chagrin*. It is the account of a man consumed by a burning impatience for power and fortune. An antiquary makes him a present of a wild ass's skin which has the power of fulfilling every wish of him who possesses it—everything, that is, except life itself. For the talisman takes its revenge: it shrinks as each desire is satisfied, and so measures at each instant the time which is left to him to live. Let us beware, gentlemen, lest this tale become a symbol of twentieth century man. Never has science been so docile to man's biddings. Though wide-awake, we are living a vast fairy tale. Yet are we not constantly in danger of finding ourselves once again the slaves of our power? What profits us our mastery of nature if we cannot learn to master ourselves? The hero in Balzac's story had to admit this, when he felt his end approaching—his days shortened by the talisman, of which he was the prisoner, though he thought himself its master. "Power", he then exclaimed, "makes greater only the great." To be truly great, man must first break down the barriers of egoism and hatred, of falsehood and injustice. Unless it is accompanied by social progress, material progress carries with it an immense danger. And how can we imagine social progress without a fair chance for all of an education that liberates each one, without the consolation of a culture in which each one can find his happiness? Unesco's very name indissolubly links the trinity of science, culture and education. The realities to which those words correspond require towards all three of them an equal loyalty. In a world from which science were missing, culture would again become subservient to magic, and education would decline into an automatic and tyrannical machine. On the other hand, in a world where progress depended solely upon science —where education lacked the influence of humanism, and culture was without warmth or vitality, where power would end by outgrowing the capacity of the mind that controlled it—the inventor would be merely the victim of his inventions. Vanquished by his own victories, conquered by his conquests, Man, placed between the tyranny of technical triumph and the responsibility of freedom, would no longer know how to choose.

[61] Happily, humanity is under no compulsion to abdicate in order to continue its onward march. The peace we aspire to would be a poor pretence if we thought to build it upon the repudiation of science, the restriction of teaching, or the placing of culture in leading strings. On the contrary, Unesco is fighting for a fellowship of free men, a fellowship of human beings capable of full self-expression and genuine self-realization. It is only with men thus worthy of the name of men that we shall be enable to assure a true peace. May your debates, gentlemen, be inspired by the ideal of such a peace!

[62] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, your applause makes it unnecessary for me to convey the thanks of the Conference to the Director-General. I shall therefore call upon the first speaker, the delegate of Greece.

[63] Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece) — Fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, *Quid vult concursus ad amnem?* This is the question which we are again asking ourselves at our Fifth Conference upon entering these historic precincts where we have always, wether on the banks of the Arno or on those of the Tiber, met with Italian hospitality. Many of my countrymen enjoyed this hospitality before and after the days of Lorenzo de Medici and it is a historical fact that in return they contributed to the development of culture according to our tradition, whether here, in Rome, in Venice, in Milan, Bologna or in Messina. Today, in different circumstances following so generous an invitation, the Greek Government and our delegation want to express their warmest thanks to the Government of the Republic of Italy and to our numerous friends here, the aristoxenoi, as Petrarch called Lello Stefani. Let us remember

that Petrarch wrote that nature asserts her prerogative of fashioning great souls in every land and under every sky, and let us believe that this truth underlies all Unesco's concursus. We of the Greek delegation consider that it is our duty to be imbued with Petrarch's feelings. We do not forget how he reacted when receiving from Nicholas Sygerus, in 1354, the first copy of Homer which passed from the East to the West. We do not forget how the sacrifices of many Italians of that period helped to bring the light of culture to the West which nowadays bears the torch of human civilization more steadfastly. But we also remember, and more especially here, that it is to Petrarch's efforts, more than to any of his predecessors, that we owe the fact that the culture of the Renaissance became a living force in the development of Europe. It is the same spirit which we are seeking in this Florentine forum, where we do not come to express divergencies or to find adjustments and rich compromises, but bring with us the conviction that we shall learn from our discussions how to improve our understanding of other aspects than our own for what concerns education, other ways than the ones we know for a wider improvement of scientific knowledge, and other behaviour than our own for what we may consider a genuine culture. In this way we intend to contribute to the search for a common factor in our final decisions. We shall keep a spiritual objective in view, with independence of thought and with a conviction of our interdependence on each one of our sister delegations and on the whole they form, which is the very soul of Unesco. It is in the same spirit that we intend to examine the Director-General's Report. Criticism does not mean fault-finding. Its main business is to penetrate below the surface of things, to apprehend their true significance and to appraise their just value. This intellectual faculty has evolved from the time when we were preparing the Constitution of our Organization, and I cannot find a better guarantee for the future of Unesco than this mutual comprehension which constitutes the essence of a wider sympathy between us all.

[64] The Director-General has mentioned Dante's words on the necessity of the development of intelligence throughout the whole of humanity, but we must not take Dante's words as having a meaning coinciding with modern nationalism with its materialistic outlook. Intelligence in Dante's mind had a meaning which Benedetto Croce admirably expounded through the conception of the spiritual nature of reality, and it is in this wider field that we natives of the Mediterranean would like to see more definite gestures coming from Unesco. How can we understand the word "masses" which has often cropped up in the midst of our Conferences if we forget what Croce quoted from a letter from Lanfrey to Maxime de Camp: "On a systématiquement tué l'homme au profit des masses. Nous avons à relever l'âme humaine."? We would ask therefore for a more accurate appreciation of the idea of masses in terms of people, and in the way in which Giuseppe Mazzini understood it, a distinction which Benedetto Croce had so well determined. It is by his conception that we shall better learn how to avoid uniformity or equalization of means or standardization of process, and that we shall have a clearer understanding of quality in our very wide activities instead of being impressed only by problems of quantity.

[65] It is much more on ethical and spiritual lines that our Organization must play its proper rôle in the march of progress. In fact, it is by fostering the recognized moral order, the rule of law, and by improving the general outlook of both young and adult persons on the meaning and end of coercive measures, that we can improve men's characters, because men's characters are the best pillars of the temple of peace. How can we obtain sound results if we have no closer co-operation with the spiritual and moral guides of the people and how may we hope to attain our object if we do not pay more attention to youth, the men and women of tomorrow, the youth on which such terrible blows were and still are systematically inflicted.

[66] These are the fundamental priorities which must lie below the surface of our activities, for which we would like to see our Organization adopt a straightforward policy emanating from our programme, notwithstanding the difficulties that we have to face, with the moral courage which is necessary for those who do not like to hide themselves behind their finger. Without this moral courage, no education, no culture and no science can be claimed.

[67] After taking in hand his tremendous task which in reality began in the first months of last year, the Director-General, who inherited from the Beirut Conference a Programme difficult to apply, simplified it with praiseworthy dexterity, and with the help of the Executive Board and a better grasp of Unesco's mission on the part of the Paris Conference of September 1949, the Director-General, with his Secretariat, accomplished the impossible. We owe him our deep gratitude. From our point of view, three distinct courses were, and still are, open to him. First, concentrate Unesco's work specifically on outstanding projects chosen from the whole, second, decentralize the turmoil by increasing the work of the National Commissions; and third, demand special

credits in order to have a freer hand for a signal decision of this Conference.

[68] The main problem of Unesco is to find the necessary equilibrium between these three policies, which depend on time and space, namely, on the actual economic difficulties and the geographical situation of each one of our Member States.

[69] The first policy, namely more concentration of specific projects in a world-wide organization, is very difficult in the beginning of the life of Unesco, especially so if we want to increase the interest of the peoples of our Member States, who have heterogeneous problems to solve, and in fact, as the Director-General mentioned already, we do not know always the real problems of each Member State.

[70] The second, namely the decentralization of Unesco's efforts and promotion of the work of National Commissions, is feasible, though closely related to the means which are at the disposal of the Ministries of Education through state budgets. Let us be frank and say that it is a long-term policy, and to decentralize our activities is obviously to have already the right persons in the national centres of Unesco. I believe that if we wait for the right evolution of National Commissions by themselves in many of our countries we shall lose precious time. The representative of the United Nations, Mr. Laugier, reminded us yesterday in the most moving way of the real situation that we have to face, and which we must bear in mind during this Conference.

[71] The third point, namely special credits for paramount and world-wide activity, would be possible even through other sources than our budget. A signal decision for action would inspire our people after being accepted by all of us. We intend to discuss this matter further during our deliberations, and we definitely think that in our present times it is to this last solution that we must turn more of our attention, granting our Director-General our confidence concerning the ways and means by which he will give our Organization a definite new impulse. The United States' initiatives for great projects were salutary in many fields. Let us hope that with poor means our Organization will be able to imitate their enormous post-war moral contribution to mankind, the contribution to more than civilization, which I may be permitted to call welfare civilization, a civilization deriving from a better appreciation of spiritual and moral values. The work from the first days of the conception of Unesco, to which we gave all our affection and trust, has to be expanded if this Organization is to be worthy of the hopes of any cultured group and of every Member State and of a suffering world for a civilized peace.

[72] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As the next speaker, the Yugoslav representative, has announced that his address will be a fairly long one, I think it would be better to suspend the meeting until this afternoon, when the delegates of the following countries will speak: Yugoslavia, Denmark, Netherlands, Switzerland, Lebanon, Italy, Canada, Belgium.

[73] As the General Conference has accepted the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the organization of the work of the Session transmitted to it by the General Committee, I draw its attention to the following resolution on page 8 of document 5C/BUR/1:

Member States are requested to submit two copies in writing, not later than the close of the third working day of the Session (the evening of 24 May), of any new proposals, draft resolutions or amendments involving a substantial modification of the Programme and the Budget Estimates for 1951.

I therefore invite delegations desiring to present new proposals or amendments involving a substantial modification of the programme and budget estimates to hand them in to the Secretary of the Conference as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.

FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

CONTENTS

Page

X. Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*continuation*):
Speeches by delegates of Yugoslavia, Denmark, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland and Belgium 70

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

X. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We shall resume the discussion of the Director-General's report. I call upon the representative of Yugoslavia.

[2] Mr. Vladislav RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the Director-General's remarkable report is full of far-reaching and constructive suggestions which may open up new possibilities for Unesco's activities and provide fruitful matter for our discussions. In connexion with this report, I may perhaps make a few comments on Unesco's past activities and future opportunities.

[3] But I should like first to outline briefly the reasons why Yugoslavia has waited until now before becoming a Member of Unesco. In November 1945, at the Conference in London, Yugoslavia's representatives, among 41 countries belonging to the United Nations, signed the Constitution of Unesco. The peoples of Yugoslavia were bound to welcome the establishment of an organization designed, in the words of the Constitution, to advance . . .

> . . . through the educational, scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims.

[4] Although Yugoslavia signed this Constitution, she did not become a Member of the Organization. There were good reasons for this, and the Yugoslav delegation set them forth explicitly at the First Session of the General Conference in Paris in its criticism of the first programme of work for Unesco which was then under discussion. At that time, the Yugoslav delegation pointed out that the programme fell far short of the fundamental aims clearly set forth in Unesco's Constitution. It was obvious that the sponsors of the programme intended to make Unesco a sort of world missionary organization responsible for propagating a particular culture and ideology or even a particular philosophy among the peoples, to bring about a "spiritual renaissance of mankind". The Yugoslav delegation protested against this tendency towards centralization and uniformity in cultural affairs and opposed the attempt to formulate an official international philosophy. The delegation believed that fruitful co-operation among the nations was dependent upon free cultural development and competition, upon the preservation of a diversity of opinions and points of view regarding educational, scientific and cultural matters. The delegation also protested strongly against the view that Unesco was not required to play an active part in the struggle for peace because—as was then suggested—its work in connexion with education, science and culture was enough to secure better understanding between the peoples and therefore made a contribution, albeit indirect, to the maintenance of peace. Since "wars begin in the minds of men" and "it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed", it was held to be enough to spread the *idea* of peace. As we know, that concept was embodied in the Preamble to the Constitution of Unesco. You may remember that a few enthusiastic champions of Unesco then asserted in all seriousness that to work for the propagation of education, science and culture was enough to ensure that wars would automatically be brought to an end. The Yugoslav delegation protested against these ideas and emphasized the need for Unesco to take an active part in the endeavour to secure peace, in the endeavour to prevent any act likely to give rise to unrest and hatred among the

peoples, to combat the war propaganda which, in the most diverse forms, finds its way into education, science and culture. Unesco's programme in fact made no provision for active measures for the defence of peace.

[5] These were the main reasons for which my country then decided not to become a Member of Unesco. Nevertheless, from 1946 onwards, we have attended sessions of the General Conference in the capacity of observers and have kept in close touch with Unesco's work and progress, playing our part in many international enterprises, whether or not sponsored by Unesco, designed to foster international co-operation and to promote contact and understanding between the peoples. As we could not approve Unesco's tendency towards centralization and its deliberate neglect of the urgent problems of peace, we endeavoured in the first place to establish close co-operation, in cultural and other matters, with the U.S.S.R. and the popular democracies. We believed that, by co-operating with socialist and socialistically inclined countries, we should safeguard our national and cultural independence. We thought that co-operation, of whatever sort, between socialist countries, could be based only on the principle of equality and mutual assistance. We regarded this co-operation as the best guarantee of the free development of our national culture and the safeguarding of our independence. For that reason, we fostered cultural contacts with the countries of Eastern Europe. Experience soon showed us, however, that in the East, as elsewhere, there was a policy hostile to the principles of equality between large and small nations, a policy which threatens the independence of peoples and the untrammelled development of their culture. Experience taught us that the tendency of large countries to exploit and subjugate small ones is, in some circumstances, quite unrelated to the social order established in those countries, and that differing and contradictory "ideological reasons" are only empty words disguising policies which are essentially the same.

[6] The peoples of Yugoslavia are small but they are firmly determined to safeguard their independence. By their refusal to accept a status of inequality and their firm insistence that, in the relations between the peoples, the principle of equality should be respected, they have come into conflict with all those who hold that the world consists of "governing nations" and dependent nations, and that the latter can take no active part in the moulding either of their own destiny or of that of humanity as a whole. This policy followed by certain great nations with regard to smaller or weaker countries resulted in the subjugation of some countries by others, the formation of strategic blocs, and the bargaining which goes on between the great nations for the division of the world into spheres of influence. This policy is at the root of the present state of tension in the world.

[7] This situation is not due to ideological differences, as the propagandists would have us believe. The ideological differences which are the outcome of social differences do not, in themselves, entail the threat of war, any more than similarity of ideological views alone is a guarantee of equality in relations between countries. Similarity in ideologies excludes neither antagonism nor conflicts. We can see that unity of views is non-existent either between socialist countries or between capitalist countries, and that within those groups conflicts are not impossible. Yugoslavia's is a case in point. Wars are not the result of ideological differences; they are caused by violation of the principles of national independence and equality of rights—principles proclaimed in the United Nations Charter but constantly neglected and dishonoured.

[8] To fight for the cause of peace is to fight for freedom and equality between the nations, to combat the attitude conducive to war, which people try to tell us is inevitable because of ideological conflicts. To uphold the cause of peace is to strive for the development and expansion of co-operation between the peoples on the basis of equality, irrespective of forms of social organization and of ideological differences. The United Nations and their Specialized Agencies are the instruments best calculated to secure the success of endeavours to bring about such co-operation.

[9] In the present state of the world, it is our duty to neglect no possible opportunity for international co-operation. Yugoslavia is convinced that, today, her collaboration with Unesco may really advance the common cause of peace and fruitful co-operation among the nations and benefit the Yugoslav peoples themselves. Faithful as ever to her policy of peace, Yugoslavia will assist any of Unesco's activities which are designed to strengthen international co-operation in mutual respect for the sovereignty and independence of all the nations, based on equal rights for all the peoples, great and small, and the policy of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. Yugoslavia will be found particularly ready to co-operate in any work to combat agressive tendencies or hegemony, discriminatory measures and incitement to war, from whatever source and in whatever form they may appear.

[10] The Yugoslav delegation is convinced that Unesco's peace policy must be a constructive and forward-looking policy based on a true appreciation

of facts. Unesco's activities must make international co-operation easier instead of more complicated. The Yugoslav delegation therefore considers that support of the Kuomintang delegation is not only an injustice but also a very serious obstacle to Unesco's own work and to the advancement of peace. We cannot overlook the fact that the Kuomintang government does not represent the Chinese people and is in fact opposed by the whole nation. In our opinion, the participation of the peoples in the cause of peace and culture is bound to be incomplete whilst the largest nation in the world and one of the most ancient civilizations remains absent.

[11] One of the most effective means of promoting peace is to combat lies with truth. At the present time, aggression is being plotted under the cloak of pacifism, and on every hand falsehood is used to sow hatred and distrust among the peoples. The only means of frustrating these plots is truth, and this must be the weapon wielded by Unesco. My country is well qualified to speak on this subject. Recently, some Western countries set on foot a campaign against us inspired by a single purpose—to conceal and give specious cover to the aggressive intent of its promoters. On the other hand, the savage outcry which, for the past two years, has been raised by the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe against the people of Yugoslavia, is also a grave threat to peace. The experience and example of the Yugoslav people in this way may be most helpful in Unesco's endeavour to safeguard and consolidate peace.

[12] The Yugoslav delegation will try to contribute to the development of that true international co-operation in cultural affairs which it is Unesco's fundamental purpose to secure. This co-operation is now more than ever necessary, and we are convinced that Unesco can do much to further it. We therefore hope that the Organization will make an even greater endeavour, revising its programme and adapting it to the new needs and requirements of the present day, so that it may be fully consonant with Unesco's fundamental aims and, once implemented, may fulfil the hopes the nations placed in Unesco at the time of its establishment.

[13] In principle, we agree with the desire shown by many delegations to cut down the present programme of Unesco, limiting it to matters of immediate interest and value to all the peoples of the world and the general cause of peace. We appreciate the efforts the Executive Board and the Director-General have made to this end, but we feel that what has so far been done can be regarded only as a first step. There are great gaps in the programme, but it is still too wide; some of Unesco's activities overstep the limits laid down for the Organization and encroach upon the field of other agencies and organizations of the United Nations. Owing to the wide scope of the programme, which is beyond Unesco's capacity, the results achieved by the Organization's work are inadequate and, as the Director-General recently said, there is a danger that its work may seem purely symbolical. Unesco must therefore adapt its programme to its real resources and concentrate on essentials.

[14] It also seems to us that the programme still smacks of an outmoded idea of Unesco as a sort of higher academy designed to deal mainly, with the help of its scientific institutions, with the study of the great philosophical, psychological, moral, sociological, political and other problems of the present day, considering those problems—and even sometimes science and culture in general—as things-in-themselves, apart from the economic and social forces and relationships which determine their nature. It is not essential that Unesco should be a focus of "scientific thought"; it should chiefly be a meeting place where all the achievements of science and culture are to be found, where differing opinions are exchanged, where scientific and cultural acquisitions are passed from one to another, where arrangements are made for mutual assistance in the field of education, science and culture, and where efforts are made to bring the peoples together in an atmosphere of peace and international co-operation. If Unesco really wishes to fulfil the hopes the nations have placed in the Organization, instead of devoting so much effort to scientific study, which generally has no relation to Unesco's fundamental purposes, it must pay more heed to the settlement of specific questions directly concerned with the development of that true international co-operation on which peace must be founded. There must be fewer surveys of ideological views and conflicts, fewer studies of "social tensions" (usually approached in the light of abstract hypotheses), and more endeavours to lay bare and confound the attempts of those who wish to use instruments designed for the extension of education, science and culture to propagate a belief in the inevitability of war and to foster hatred among the peoples. Life demonstrates that there can be no world-wide centralization in cultural affairs, and that no "universal" philosophy can be imposed on anyone. We believe that the realization of this fact has helped, to some extent, to modify the original conception of Unesco's "world mission", and that the influence of the adherents of cultural centralization is no longer predominant in the Organization. Resolutions recently formulated by Unesco have often men-

tioned the need to assist the free development of varied cultures and have contained more and more allusions to the benefit to be derived from the inter-action of different civilizations. It is obvious that Unesco's "world mission" consists in providing general assistance for this mutual enrichment of the various peoples of the world.

[15] Now more than ever, when differences in views and variations in culture are exploited to the full by propaganda, with the object of dividing the world into hostile camps, it must be Unesco's duty to combat such propaganda and to prove, by example, that, however much their characteristics may differ, the nations are able to live together in peace and to develop fruitful co-operation, on an equal footing, in the interests of the cultural advance of humanity. In the effort for the defence of peace, Unesco can, in its own field, do extremely useful work. Its primary task should be to oppose any violation of the principles of democracy wherever the risk of this appears in international relations in connexion with education, science and culture—wherever a tendency may be displayed to smother the culture of any people and to impose ideological views. Unesco may go on defending these principles of democracy by the means it has already used to some extent, but should redouble its efforts to develop peaceful co-operation between the nations by facilitating international understanding, organizing a more extensive interchange of cultural achievements and providing as many opportunities as possible for the comparison of differing opinions on education, science and culture. Unesco might also take more active measures to ensure that everywhere the principles of democracy are observed in all civilizations, and to safeguard freedom in scientific and artistic creation, without which there can be no advance in culture. The Organization must combat the ominous tendencies to cultural isolationism no less than aggressive cultural nationalism. And, above all, Unesco must resolutely oppose war propaganda when it finds its way into education, science and culture. Unesco must make still greater efforts to find a basis for general cultural co-operation and to facilitate discussion between the two opposing schools of thought in an effort to find immediate practical solutions to secure peace.

[16] In order to spur on the latent forces of peace, the Yugoslav delegation, following out the Executive Board's suggestions, proposes the following resolution as a first practical measure:

CONSIDERING that the activities of Unesco set forth in the Draft Programme of the Organization are capable of making a valuable contribution to the development of the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind and, in this way, of serving the cause of peace and general progress:

CONSIDERING that these activities can bear their full fruits only in the comparatively distant future, as the Draft Programme contains no provisions for measures by which the factors upon which peace today depends may be directly and immediately influenced;

AND CONSIDERING that it is necessary that Unesco should co-operate actively in the United Nations' work for peace in the present as well as in the future, thus endorsing the observations set forth by the Executive Board at its Twentieth Session;

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

OBSERVING that the most serious obstacle to effective international co-operation in connexion with education, science and culture is the artificial maintenance of a war psychosis;

AND BEING CONVINCED that, in order to combat this psychosis and to develop international co-operation, it would be most useful for representative intellectuals, of different schools of thought and from every quarter of the world, to meet to discuss what work Unesco might do, and by what means, for the immediate promotion of peace;

1. APPEALS to all organizations and all people engaged in educational, scientific and cultural work to take an active part in the consolidation of international peace, in order to lay a lasting foundation for intellectual co-operation between the peoples;

2. INSTRUCTS the Director-General, with the aid of the Secretariat, to make the necessary arrangements to convene a Congress on Intellectual Co-operation before the end of 1950, the duty of this Congress being to consider possibilities of action by Unesco as part of the Organization's normal operations, and its purpose to strengthen international co-operation, to strive to reduce the danger of a war psychosis and the belief in the inevitability of armed conflict between countries with different social systems, and to suggest. in the form of recommendations, practical measures which it would be possible to take immediately;

3. RECOMMENDS that, as soon as possible, the Director-General issue invitations to all national professional associations of scientists, teachers, writers, artists, musicians, scenario-writers and journalists in all Member States of the United Nations, and to prominent people who have distinguished themselves in the endeavour to promote peace;

4. AUTHORIZES the Director-General to fix the date and meeting place of the above-mentioned Congress, taking into account, firstly, its urgency and, secondly, the technical and financial resources required by the Secretariat for this purpose;

5. EXPRESSES the desire that this Congress be held in Europe.

That is the draft resolution that the Yugoslav delegation has communicated to the Secretariat.

[17] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Denmark.

[18] Professor Jakob NIELSEN (Denmark) — Mr. President, I do not want in this general discussion to offer any considerations of general character. I propose only to make a few points which deal with what may be a question of methods, but which, even if they seem small, have a bearing on Unesco's activity at the present turning-point.

[19] The Danish delegation welcomes the setting up of a basic programme and the arranging for its implementation by fixing during each General Conference the individual steps to be taken in the interval until the next Conference. This change is the logical consequence of the fact that Unesco has now passed the experimental stage and that we know better than we did in 1945 both what we are trying to do and the methods by which we want to achieve it. This arrangement of the Programme carries with it, in our view, the need also to change the conditions of work of the Secretariat by allowing longer periods of uninterrupted action. In the initial stage it was quite natural that there should be General Conferences each year, and that we should have to place a heavy strain on the Secretariat by asking the staff to carry out many investigations for these conferences, whilst the Member States were trying to agree on a more permanent course to follow. Now it should be sufficient to hold General Conferences every second year only. My delegation had thought of raising this point and we are pleased to see that the United States delegation puts it before us in the form of a definite proposal. It fits in with the fact that we have had to give increased powers to the Executive Board, and that we shall surely continue to do. It has also many conveniences for Member States, but the main reason for the change is that it provides better working conditions for the Secretariat.

[20] So far as the question of methods is concerned, we want to emphasize the following point. It has often been stated explicitly that Unesco will, as far as possible, work through existing organizations. I am fully aware of the fact that in many cases this or that organization may have been slow to perform services for which Unesco has asked, and that in such cases the Secretariat may be tempted to do the job itself, which again means more specialists on the staff. I think we must take into account some inertia on the part of the organizations concerned and realize the fact that the Secretariat, however well staffed, can never replace an organization which commands the best specialists in the field in question. It is, in our view, for good reasons that the words "encourage", "promote" and "stimulate" are so often to be found in our resolutions. I think it is a marvellous result that the United Nations should have created this agency of Unesco in order continuously to stir up the cultural organizations of the world, should they be in danger of falling short of their lofty task! Most of the instruments of educational, scientific, and cultural life have existed since olden days. What we need is a nerve-centre linking them all together and making them serve a common cause. I do not, of course, deny that there are cases where Unesco must do the job itself or must call experts together for information and advice. But, as a general rule, we must rely on enlisting the collaboration of existing bodies of competent people as the only means of obtaining a decisive impact with a limited staff and limited resources. We are glad to see from the Dierctor-General's Report that many non-governmental organizations have done valuable work for Unesco, and we have been pleased this morning to hear from the Chairman of the Executive Board that the Board, as I understand it, shares the view that we must use the existing organizations. Many organizations of high scientific and cultural character have, in themselves, a far-reaching bearing on Unesco's aims, even if this is not explicitly evident from the definition of their objective. In such cases we must take care not to be too narrow in our conditions for collaboration.

[21] Finally, let me mention another question of method, that of the written communications and publications of Unesco, which have often called forth criticism. If, for instance, there has been a gathering of people discussing some special problem, why then publish verbatim reports? Let the result of the meeting be published, together, when suitable, with a short statement of the main points brought forward in the discussion. Then we should get three pages instead of thirty. In these five years I have had to read piles of Unesco papers, and in many cases I have wasted much of my time finding my way to the real point. You may object that there is a certain tradition, the tradition, if I may call it so, of the "whereases" and the "considerings"; I mean the tradition of painting in very broad lines the background of certain questions. That is a well-established tradition, but we may question its wisdom. The purpose of a written communication is not that everybody should be able to find every detail in it, but that it should actually be read. And we all know by experience that a paper finds readers if it is concise and goes straight to the point. Most of the qualified persons whom we want as readers are busy people who have no time to waste.

[22] And now for the printed publications. Some of these must be of a periodical character, such as those issued by purely technical services,

for instance, the *Libraries Bulletin*, and we need also one single periodical of a general character, like the *Courier*, which is on the whole well written. But all those publications which are intended as propaganda in one form or another should not be periodicals, but separate pamphlets. The reason for issuing a new publication must be that it has a new idea to bring out, not that a new number is due in a series which cannot be stopped. And such publications should not be written by a staff member in special charge of editing, but by members of the Programme Departments as a direct result of their work. Let considerations of high quality be the guiding principle in our publications policy, and let us then print the really good publications in numbers sufficient for wide distribution.

[23] But I do not wish to give you the impression that I am implying still more criticism of the Secretariat. The Director-General is right in saying, as he did this morning, with well-justified emphasis, that the General Conferences have so far mainly imposed still more duties on the Secretariat without defining the corresponding duties of the Member States. He is right in emphasizing this fact at the moment when a more permanent programme comes into being, and this moment is a turning point at which Member States should warmly confirm their faith in Unesco. The points I have mentioned are meant as a contribution to that feeling of responsibility which all Member States must share. There is the danger of Unesco's trying to cover too vast an area, dissipating its energy, and presenting a diffuse picture. Even if we are aware of all the problems of our time, we must be cautious in selecting those which are our immediate concern. If these are well defined and tackled vigorously, there will soon be no further doubt as to the significance of the cultural agency of the United Nations.

[24] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Canada.

[25] Mr. Jean DÉSY (Canada) — [*Translation from the French*] Florence has had an eternal attraction for pilgrims in search of beauty. For centuries they have come from every corner of the world to meditate amid the wonders of this city. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was bound, in its turn, to succumb to its age-old magic. When the founders of the city gave it its name, they perhaps foresaw that one day it would be adorned, as with a flowery garland, with the most wonderful works created by human genius. City of Spring and garden of the mind. Spring lives in the immortal gardens where Botticelli's nymphs go floating by, flowers ornament the hat of Donatello's David and the embroidered mantles of Angelico's Virgins. And there are those other flowers of humanism, heroism and asceticism, whose perfume scents the air of Florence. Yet at first there was nothing to mark out Florence for such an extraordinarily rich development among the rival cities growing to power in her vicinity. The reason for her pre-eminence is obviously not to be found in any superiority of her technical resources, in the endowments of her University or the organization of her schools. Her secret probably lies in the atmosphere in which, at one time, her most gifted sons found full freedom for development and self-expression. Within two hundred years, at the instance of Cosimo the Elder and Lorenzo the Magnificent, the splendid buildings which are the glory of Florence were raised. Yet while these flowers they had nurtured came to bloom, the Medicis took care to impose no constraint or compulsion upon the men of genius they gathered around them. They were content to create the atmosphere in which masterpieces might be produced. Art needs patronage, not direction.

[26] Unesco today has to choose the more useful of these two roles. The discussion on which we are now embarking will, I hope, induce the Organization to concentrate its efforts on the strictly limited field in which we believe it may properly operate. May Unesco initiate a new Renaissance, like those enlightened patrons who made Florence one of the fairest blooms of civilization. If it succeeds, it will have more than fulfilled our brightest hopes. Culture, which Burckhardt defines as the sum of naturally occurring intellectual developments which make no claim to compel universal acceptance, is an indigenous growth requiring nothing more than a suitable climate. It is the body of changes in the moral, aesthetic and material conditions of life brought about, in any given environment, by the natural operation of the intellect. For that reason, as Mr. Herbert Read says, it can never be imposed "ready-made". In our opinion, it is the duty of external agents to facilitate such an upward movement without attempting to guide it into predetermined channels. Unesco may sow the seeds of culture; it cannot purvey it.

[27] On behalf of the Canadian delegates to the Fifth Session of the General Conference, I am glad to welcome the observers from Germany and Japan, whose advice will no doubt make it possible to execute the work planned in those two countries more efficiently.

[28] I hope our meetings may guide Unesco into paths better suited to the nature of the Organization and its resources. Its primary duty is to help the cultures of the different nations to

develop fruitfully, and later to open up channels of communication by which the contributions each can make to the progress of all may pass from one to another. Everything extraneous to this already extensive programme should be struck out. The programme the Director-General has submitted to us indicates a very definite desire to condense and co-ordinate the Organization's work. I take this opportunity of specially congratulating Mr. Torres Bodet, and of telling him how much we appreciate and admire his exemplary devotion to his duties and his excellent direction of Unesco. He rightly places in the forefront the question of the exchange of information between countries. This promotion of contact and understanding is, in fact, still the most important part of Unesco's work, and I am glad to see that it is still given priority in every service. From this point of view, I consider that the projects concerned with the exchange of persons and the development of the social sciences in countries in which they have hitherto been neglected, deserve to receive our approval. Such measures merit our support, for they weave bonds of friendship between the peoples. If peace is to be firmly founded, the first necessity is to lay the groundwork of international collaboration and intellectual understanding.

[29] The execution of other proposals might, however, in our opinion, profitably be postponed. We do not think it essential to publish monographs on free and compulsory education, to issue popular articles to broadcasting organizations, to produce film strips or pictures for the use of lecturers, to trace the stages in the constitutional development of the Specialized Agencies, or to collect photographs and illustrations supplied by scientific or technical societies. There is too much urgent work awaiting our attention for us to waste time on such enterprises.

[30] Finally, the Canadian delegation would be glad if several projects were omitted. I wonder indeed what advantage artists would derive from having their rights set forth in a declaration which, when all is said and done, would simply be a more restricted version of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The establishment of an International Institute of the Press and Information has so far won so little support that the only possible course is, we believe, to abandon it. Instead of attempting to compete with institutions of established reputation, Unesco would certainly do better to take advantage of the documentation they have already assembled. In connexion with the natural sciences, for instance, the files of the International Scientific Union and the International Documentation Centre might be most helpful. Unesco would be wrong to try to compete with private associations which are better equipped than the Organization to carry out some types of research. It would be better to make use of the services these associations could render Unesco if Unesco thought fit to ask for them.

[31] I am glad to find that Unesco maintains close relations with the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council and the other Specialized Agencies. If this co-operation were rather more actively organized, it would make it possible, in many cases, to prevent overlapping and to arrange for better use of the resources placed at Unesco's disposal by the United Nations. For instance, the investigation of methods of international collaboration which has been initiated under the auspices of the Department of Social Sciences should, in our opinion, be entrusted to the United Nations Secretariat, which has already published comparative accounts of the regulations observed in the Commissions of the United Nations. Moreover, the General Assembly has instructed the Interim Committee to carry out similar enquiries in the political field. I also see that the Economic and Social Council's Committee on Co-ordination has not yet clearly indicated the special functions of the various Specialized Agencies with regard to the education of backward children. Unesco should not make the first move without consulting the other United Nations bodies concerned. Unesco's functions are already so extensive that it need feel no desire to encroach upon its neighbours' ground.

]32[Secondly, there is room for improvement in Unesco's machinery. The frequent sessions of the General Conference entail very heavy work for a constantly changing staff, taken on for short periods at a time. In order to relieve the Secretariat of some of the work imposed upon it by conferences held away from the headquarters of the Organization, during which current business sometimes remains in abeyance, it would be better if one session out of two were held in Paris. Nevertheless, in spite of these difficulties, which do not seem insuperable, there should be no delay in correspondence. The Canadian Government likes to obtain the advice of scientific or educational associations on the various matters which the Executive Board proposes to include in the agenda. On the present occasion, the information arrived too late to allow the competent authorities in my country to consider it properly before discussing it with the representatives of private associations. As these delays occur regularly, I would ask the services concerned to make sure that they do not continue indefinitely.

[33] On behalf of the Canadian delegation, I must congratulate the Director-General and the Executive Board on their manifest efforts to reduce

administrative expenses. I maintain, however, that while it is still necessary to improve the implementation and financial administration of Unesco's programmes, the main need is to practise strict economy in preparing those programmes. It is now an established procedure to fix in advance the maximum figure for authorized expenditure in the next financial year. Although there are some advantages in this procedure, it also has serious drawbacks. During the year, there is a great temptation to add arbitrarily to the various budget items in order to reach the ceiling figure fixed. Would it not be more logical to strike out of the programme all projects which are not strictly within Unesco's purview and which do not qualify for exceptionally favourable treatment? In my opinion, it would be better to fix on a few essential projects, allotting each of them a minimum sum. If we are conscientious in our examination of the various basic items in the programme, the total of these sums will be less than the agreed ceiling. If not, the total will be too large and we shall have to embark on a fresh examination of the different budget items in order to cut down individual appropriations. My fellow countrymen are somewhat concerned to see Unesco sinking millions in a great number of projects, each of which should really be dealt with separately at the proper time. We are undertaking too much to do anything thoroughly. The essential aims of Unesco would be seen more clearly if each year a carefully chosen project were given special attention by the Secretariat, thus providing a central topic for Unesco's propaganda. A few years hence, when Unesco's various major projects have in turn had all our resources focussed upon them, public opinion will know more about the objects Unesco has in view. At the same time, Unesco's activities, being more narrowly confined, will have more penetrating power and will no longer be dissipated ineffectively at surface level.

[34] In order to achieve its goal, Unesco must have the support of public opinion in all countries. It will be able to win the confidence and sympathy of the people only if it avoids dissipating and wasting its energies, co-ordinates its work with that of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies, makes its administrative services more efficient, and keeps a rigid check on its expenditure. It is important that Unesco should be able to keep to essentials in the enormous sphere in which the Organization hopes to make its influence felt. For the rest, as Lorenzo the Magnificent often said of men of letters, "they only need support". That phrase, I think, should be the motto of our meetings.

Questi hanno solo bisogno di essere sollevati.

[35] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Italy.

[36] Professor Guido GONELLA (Italy) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President and fellows-delegates, at every international conference, whenever men of different countries meet together, they come face to face with the problems of our modern world, more than ever anxious about the fate of peace, more than ever fearing war, growing daily more familiar with both the taste of freedom and the abasement of servitude. All men everywhere earnestly desire peace; but peace today is less to be achieved by safeguards and defence (we may remember the anguished cry of the women of Canterbury in Eliot's play: "We do not wish anything to happen"), than to be won by strife and conquest. Our world undoubtedly contains some seeds of decadence but, at the same time, there are factors which may bring about revival, and we must concentrate with all our heart upon the latter, not in an endeavour to discover facile compromises, but to win back to the elementary human values, to the springs of that firm and manly courage which faces, unfaltering, the ever-renewed enigma of the universe. Now, when on every hand new secret weapons are being prepared, we must go forward together, using our intelligence to seek salvation in truth and redemption in freedom. It is well to keep this, our ultimate goal, ever in our minds, not that it may serve as a reason or excuse for evading urgent issues, but that we may pause, even if only for a moment, to take stock, as our eminent Director-General, Mr. Torres Bodet, so wisely recommends at the beginning of his interesting report—to take stock or, as it were, to examine our ship's papers as it sails on its way.

[37] I wonder whether Pascal, who thought the discussion of ends and means a pity, would abandon his contention today if he saw us so exclusively concerned with means, methods and techniques. Would he not rather admonish us with another of his penetrating remarks: "That which ascends through progress also declines through progress." Once the inviolable dignity of the individual and his sacred rights have been solemnly affirmed, there may be a temptation to avoid the strain of making a thorough study of the formidable complexities of the individual and his historical evolution, or the dangerous responsibility of an interpretation which would commit us irrevocably, by taking refuge in what may be called "neutral" or objective science. It is then forgotten that science, far from being sufficient in itself and far from providing a sufficient interpretation of the world, must itself be explained by the efforts and intellectual re-

quirements of that very individual whom it attempts to analyse and portray. If the scientific outlook leaves aside the inmost essence of man, it can evolve techniques of great value, but it can not penetrate into the deeper realm of causes; and while we accept those techniques with gratitude, we must not forget that man cannot be truly man unless his moral and spiritual values are a vital force in his life. Man needs not only the truths of science but also ethical principles to guide his living.

[38] In its programme, Unesco indicates what there is to be done, what activities are to be undertaken, and what methods and means are to be used. But the Organization must not neglect the common spiritual ideal which is now coming into being. While it is necessary to lay down the basis for practical work in which men of different political and religious creeds may take part, we must also take care not to make our work fruitless by letting scepticism confine us to superficial agreement for practical purposes and, by implication, abandoning the effort to find more precious points of contact in more essential matters. Unesco, in its desire to build the defences of peace where wars begin, in the minds of men, must necessarily devote its efforts to a great campaign for education and re-education.

[39] Unesco will attest its noble and constructive ideal of a peace founded on the serenity of mankind and the courage of justice; in its work it will find constant inspiration in that ideal and will discover its own optimum speed; it will not be schocked or alarmed at facts as they are; it will come up against obstacles and opposition in its systematic development. The critical attitude which the Director-General has adopted in his clear and masterly report, is an invitation to each of us to put forward constructive criticisms. When we think of the present state of the world and the possibility of universal cultural understanding among the peoples, we see that our stock-taking must cover both ourselves and the world as a whole.

[40] You are certainly all familiar with Dante, a poet who appeals to every nation because he expresses the soul of man; you are sure to remember how, when he was lost in the forest of sense and sin, he caught sight of the sunlit Mountain, the mountain of his despair and of his hope. His instinctive natural impulse to rush forward to scale the sunny height was met by reason, through the mouth of Virgil, with a statement of the need for long and difficult consideration, for a judgment on the strange world of the past in which the wanderer had lost his way.

[41] If we wish to reach agreement, in a spirit of understanding and collaboration, we also must work patiently to make ourselves more perfect; we must try to discover what we are and how we have been shaped by our national traditions and culture from which we have drawn such liberal sustenance. Very often it is ignorance of that culture and those traditions which gives rise to misunderstanding; we fail to understand one another, because we have nothing to go on but the incomplete and biased picture shown us in an artificial light by insidious propaganda. Leonardo da Vinci used to say:

Nessuna cosa si puo amare nè odiare, se prima non si ha cognizione di quella . . . con cio sia che l'amore di qualunque cosa è figlio di essa conoscenza.

Or again, we might say with Sun Yat Sen that the difficulty lies in knowing and understanding; when there is understanding, action is easy. Such meetings and interchange must be left to the free initiative of mutual good will, but at the same time their progress should be followed with extreme care and attention; practical help should be provided to prepare for them and carry them out, and every possible assistance should be given to enable them to produce constructive results. To achieve this and to ensure that our work is effective, we need the constancy of a willing and honest disposition of mind. But the mind must find means of exercising an effective influence at every moment.

[42] If we are to embark in practical fashion on the stock-taking we have been asked to carry out, we must devote all our attention to the fundamental problem mentioned by the Director-General in the passage in his speech in which he speaks of the relations between Member States and the Secretariat. The increase in the staff of the Secretariat, the reasons for which are so well explained by Mr. Torres Bodet, is certainly a practical indication of the satisfactory extension of Unesco's activities, but it also calls for thought and vigilance on our part. We must ensure that the Secretariat does not cease to be the instrument of the will of Member States and that, swelling to an unnatural size, it does not turn Unesco into an organization which would tend to become independent of the Member States and to take their place.

[43] In the opinion of the Italian delegation, this danger will undoubtedly be avoided if the priorities suggested for the Organization are reconsidered. While none of these priority projects is unnecessary, not all are equally useful or equally urgent. If we wish our not unlimited resources to cover our immediate aims, the Italian delegation believes that it is necessary to space out carefully the various tasks which are at present being undertaken simultaneously, even though adequate preparations have not yet been

made for all of them. In this connexion, it may be maintained that it is necessary not only to extend but also to concentrate Unesco's activities, by setting the Organization aims which can be truly and effectively achieved without any departure from its fundamental principles. For this purpose, it is important for the National Commissions to be strengthened by their Governments, so as to make more valuable the assistance provided for the Secretariat by Member States.

[44] We may also note that it is desirable to call widely on the collaboration of the competent international organizations, with due respect for their independence. There was international co-operation in education and culture, altough in a different form, before Unesco was established; today our Organization is one of the most efficient and original instruments of that co-operation. In the endeavour to secure co-operation, other organizations were set up, before our time, and we should desire them to take their share in the work we are all pursuing, and should encourage them to do so. For this purpose, we should endeavour more and more to make the competent international organizations responsible for studying special problems, as, for instance, we have commissioned the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers to examine the question of the equivalence of university degrees. It is, of course, essential to select these Organizations carefully, taking account of their structure and aims.

[45] When, after mentioning these general problems, we consider the guiding principles and the actual activities of our Organization, attention should be drawn to one of the most important passages in the Director-General's report, in which he complains that Unesco's inspiring words are not always fully understood by Member States and cultural organizations.

[46] In order, as we desire, to remove the obstacles to international understanding and to make the great Unesco machine work smoothly, the first essential is to define clearly the ideas underlying the work of our Organization. There are many references to democracy, humanity and freedom in our programme, but we do not always succeed in giving those terms a definite meaning acceptable to all. We were surprised and distressed when we read, in the report of a Committee of Experts on International Voluntary Work Camps, dated 7 September 1948, that a proposal designed to secure respect for three fundamental human rights in work camps (the right to freedom of work, the right to practise religion, and the right to freedom of information and expression) had been rejected on a point of order. If, as we all desire, we are to win the trust of the nations, we must not hesitate to recognize the fundamental rights which it is Unesco's most important task to affirm and defend. If Unesco is to win the sympathy of men of good will, as we all hope, it must take need of the warnings expressed by several delegations, including our own, and avoid committing itself to the support of bodies which may be a grave moral danger to young people, precisely because they are not interested in safeguarding the exercice of fundamental freedoms. We believe that the foregoing advice is relevant because we were extremely pleased at the chivalrous appeal in the first part of the Director-General's report, reminding us of all that the nations expect from Unesco's work for peace.

[47] The Italian delegation is fully aware of the great difficulty of abandoning vague and general tenets for a precise definition of the fundamental principles guiding our Organization, but it is nevertheless convinced of the absolute need for us to neglect nothing which may help us to reach such a definition. Of course, as the Director-General said this morning, there can be no question of producing an artificial Unesco philosophy—a ridiculous eclecticism—or of securing general acceptance of a single conception of the world and of human life among peoples who each have their own conception of the problems of the world, all alike deserving of respect. As Jacques Maritain said at the General Conference in 1947, these different peoples can and do desire to set themselves a single common aim—to establish peace on culture and education and to build the defences of peace in the minds of men. Surely that in itself indicates agreement on principles which may suggest practical activities in which we may all take part.

[48] There is a danger that any universal language may, in the endeavour to satisfy all, satisfy none. The most immediate problems obviously arise in different forms in different countries. The problems are not the same in highly civilized countries as in those in which some of the principal elements of culture are still lacking. It will certainly be in Unesco's interests to take full account of these differences. The Organization will then be more easily able to bring these various cultural requirements into line with one another by adapting its activities more and more, as time goes on, not only to the needs of the Secretariat but to those of National Commissions and groups of National Commissions. That is one of the most interesting points made in the Director-General's report, for it is obvious that in any world-wide scheme of action, a centralized organization is not the one most likely to satisfy all requirements.

[49] A decentralized system such as we would wish would also make it possible to ensure that

enquiries are not undertaken in Member States without their collaboration and, one might almost say, without their knowledge, contrary to the provisions of Article I, paragraph 3, of the Constitution of our Organization. It would likewise help us to avoid making in future such mistakes as that of asking prominent people for help in the publication and translation of the classics, a project which was subsequently abandoned.

[50] All these snares, which are attributable only to flaws in the system, can be avoided if governments and National Commissions have a real share in the responsiblity of carrying out the recommendations of the General Conference. In this way, Unesco will no longer be a single centre; it will have 56 centres to make the spirit of the Organization a living force in the educational, cultural and scientific life of mankind as a whole. These new centres or foci of Unesco's influence will have to take account of the need not only to spread culture by every possible means, but also to promote research in pure science.

[51] We are as well aware as anyone of the urgency of the literacy campaign and the demands of adult and popular education. In spite of the grave damage inflicted on our educational establishments by the war, the democratic government of Italy has, in the last few years, established tens of thousands of new elementary and popular schools, in the conviction that a government of the people must above all work for the education of the people. Our educational reforms are designed to prolong the period of free, compulsory schooling for the children of the poorer classes. There is an appropriation of over a hundred thousand million lire a year for this purpose in the budget. The publication which the Italian delegation will circulate to the Conference gives an account of the work which has been done for popular education. But democratic Italy, in its endeavour to fulfil the people's desire for instruction to the best of its ability, is also obliged to state that it is useless to attempt to disseminate culture without prosecuting research to add to the knowledge from which it draws its strength, without daily revitalizing the leaven of humanity and renewing the "salt of the earth" as quickly as it is used up.

[52] We cannot reduce the functions of science and culture to a simple—though necessary—process of popularization, without condemning both to sterility within a short time. This stress on the popularization of culture inevitably leads to the preferential treatment of purely mechanical forms of culture. We do not believe that the spiritual training of humanity—as we read in Unesco's preamble—should be based on the enormous mechanical advances made in the last few decades. We think, on the contrary, that mechanical progress should be guided and directed by intellectual and spiritual principles.

[53] Nor do we share the opinion that it is possible to draw up world-wide plans for all types of teaching or to recommend textbooks which may be used by all nations, although we agree that textbooks should be imbued with the idea of the brotherhood of the peoples. Cultural understanding should not be achieved by eliminating the individual characteristics of each of the nations or by any general reduction to a common level, but by stimulating and working on the richest and most truly human features in each of them so as to secure a rich and harmonious orchestration instead of a monotonous chant.

[54] I have drawn attention to these points in reponse to the Director-General's chivalrous invitation and not to raise any doubts about our country's loyal support of Unesco or the value of what has been achieved by the Organization.

[55] The Italian delegation is anxious, in particular, to congratulate Mr. Torres Bodet on the passage in his report in which he deals with the efforts our Organization has made to improve the technical arrangements for international interchange at the present day, when intellectual progress makes necessary division and specialization in research. But that progress itself makes it more difficult for us to discover at the proper time the results which research workers have obtained. Unesco has already done much for world culture by overcoming many of the difficulties, and we must therefore be grateful to the Director-General for the efforts now being made to develop and improve this important part of our Organization's work.

[56] The difficult and varied work which has been done for cultural reconstruction in the regions which suffered most severely in the war is also deserving of commendation, although much larger resources would have been necessary to fulfil such generous plans. Assistance to scientists also deserves to be extended.

[57] Finally, the Italian delegation wishes to express its hearty satisfaction with what has been done for education and culture in the underdeveloped regions. At the same time, the delegation thinks it desirable to avoid the danger of making all cultures uniform. In our opinion, Unesco should provide the backward peoples with means of stimulating their spiritual and intellectual development, without attempting to impose on them an artificial cultural conformity, which would be most regrettable.

[58] This danger which, I am sure, we all wish to avoid, might rear its head again if we were too much inclined to limit ourselves to technical

surveys, which are, of course, necessary in our society but which, by themselves, would be a serious obstacle to international understanding. If we are to maintain the system of human values on which our life is based, we must devote our resources and endeavours to the propagation of that humanistic culture, true source of peace and freedom, which expresses the common features to be found in our diversities and what is lasting in the evolution of the peoples.

[59] Projects designed to establish lasting and fruitful relations between the peoples in connexion with the humanities and intellectual training should include those concerned with the visual arts, music and literature. The immortal works of great artists bear witness to the pure humanity which is able to rise above quarrels and divisions. The peoples must turn their eyes to those works to learn from them, so that they may come to a clear understanding of the symbolic significance, with its high moral implications, of the perennial victory of Orpheus over Hercules.

[60] Humanistic studies must also include social studies, resulting from the reflections of different social groups on the life of man. In this connexion, may I draw your attention to the need for our Organization to encourage studies of law, which have hitherto been almost entirely overlooked.

[61] Here it is desirable to point out again that science, as distinct from its practical applications, has an educational value, but we must recognize that science can be a unifying force only in the hands of a regenerate mankind which has reached agreement on fundamental values. It is Unesco's business, in its work, to serve those fundamental values.

[62] One extremely important principle which should be mentioned is that of religion and the interpretation of religious creeds, through whose influence the distinction between Jews, Romans and Hellenes was first removed. If we are to be true to the facts of history and to take account of spiritual realities, we must admit that there are other forces which have worked and are now working for the same purposes as Unesco by means differing in some respects and with more distant aims in view. This recognition of the share our Organization has to take should be universal and should affect all creeds. As Italians, we feel it necessary to recall the great work which Catholicism has done and is still doing for peace and civilization in every age and every land. We believe that this work cannot and must not be overlooked by those who are determined to wield the arms of the spirit in the service of world peace.

[63] The clouds which herald fresh crises have not yet been dispersed from the horizons of the world. Never before has humanity been so capable of advance and so inclined to retreat until it falls back into the stormy darkness of the past. This terrifying descent is made possible by the obscure and terrible passions of mankind. So long as hearts are hard, it is inevitable that these forces should become the instruments of irretrievable destruction. A great intellectual leader, Newman, has said that:

> . . . to hope to rival the giants of human passion and human pride by using nothing but the delicate instruments of reason and man's learning would be like digging away a granite rock with pebbles or mooring a ship with a silken thread.

On what, then, can we found our hopes? What instrument can we use to dig away the granite rock which is threatening to crush us? What can we use to moor the ship of life to save it from the storm? To this agonizing question, the general consciousness of a common desire for inner renovation provides an answer which may justly give us comfort.

[64] Whatever state we may be in, we are all conscious that the present crisis is too grave and too deep-seated to be solved by the methods of politics or simple scientific technique. What is needed is a renaissance in man's moral life—the Christian regeneration, in fact, which seemed absurd to purely human logic. The old Adam, accustomed to the use of force, must die, that the new man, believing in the power of love, may be born. *Tempus libertatis*, as St. Augustine called this period of rebirth, emphasizing that his Creator does nothing by force, *sed omnia suadendo et monendo*. This loftier virtue should govern human relations. We are conscious of the need for a new conception of life's problems. Civilization, produced by man in his development, has outstripped him. It threatens his survival. And this struggle against the civilization he has produced gives rise to a desire in man for new and more certain values. It is therefore true that politics, as a means of preserving life, are today dependent on the nature of education, science and culture, and that in consequence the basis for a vital and constructive policy, in conformity with the ideal underlying Unesco's Constitution, should be laid by a regenerative education, designed to develop strength, not without regard to the purposes for which it is to be used, but for free and fruitful purposes, and to develop those divine gifts of the spirit which are the property of man in the harmony of the universe.

[65] If we can be born again, we shall be able to survive. It is our desire that Unesco, collaborating with all the spiritual forces at work in the world, may emerge from this Fifth Session of the General Conference strong in its clear aware-

ness of the aims before it and in its faith in the efficacy of its endeavour to rebuild the world.

[66] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the representative of the Netherlands.

[67] Dr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, an organization seeking to execute a bold design must necessarily go through many critical moments in its existence. Unlike the ordinary bureaucracy, it will have no beaten path to traverse, with the unexpected reduced to a minimum, but must continually bring into play originality and imagination to overcome a succession of major obstacles. We are glad to note that Unesco has proved able to accomplish the greater part of its large-scale projects. A clear distinction has now been made between the basic programme and each year's current projects, and thus it has been possible to distinguish more clearly between programme and purely administrative activities. At this early stage of the Conference I want to place on record my special admiration not only for the precision of the budget estimates but for the lucid expositions of the Director-General and for his suggestions concerning the accomplishments of the 1951 programme. Taken with the basic programme these precise data will be of the utmost value as pointers to the resolutions we must take. It gives me great pleasure to assure you that both the Government and the National Commission of the Netherlands have the fullest confidence in what Unesco is doing.

[68] We fully realize, however, that at the present time Unesco is nevertheless going through a difficult period and on that account this delegation has a number of constructive criticisms to make in line in the main with the views expressed by Mr. Torres Bodet this morning. The Director-General's report is a realistic document and does not gloss over the difficulties. Over and above the lack of co-operation by certain Member States to which he rightly draws attention—a point to which I shall revert later—the most striking feature emerging is the major difficulty implicit for the Organization in the fact that every task accomplished opens up further possibilities and leads to yet other tasks requiring ever-expanding effort.

[69] I wish to draw attention to a point of great importance, which may well prove decisive for Unesco's future: one consequence of the programme's proliferation is the increase in the numbers of the Secretariat. The 1951 Estimates budget for a staff of 841, an increase which not only gives every indication of being excessive but also means that salaries, emoluments, etc. will account for more than half of the total estimates. Clearly this is not good publicity for Unesco.

[70] Another problem for consideration is that of the burden of work placed on the Secretariat, to which the Director-General has drawn attention. Only by concentration on the essential items of the programme can we relieve the work load falling on certain sections of the Secretariat. Incidentally, may I say how much we in the Netherlands admire the keenness shown by many staff members who have often given up hours and even days of their own time to the accomplishment of their allotted tasks. A contributory cause of the excess work load has clearly been the brief space of time separating the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Conference. One of our tasks must be to study all means of diminishing the amount of work involved for the Secretariat in the preparation of Conferences. One solution is the suggestion by the United States delegation that Conferences should be biennial. I myself feel that this proposal should be borne in mind, but I would fain judge it in the light of the situation as regards programme activities as a whole.

[71] It would also seem essential to aim at a higher degree of concentration. Under this head the concentration of all questions relating to youth in a single section is a good beginning, and the recent formation of the "Technical Assistance Unit" seems to offer good prospects for the concentration of projects in this class. In publications also more concentration would be desirable. Would it not be possible to secure co-operation between the youth publication *Impetus* and those on the role of the arts in teaching, on young peoples' science clubs, study centres and work camps? The same is true of other types of publication, and by these means it should be possible to secure better focusing of public attention, at present dissipated and distracted by an excess of calls on it; financially such a policy should lead to economies.

[72] Ladies and gentlemen, the policy line I have suggested might also react favourably on another weakness, namely the lack of activity by Member States. Here many changes are called for. All countries in general—including the Netherlands—and their National Commissions in particular, afford the Secretariat too little effective help, so that, despite the interest of the contents, Unesco's issues of documentation are often distressingly reminiscent of a speech to an empty hall. What is to be done? Obviously, the first thing is to put some life into the National Commissions. The latter are likely to work most effectively through small sub-commissions, whose activities would follow the lines laid down in the several sections of Unesco's programme, adjusted

to conform to the needs of the country concerned. Here Unesco itself can do much to help by reducing its own programme. The nations may be likened to vessels anchored in a roadstead, on which the gale of Unesco's projects and activities strikes with such force that they drag their anchors and are driven out to sea before the crew has had time to embark. The danger can be avoided by more efficient organization of the programme. Thus it would be advisable not to start on the execution of new projects when there are similar incompleted projects still in hand; even the drafting of others should only be undertaken when the published reports show that real results have been achieved in earlier undertakings of the same kind.

[73] Unesco, I repeat, has reached a critical point. It is easy enough to add new items to the programme and any one of us could go on contributing them indefinitely; we must however call a halt to this process. The first time a child is allowed into a garden riotous with growing things and a blaze of varied colours, with leave to pick all the flowers that he wants, he may well hesitate where to begin; he has the choice of so many glorious colours that he cannot make up his mind. There is nothing abnormal about such hesitation; it is merely the outward sign of the child's happy surprise before prospects unhoped for and unforeseen. In the case of an adult, hesitation may spring from quite different causes: the psychopatic sufferer who goes to a department store with the intention of buying a particular article loses all power of willed action the moment he sets foot inside the doors; he feels overwhelmed by the variety of articles displayed before him and choice becomes impossible. These two examples are both, of course, extreme cases. Nevertheless, the same possibilities and the same difficulties come into play to some extent in the case of every man and every large-scale organization. Briefly the task is to avoid being swamped by the abundance of opportunities.

[74] Today this applies with special force to Unesco itself. Unless the general public comes to look on Unesco as a living organization, much of Unesco's appeal will be lost. The question is asked all too often what actual results can be set off against so many ambitious projects. To some extent the implied criticism is justified. It can fairly be claimed that Unesco has had to feel its way forward at the cost of many errors, but the time has now come when it must increasingly make a deliberate choice of the road it should follow. The full story of the activities of the various sections affords clear evidence that, though the projects undertaken are notable and valuable in themselves, their numbers are excessive. Thus the paradoxical question arises whether the results secured would not, in many cases, be greater had the available financial resources been more modest. The fact is that there are many projects which it would be well to hold in suspense for the moment in order to devote more attention to the execution of others. Often the sole result of excellent research work is a report forgotten as soon as read.

[75] Again, in the selection of new undertakings, we must pick projects from which concrete results may be expected and whose importance and value will be apparent to the readers of the daily papers. To take an example, in countries with a fully developed educational system, there is the problem of striking a balance between the necessary extension of the school period, having regard to the requirements of modern technology, and the ill effects on young peoples' sense of responsibility if their entry into adult life is postponed until a more advanced age. Or again, there may be other concrete subjects to which it would be preferable to give priority. That is not the point we are discussing at the moment.

[76] If the programme could be planned on a two-year basis, in accordance with the United States' proposal, then there would be still greater need to make it at once more practical and more consistent. There is a danger that Unesco's energies may be dissipated if it attempts to flash too many opportunities at once before the world.

[77] To conclude, it will be essential for Unesco to seek to shift the load more than formerly on to its Member States, and this will simultaneously act as a spur to the latter. Much is to be gained by Unesco's projects keeping in line with the parallel activities already proceeding to some extent in certain countries. One such instance is public information, where there is always a tendency to more or less haphazard activity unless a national centre is made use of as an intermediary; the same is true of many programme items which should take into account the similar concrete problems with which many countries are already at grips. An encouraging example here is that of Unesco's sociological investigations in India, where the Government itself has undertaken the preliminary research.

[78] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in what I have said I have sought to make it clear that the task of this General Conference consists less in giving the final polish to the programme than in trying seriously to arrive at a better notion of Unesco's general policy. The course on which the Organization has embarked, according to its published documents, is one which inspires the Netherlands delegation with complete confidence. Nevertheless, as I have tried to

show, there must be pruning and we must get results to avoid an excess of projects leading to the paralysis of all practical work.

[79] Finally, in order that Unesco may achieve increased practical results, it is my earnest hope that all those sharing in the work, alike in the Secretariat and in the Member States, will clearly realize that our Organization's object is not to stage an attractive display of cultural activities and large-scale research, but, under the very terms of its Constitution, to secure throughout the world the dominance of a single state of mind going deeper than mere superficial agreement in political and economic matters, one which shall plant true moral solidarity deep in the heart of mankind. To this end we must tackle the concrete problems facing every cultural centre, all of which spring ultimately from a lack on the human side, a lack which finally is of the spirit.

[80] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Switzerland.

[81] Professor Jean PIAGET (Switzerland) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, allow me first to express the pleasure felt by the Swiss delegation at being in a country which is both our neighbour and our friend and which, in our homeland, as everywhere else, is universally admired and loved. I should like next to congratulate the Director-General upon his excellent report and the entire Secretariat upon the very great effort they have made over the last six months. The Director-General's report is a most valuable document. Mirrored in it we see the author's lucidity and logic: his sincerity as well; for he does not hide his present difficulties nor the anxiety he feels about the future. It reflects, too, his constructive mind, his unalloyed idealism as to our aims and his energetic realism as to means.

[82] The report contains an appeal to delegations to ponder the aims and methods of Unesco and to discuss them in detail. Last year I submitted the Swiss delegation's views on our aims. I dwelt on the immediate action we expect, action which should take priority over work of research and co-ordination. This year I should like very briefly to examine Unesco's methods. Our delegation and the whole of our National Commission are preoccupied by these. I shall not echo the criticism of the public, nor that which emanates from certain high intellectual circles. These circles, like the general public, are apt to regard Unesco as an unduly cumbrous machine when compared with its achievements. There is obviously much that is unjust in such criticism, which is chiefly due to a partly deliberate deficiency of information.

[83] But I want to raise the main domestic problem, that by which we are all preoccupied in our capacity as responsible delegates. We have a Director-General of the highest class. He has immense powers of work and is completely devoted to his task. We have an admirable Secretariat. The better I know it, the greater is my respect for our collaborators in Unesco, in all grades down to the secretaries, and more especially for the programme specialists, of whom too little is heard and who expend all their strength without stint upon the cause they have at heart. We have an excellent Executive Board. Its members are all highly competent people, men of conviction, wedded to the common cause, and we appreciated its merits this morning once again when we listened to its admirable Chairman, Sir John Maud. Of the Conference itself I shall not speak. You yourselves know its worth.

[84] Well then! Our machinery is sound. Our material resources are virtually sufficient. Why can we not act more speedily? How are we to explain that at each new conference we have not some decisive success to chalk up to our credit? Why is it unhappily always a fact within our knowledge that whenever we have something to set down on the credit side, a publication, a conference, a lecture, a pilot project, a seminar, a broadcast, etc., a section of public opinion remains unconvinced? There are, I think, two reasons, on which I should like to dwell; the way in general in which the programme is conceived and, above all, our methods of work.

[85] First, for the conception of the programme. The programme is a world in itself. Nothing is forgotten. We find there the exact sum total of what could be done, and even, perhaps, a little more. Is that a strength or a weakness? In one sense it is a strength, so far as we ourselves are concerned. By doing practically everything, we know that we cannot add to the load. But, except in this way, it is perhaps a weakness. By doing a little of everything, we do of course advance along the whole line. We advance each year. But we advance by inches. We have no big battles to deliver, since we do not concentrate all our forces at a few points only. And so, we lack conspicuous successes. In short, by trying to do everything, we are in danger of ending up rather in the manner of the tradesman who embarked upon a multitude of speculations each one of which was hazardous and who said, "I lose on each article, but I catch up on the bulk." Well, the Director-General and the Executive Board have discerned the danger. They have put forward an admirable agenda, which provides for concentration and for the classification of subjects in order of urgency. We congratulate them upon it. On the one hand, we have a standing programme representing the ideal objective of Unesco

—an objective as final as it can possibly be. On the other hand, we have resolutions and plans of work for each year, for instance, those for 1951, which represent a small fraction of the standing programme.

[86] But we ask, has this concentration gone far enough? Would it not, we wonder, be better, in some cases, to leave aside whole sections of the long-term programme and concentrate on current problems? This year more than ever it seems to me we must sacrifice certain parts of the programme and set about the most urgent jobs. Unesco's primary duty is to serve the cause of peace. Had there been any need to remind us of it, the moving words we heard yesterday from Mr. Laugier would have sufficed to bring back into the full light of day this essential task of Unesco. Now, there are two conceivable methods of paving the way for peace by education, science and culture, and we fear that we have perhaps been misled by doubt as to which to follow—either peace by education, science and culture, or, and this is the alternative method, education for peace, science for peace, culture for peace.

[87] If we take the first road, it will, for instance, be thought that all you have to do is to teach human beings, to educate the illiterate, to make known the achievements of science and so, inevitably, reach the goal of peace. If, on the other hand, we take the second road I have mentioned, we must seek forthwith for special techniques of international education, of cultural and even scientific action tending towards peace. Both the roads are indicated in the programme. We have not made our choice. Both are right, but both are not equally applicable to present needs. Following the first we are indeed paving the way for peace, but in thirty or fifty years. We are ensuring peace for future generations. But if we follow the second road, we may hope for immediate action, action that will bar the way to *Homo Stultus*, of whom Mr. Laugier told us, and saguefard the last opportunities for *Homo Sapiens*. But there can, I think, be no doubt. We must throw everything overboard to reach this primary goal.

[88] I now come to the question of methods. Unesco's difficulty in making decisive conquests is mainly due to its methods of work. It is of them that I should like to speak, for I was privileged this winter to spend three months as an official of Unesco. It was an unforgettable experience, which every delegate should undergo. Unless you have seen things from inside, you will, I am certain, have difficulty in realizing why the work is sometimes inevitably slow, and understanding the obstacles that often cannot be surmounted.

[89] I will, first of all, mention three points. I shall not dwell long on the first, because I was glad to hear Sir John Maud do so this morning. I refer to the state of health and overstrain in the Secretariat. I mentioned this last year. It has become chronic. Fruitful, successful work is, I think, an impossibility unless we take steps in this matter. Like all other officials, I underwent a medical examination when I entered upon my duties, and I took advantage of it to get the doctor to talk. Well! the Unesco doctor told me some things that really alarmed me. Should we not each year ask to receive, either from the Director-General or from the Executive Board, a report from the medical officer of the Organization, a frank report in which he would describe things exactly as a doctor sees them? But to see the effect upon the health of the staff, we do not, I think, even need a doctor. Just see how Dr. Beeby looks at the Conference this year. Compare his present appearance with that of last October, when he finished work at Unesco, and you will have a direct visual picture of what I mean.

[90] My second point is the rate of work. This is quite terrifying. There is no time for reflection, and that for reasons which you see as well as I do, for they are obvious. Surprise is sometimes expressed at the inadequacy of certain questionnaires —this is, of course, exceptional— or the comparative emptiness of certain documents. The explanation is simple. The writers have not had a minute to take a walk in the Bois de Boulogne before drafting what they have to say. They were told in the morning that the documents had to be ready that very evening or the next day.

[91] Finally, and this is my third and perhaps most important point; there is a feeling of moral dissatisfaction among Unesco's helpers. The only moment of real sadness that I experienced during my stay was that of departure. I saw that many of my colleagues envied me, those who did not say so perhaps more than those who openly did. And for myself I had a feeling that I was deserting, that I was leaving my chums in the front line to go back, so to speak, to the rear.

[92] This raises a problem, which the Director-General has mentioned in his Report, that of recruitment and the number of high posts still vacant. The Director-General ascribes this situation to two causes which are obviously important : firstly, that a job in Unesco leaves no room for individual creative or intellectual work and, secondly, that in Unesco officials are working for distant objectives and not, as national officials are, for immediate objectives. But I believe there is a third cause which seems to me yet more serious. We want

first-class collaborators, and such are absolutely indispensable for Unesco. But at the same time we condemn them to an executive role, to a mere quill-driver's job. We do, of course, pay them well. But that is not enough. A true intellectual does not shrink from honourable remuneration, but he cannot accept it in return for the loss of his spiritual freedom. The Director-General told us this morning that the Secretariat's role is an executive one. But that is too modest a role. He reassured us a little later when he said that true modesty was only the first rung on the ladder of ambition. And I hope the Secretariat will be more ambitious in the future. Speaking personally, and on behalf of my delegation, we refuse to agree that the role of the Secretariat members is purely executive. We consider that an official of Unesco needs a very large measure of imagination. But those are only symptoms. We must discover the causes. The causes appear to me to be three in number, and I wonder whether perhaps they are so deep as to be anchored to certain vices in the Constitution itself.

[93] The first reason is, of course, the shortness of the intervals between Conferences. This is an obvious cause of infertility. A whole month's work is blocked during the Conference itself, and two or three months are blocked by preparations for the Conference. Work is carried on unremittingly against a future date and there is no time to put the programme into effect. The Director-General only has time to consult the heads of services and not, as he should do, all the programme specialists. He has no time to foster the team spirit in each department. And therefore we warmly endorse the United States proposal to suppress one conference in two and to make them biennial conferences. Our delegation would have made that proposal had it not been presented by others better qualified to do so.

[94] The second cause is one which seems to me to call for a few remarks. The Constitution of Unesco places the responsibility for carrying out the programme on the Executive Board, and not on the Secretariat. That may perhaps have been necessary; it may still be necessary; but that necessity entails certain drawbacks. I should like to deal with two of them. The first is that the Secretariat is in permanent conference, not only during our sessions, but also during the necessarily numerous meetings of the Executive Board. The second drawback is that, by withholding from the Secretariat direct responsibility for the execution of the projects, you are in fact robbing it of its best spur to action. And, moreover, we wonder whether it would not be useful occasionally to be informed both of the Secretariat's proposals and of the changes in those proposals made by the Executive Board. Divergencies of opinion often beget ideas, and I believe that the Conference would have a clearer vision in certain instances if it knew the arguments pro and con. It is, we think, essential in some matters to know why such and such a view prevailed over another and especially why it prevailed over those of men who, when all is said and done, are responsible for the execution of the project.

[95] Lastly, the third and, maybe, the chief reason, which should perhaps be put on a level of equality with the other reasons for Unesco's lack of speed, is the exceptionally cumbrous administrative machine. Of that portion of an official's time that is not devoted to preparing for the Conference or the meetings of the Board or committees, three-quarters is spent in internal discussions with the administrative services of Unesco. I am not blaming those services. They are faithfully discharging their duty. They are doing what is expected of them. The real culprits are the Member States who set up this unwieldy administration, whose drawbacks we see now. If I may sum up my thoughts in somewhat homely language, I picture the story of Unesco over the past years in the following way: the Member States who supply Unesco with large contributions in money, in manpower and in time, were afraid lest, when the Secretariat was feeling its way, there might be a certain wastage of strength, amounting to, say, ten per cent. And then, to avoid that wastage, they set up so cumbersome an apparatus that I, for my part, wonder whether it does not involve in reality a wastage, not of ten per cent, but of thirty to fifty per cent, in some cases of the strength and means at the Secretariat's disposal.

[96] Such are the remarks which the Swiss delegation desired to submit. They may appear somewhat critical, but that is not the case. At least, if they are critical, they are constructively so, in the sense that each of the faults which I have mentioned seems to me to be curable. We, for our own part, are resolved to do our best to find the remedies, because we believe that they are to be found, and, because we think that the work of Unesco is today more valuable and more indispensable than ever.

[97] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the representative of Belgium.

[98] Mr. Léo MUNDELEER (Belgium) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, firstly, to make a few comments on the clear and concise report of our distinguished Director-General; secondly, to mention certain action which Belgium has taken this year; and lastly, to make a suggestion to you.

[99] In my speech last September, I, along with many others, recommended that Unesco's programme should be reduced to a scale compatible with the financial resources of the Organization. We should progressively compress our programme, first ensuring the solution of a few main problems, and leaving aside problems of lesser importance or urgency, if we are to make our work more effective. Our Director-General seems to take the same view. On behalf of the whole Belgian delegation, I should like to tell him how very pleased we are. Under the dynamic impetus of his leadership, it is clear that the Unesco Secretariat, which it has been so difficult to organize, is daily accomplishing more effectively its very heavy and complex task.

[100] But Unesco's aims cannot be achieved by the unaided efforts of the Director-General and his assistants, however willing and devoted to the Organization they may be. The mistake our Organization is making is to impose on them the twofold burden of directing and implementing the programme. The latter responsibility should to a large extent be taken over by the national organizations of Member States. Mr. Laugier, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, eloquently put forward this suggestion in his outstanding speech yesterday. Our Director-General's report also emphasizes this need. I subscribe whole-heartedly to their views. I must however express to our Director-General and his assistants the admiration we feel for their untiring efforts, and particularly for the remarkable part being played by Mr. Torres Bodet himself. It has earned him not merely the respect but the very real gratitude of Belgian intellectual circles. He is one of those on whom we pin our greatest hopes in connexion with what we all desire Unesco should do for the peace of the world.

[101] I should now like to tell the Conference of a new scheme initiated by Belgium this year and now well under way. The idea goes back to the discussions of the International Cultural Commission of the European Movement and is in line with the spirit informing the policy and all the work of Unesco: I refer to the College of Europe, which, after a preparatory three-week meeting in 1949, will be officially opened in Bruges next October. This establishment, whose value to the public is recognized by Belgian law, is controlled by an international Administrative Board, under the authority of a Board of Governors on which many distinguished persons will serve. The teaching staff will consist of leading scholars of different nationalities, while there will be forty students, all university graduates selected by the national European Movements. Young non-European intellectuals will also be able to attend lectures. The task set itself by the College of Europe, an institution for advanced scientific studies, is to complete the training of students in humanistic studies, so that the States of Europe, instead of remaining in their present intellectual isolation, may be welded into a political, economic, intellectual and social community. Thus Bruges, that was thought by some to have lost touch with modern life, has returned to its international traditions of the past. This old Flemish city which, in the Middle Ages, was the leading commercial centre of Europe and a meeting-place for famous craftsmen and artists, is now adapting itself to the needs of the present hour and will once again become one of the main centres for the intellectual life of Europe.

[102] I should now like to comment on the work of Unesco, with regard to which I have a suggestion to make. We are all agreed that no time-limit can be set for the fulfilment of our task. However great our efforts, there will never be an end to it. We are working systematically to create an atmosphere favourable to peace throughout the world, but much time must elapse before we can look forward to a full measure of success. Our programmes are, in the main, wise ones, but their effect will only be felt in the distant future. Many prominent thinkers, while appreciating the value and effectiveness of our work, are showing signs of impatience, for they find our programme too theoretical for these troubled times. They expected more of us. They feel that, desiring as we do to promote that universal peace for which they yearn, we should intensify our efforts and take some action prompted by the needs of the moment, exerting stronger pressure in order to achieve immediate results. These views are reiterated in the comments made by the Chairman of the Executive Board. Can anything be done?

[103] I do not underestimate the difficulties, for Unesco must remain essentially an educational, scientific and cultural institution. It should carefully hold aloof from all political issues; but it may serve as a useful laboratory for the United Nations. Failure to recognize or deal with this feeling of impatience might be regarded as weakness, as a sin of omission, calculated to impede the development of Unesco by depriving it of the support of its staunchest followers. If we were to accept solutions of a political complexion we might jeopardize the very existence of our Organization. Does this mean that no action is required of us, that we must calmly ignore the situation, withdrawing to an ivory tower? I do not think so. But what immediate action can be taken? We could draft and publish a solemn, new declara-

tion outlawing war. But this would be of no practical use.

[104] Having reflected on this disquieting problem, I would submit for your consideration two ideas that you might possibly adopt. They would involve no substantial financial repercussions.

[105] Our Director-General might be instructed to convene two small commissions of scientists of world reputation, each commission to be entrusted with the immediate drafting of a concise report: the first, a purely scientific report on the deadly effects of modern weapons; and the second, a detailed report on the results of warfare, especially contemporary warfare.

[106] The first report would be an objective study of the consequences, both for civilian populations and for armies, of the use of certain recently discovered weapons of war and bombs. It would specify their nature (without seeking to discover or disclose the secrets of their manufacture), their power, their effect on human life, on the soil and on vegetation, and, in general, the deadliness of the destruction they can wreak at present and in the future.

[107] The second report would describe, with the aid of examples, the material, economic, financial and social results of wars, both in the past and in our own time. It would bring home clearly to all, including war-mongers, the utter wastefulness of war; the days when wars were profitable are over; victors and vanquished emerge from the large-scale military conflicts of today shattered, exhausted and impoverished.

[108] The findings of these reports would not be circulated indiscriminately, lest they might be linked with certain political propaganda, but they would be reserved for a small number of influential men: Heads of States, political leaders, members of parliament, university professors, journalists and outstanding individuals of all nations. Some ten thousand copies would be published for communication to selected persons so that they might realize more clearly what a new world war would mean. In the case of certain persons, these reports would open up new vistas, while they would enable others to participate more fully in campaigns for our own ideal of peace, to combat with greater energy any war-like tendencies, and to counteract the " cold war " which is so great a source of anxiety to all men of good will.

[109] This idea of listing the scientific effects of war would, I feel, be acceptable to all countries. It involves no compulsion, no political intervention, and no disclosure of military secrets, which some might quite properly wish to keep. By acting upon it, we should show our desire to provide full and conclusive data for a propaganda campaign, the sole aim of which would be to serve the great ideals embodied in the Constitution of Unesco: to promote a spirit of peace and understanding among the peoples. Such is my suggestion. I would ask you to consider it and to approve or amend it, so that Unesco may give definite public proof of its intentions and contribute towards the success of our main mission, which is to create an atmosphere favourable to world peace and so second the United Nations' ceaseless efforts to the same end.

[110] In conclusion, I would stress the desirability, nay the necessity, for Unesco to undertake a serious self-examination, not for the purpose of doing public penance for errors it has not committed and making honourable amends, but in order:

(1) To reconsider its programme and its financial and other resources, with a view to achieving more surely the aims prescribed by its Constitution—understanding and peace between all peoples through the long and arduous process of education, science and culture—with greater regard for present-day problems, especially political problems, which have changed materially since Unesco was first established;

(2) To bring out the truth wrung from experience, namely that the Secretariat cannot, by its own unaided efforts, perform the tremendous task it has been set, and that Member States and their National Commissions too must share the responsibility for any failures and shortcomings;

(3) To stress the need for resorting to the procedure of international conventions which would be binding upon the signatory States;

(4) To institute, alongside but apart from the regular programme and budget, an immediate and direct campaign for peace, such a campaign to be carried out with the aid of a special fund.

[111] These are the few ideas I would ask you to consider, discuss and adopt, should they meet with your approval. They are prompted, not by any spirit of criticism, but by a deep devotion to the Organization and a desire to help it to develop and succeed in every respect.

[112] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I should like to ask Mr. Mundeleer if the Belgian delegation is willing to present a draft resolution on these lines; in that case it should go through the regular channels.

[113] M. Léo MUNDELEER (Belgium) — [*Translation from the French*] We shall certainly present a draft resolution, Mr. President.

[114] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Ladies and gentlemen, the remarkable speech you have just heard closes the discussion for today: we shall therefore close the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

	Page
XI. Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*continuation*): Speeches by delegates of Uruguay, Iraq, Lebanon, India, Turkey, Colombia, Pakistan and Persia	89

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XI. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The meeting is open. I call on the delegate of Uruguay.

[2] Dr. Cyro GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, gentlemen, Uruguay comes to this Conference with renewed faith that humanity's urgent problems can be adequately tackled within the terms of the commitments prescribed for Unesco by the Constitution of 1945, which defines our object as the advancement of international peace and the general prosperity of mankind through the co-operation of all nations in the fields of education, science and culture. We ourselves have nothing important to add to the views Uruguay propounded at the Third Session of the General Conference in Beirut, save to express our gratification that the ideas set forth by our delegation on that occasion have been taken into consideration and adopted by the Director-General of the Organization, who has agreed on the need for combining with the permanent long-range plans of Unesco a concrete programme of immediate action designed to diminish international tensions and to apply within the Organization's sphere whatever measures are required by the circumstances of the moment. Thus our ideals and our practical work can now exert their maximum force at the exact points where collision between ideologies and ways of life provides occasions for resentment which threaten to bring to nought the noblest aspirations of the human mind and the generous impulse of the nations that founded Unesco.

[3] We are persuaded that Unesco's work over the whole of its field can contribute effectively to the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind and thus serve the cause of peace; but we also feel that there is room for an emergency programme of measures designed to exercise a direct and immediate influence on the factors governing the peace of the world. It is for that reason that we regard the resolution passed by the Twentieth Session of the Executive Board as most timely, and earnestly trust that the present Conference will consider the possibility of including in its programme adequate measures to avert the threats lowering over the world today and bring to the United Nations' work for peace the swifter aid necessitated by the perils of the cold war by which we are now surrounded.

[4] The Charter of the United Nations is the bridge by which all peace-loving nations may attain the goal of living in harmony as good neighbours. In this difficult period Unesco's task can only be to give to culture and science the wherewithal to find the common denominator for agreement, to their mutual profit, between the two worlds now at odds.

[5] We have just heard distinguished speeches by the Chairman of the Executive Board and by the Director-General, clothing the idea I have outlined in vigorous words and showing plainly the need for all countries belonging to Unesco to put forth their strength in so applying our Organization's programme as to achieve through education, science and culture the lofty goals of moral unity between the nations and social progress for the peoples.

[6] The General Conference of Unesco has chosen lovely Florence as the seat of its Fifth Session as a symbol of universal peace. Florence draws its life from the spiritual ferment of its great geniuses, its unrivalled masters: Dante, Cimabue, Giotto, Orcagna, Donatello, Masaccio, Brunelleschi, Michelangelo, Rafael, who left us the treasures all around us of lofty culture and art which might fittingly be called divine. Churches, palaces, museums and libraries all show clearly what can be done by men

creating and building in peace. These stupendous works of human genius plead to the world for peace that they may live on for the generations yet to come. Peace is the burden of the pealing bells in Giotto's tower, and all the geniuses who have brought light to the world add their prayers for peace. Florence, the mother-city of Humanism and the Renaissance, is a symbol of universal peace. Would that all men of good will might come to Florence, that they might become imbued with the spirit of Good Government symbolized in Ambrogio Lorenzetti's wonderful frescoes in the Hall of Peace of the City Palace of Siena.

[7] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Iraq.

[8] Dr. Mohamed Fadhel JAMALI (Iraq) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, my delegation takes much pleasure in joining other delegations in appreciating the hospitality of the Italian Government and the beautiful, historical and cultural city of Florence. We also join in the praise of the most worthy Director-General of the Organization, for his noble spirit and high leadership of the Organization. We subscribe to all that has been said in this connexion.

[9] Permit me to be honest and frank and state here bluntly before this august assembly the attitude of my people towards this Organization. Essentially, my people have lost faith in all international organizations, Unesco included. The reasons for this attitude are numerous. To begin with, the decision of the United Nations on the partition of Palestine, which led to the homelessness of one million Arab people, shook the faith of my people in the justice and conscience of international organizations as a whole. In the second place, my people feel that they are hardly represented in the administration of these organizations, while certain other States get the lion's share. In the third place, they feel that while the benefits of these organizations are scattered all over the globe, they hardly reach Iraq. In other words, the popular thought about international organizations, including Unesco, is that they suffer from discrimination, partisanship and power politics. Whatever truth exists in these accusations, I hope that they may be only temporary and that the international situation will improve in such a way as to make my people feel the beneficial effect of international co-operation in general and Unesco in particular.

[10] There is a brighter side to the situation, however. This year the Iraqi Government passed legislation for the formation of a National Commission, and as a sequel to the most fruitful visit of Dr. Raadi, the Unesco representative to the Middle East, the Iraqi National Commission was formed, and we hope to proceed with the work of Unesco vigorously.

[11] We are here to exchange views and share experiences as a family of nations. Each of us has many small or big problems. Yet many of these problems are common to us all and no matter how small or local a problem may be, directly or indirectly, it affects us all. We in Iraq have many experiences to share with the rest of the world. To begin with we have experienced the universality of science, culture and learning. Baghdad, the "home of peace" as it was called in the Middle Ages, was a great world centre of learning and culture in its days of glory. The Islamic culture which flourished in Baghdad under the great Caliphs is itself a synthesis of the cultures of East and West. The Arabs were the first to bring together elements of Indian and Chinese and Persian cultures, on the one hand, and Greek, Roman and Syriac learning and philosophy, on the other. This is exactly what Unesco desires to do. We, the Arabs, through the lessons of history, have come to learn that science and culture, no matter what their national quality or locality, are the property of humanity at large. No geographical or political boundaries can isolate ideas and truths indefinitely.

[12] Iraq has another experience to share with many members of Unesco. It suffered from wars and destruction several times in history, and after each catastrophe we began a new life—successive civilizations from the Sumerian, 5,000 B.C., to the great Islamic civilization in the middle of this era.

[13] Iraq may be truly described as the paradise of archaeologists. Its mines of antiquities are ever rich. This year we had three sites under excavation and a good deal of new treasure has been added to the knowledge of mankind, especially in the field of mathematics. These excavations, by the way, represent an excellent example of international co-operation. British and American scholars co-operate with Iraqi scholars in some excavations. I wish, in this connexion, to express our gratitude to Unesco for providing a year's scholarship for an Iraqi archaeologist.

[14] Each war and destruction was followed by a new uprise and a new civilization. The last devastating destruction of Baghdad was in 1258, when all the centres of learning and the libraries of Baghdad were destroyed by Hulaku. From that war Iraq has never recovered. Thus Iraq today represents a typical country where post-war reconstruction is overdue and where Unesco can find a fertile ground for activity and co-operation.

[15] The new Iraq, which is not yet thirty years old, under the leadership of His Majesty the late King Feisal the First, began to develop its new educational system on all levels. On the elementary level, schools were opened, even in the

remotest villages, and mobile schools for the nomadic tribes were provided. Evening schools for adults and classes for combating illiteracy were encouraged. On the university level, besides opening colleges for the various professions, Iraq began sending students to European and American universities, as well as to the American University of Beirut and the universities of Egypt and Turkey. Today over a thousand students study at the Iraq Government's expense outside Iraq. This does not include a number of students who travel abroad to study at their own expense.

[16] In its educational work, Iraq faces, like many other countries, some very grave problems. I shall deal only with one problem, and that is the one which touches the world situation today. In a divided world like the one we live in, subversive movements are bound to spring up and be very virulent in any country which is underdeveloped, and no matter what precautions are taken, the effects of these subversive movements on students' ideology and discipline cannot be ignored.

[17] We believe that faith in the spiritual values of man and respect for the dignity of the individual, along with effective social and economic reforms, provide the only means to remedy the situation, and Unesco must impress this fact on the educational systems of the world. Viewing the world situation realistically, education has to appreciate that the path to freedom, peace, justice and tolerance is not an easy or a simple one and, while education should cultivate respect for freedom, freedom should not be granted to those who go out to destroy it. Those within a given country who cry for freedom in order to destroy it, those who cry for democracy in order to destroy democracy, and those who speak for the masses in order to exploit and enslave the masses, should not be given the chance to do so.

[18] It is not fair nor right to teach peace and preach peace while the world today is arming heavily. In matters of freedom, peace and tolerance, we must have universal unified definitions, standards and measures. Let us hope that the Human Rights Convention will provide these definitions, standards and measures. Until that is done, the younger generation has to understand that the path for human survival and human progress is not a straight one, nor a smooth one.

[19] A philosophy of education must combine a high ideology with complete realism. Unesco must work to formulate and to disseminate such a philosophy of education. This, in our view, is much more important than any technical or scientific projects which Unesco might undertake. This universal conflict of ideologies today presents Unesco with the greatest challenge. No one can remain indifferent or neutral in this world of ours. The question is also raised, whether students should or could be taught that differing ideologies can peacefully coexist side by side, and whether the principle of live and let live could be applied. That would be quite possible and desirable if the conflicting ideologies had a truce, just as world religions, which warred with one another in ages past, have come to have a truce and to live side by side. But, so long as one side uses methods of virulence and penetration, self-protection and self-defence become unavoidable, if not a necessity, for national and cultural survival.

[20] An essential condition of self-defence, however, is continuous self-criticism and self-examination. Complacency, self-deceit and self-conceit, and power politics might easily lead to loss of ground before the opposing ideology. The young generation must be so brought up as to search for the truth and the whole truth, and not to be swayed by a press or radio that is one-sided, a press or radio which presents only one point of view of a certain vested interest or certain pressure groups. There is nothing so inimical to democracy and good international relationships as a one-sided press or propaganda machine. Education for a democracy must be such as to prevent superficial judgments or one-sided knowledge about situations. We accuse dictatorships of controlling information, but in democratic countries in the name of freedom there is freedom of misinformation and freedom of withholding information and truth. Education must provide the prophylactic the world needs in this respect.

[21] A tragic example of the one-sided control of world propaganda by a certain partisan group is what the world has absorbed about Palestine and the Arab world during the last thirty years. The peace-loving Arabs who, since World War I, have been striving for freedom, unity and progress, have been pictured by an uncouth partisan press as savage, reactionary and bloodthirsty. This propaganda has influenced many people in the world, to the extent of creating in the Middle East a situation so tragic and so inimical to peace. Unesco should impress on its members that the next generation will not accept one-sided propaganda as final truth and must insist that they hear the other side. Otherwise democracy would be a fake and peace would be endangered. One of the facts that stand in the way of genuine international co-operation in Iraq in particular, and in the Arab world in general, is the fact that the young generation find the western world so inconsiderate and so unappreciative of the rights and position of the Arab world.

[22] The tragedy of the million homeless Arab refugees of Palestine is eloquent proof that the western world has inflicted great injustice and

cruelty on the peace-loving Arabs of Palestine, without their having committed any crime to deserve this state of affairs. The school-age children of these refugees, who owe their misery primarily to the United Nations, certainly deserve greater consideration in the 1951 Budget. Arab refugee students at the university level should be given free access to and free opportunities in the universities of Europe and America. We have just read that a number of Palestinian Arab students were about to be turned out of a certain American university because they are refugees and cannot afford to continue to pay for their education. Unesco should see to it that this is not done. It is very detrimental to international spirit and morality. Those nations who are primarily responsible for the human tragedy of Palestine must see to it that the situation is partially alleviated, and Unesco is the agency to bring this about. It is the intention of my delegation to appeal to this august assembly while the Budget is being discussed, to see that the Arab refugee relief is given even greater consideration. It is a sad thing for education that the realities of the world situation have gone so much counter to ideals. Education, while pointing out the ideas of freedom, truth and justice to the young generation, must always critically analyse and present the ills of humanity and provide corrective and prophylactic measures. Unesco must see to it that the educational systems of the world adopt such a philosophy. It is not an easy task, but it is because it is not easy that we have met here together. May our endeavours in this Conference be crowned with success.

[23] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Lebanon.

[24] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, the head of the Lebanese delegation has done me the honour of requesting me, as permanent delegate to Unesco, to speak here for my country. Accordingly, it is my pleasant duty to greet, on behalf of Lebanon, the country which is receiving us today, and this city,so highly qualified to serve as the setting for an international conference of culture, science and education.

[25] The contribution this land has made to civilization is incalculable. In the earliest days of culture, Italy was the inexhaustible source of all the highest products of the human mind. At the dawn of modern history, the science, philosophy and literature of Florence, no less than her painting, sculpture and architecture, were the inspiration of her northern and western neighbours, the countries of the Danube and the countries of the Rhine. The reverses of fortune and even the injuries Florence has suffered endear her to us. We love her today as the symbol of a glorious past. Lebanon, the youngest of States but one of the oldest countries of the world, associates itself with all the Members of Unesco in paying tribute to Florence and in thanking the Government and people of Italy for the welcome they have so generously extended to us, enabling the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco to assemble amid these reminders of Florentine humanism.

[26] After four years' service with Unesco, I should now like to present, on behalf of the Lebanese delegation, not any theoretical considerations that may be prompted by the present programme, but simple reflections that have been borne in on me over these past years, as Unesco was gaining strength. I should be the first to give our Organization credit for expressing the sincere desire of the peoples of the world to forge the instruments of peace through their efforts in understanding and mutual assistance. The time for Unesco's action has come; she is the epitome of the world's struggle against the grim spectre of war.

[27] To measure the progress we have made, we need only consider the number of Unesco's Member States and the development of its programme. Judging by figures, Unesco is clearly gaining ground; in four years, twelve new States have joined the Organization—a conclusive proof of the growing faith it has inspired. Yet surer proofs are to be found in the collaboration of over a hundred international non-governmental organizations, each in its special field, the steadily increasing number of National Commissions carrying out the most varied activities in forty-three countries and, lastly, the interest evidenced by newspaper articles and broadcasts dealing with the programme and work of Unesco. To this must be added the prestige Unesco has gained at its General Conferences, in North and South America as a result of the Mexico Conference, then in the Middle East following the Beirut Conference, and now in western Europe during the present session in Florence; this prestige is a fact of practical importance and will in time spread to all parts of the world. The growing faith of the peoples in Unesco is justified by the development of its programme and the distinguished leadership of its Director-General.

[28] Instead of the haphazard mass of projects that must needs characterize the formative stage of any organization of such scope as ours, we have before us today a clear and realistic programme, reflecting Unesco's resolve to strive by the most effective means for the building of a better world. The clearly-defined aim is to work out what might be termed "a new scientific humanism", which,

we trust, may enable the men of today to cope more effectively with the present scientific revolution and which will be the means of establishing a new world in which everyone will realize that he has a part to play. Unesco's endeavours, as set forth in the present programme, are truly in keeping with its responsibilities. They will draw fresh strength from the firm, clear-sighted and systematic methods that the Director-General is applying throughout the Organization. The Lebanese delegation has pleasure in associating itself with the tributes that Mr. Torres Bodet has received from the intellectual leaders of all countries.

[29] And yet, despite these expressions of faith, there is no denying that Unesco is now surrounded by a rising tide of scepticism. What can be the reason for this disillusionment, and how can it be checked?

[30] In his stirring speech yesterday, the Director-General described most forcibly the conditions the States impose on Unesco. The Lebanese delegation feels that in 1945 Unesco was given a structure which took no account of the spiritual and cultural problems of Member States. A Secretariat was established, to work as though it were a centre from which instructions were issued and projects framed for the entire world; but, from both the geographic and the cultural points of view, the countries concerned are at varying distances from the centre. This accounts for the various "blind spots" and the lack of understanding. It is idle to say that the National Commissions can make these resolutions truly effective by adjusting them to the special requirements of their countries. The National Commissions are handicapped by these same blind spots and cannot, unaided, make Unesco's ideals the driving force they should be.

[31] To make up for this structural weakness, the Lebanese delegation considers that Unesco must make its presence more directly felt if it is to sway the minds of men. The Director-General has already thought of such a solution, the value of which is proved by the establishment of a Regional Office for the Western Hemisphere. We ourselves would have been glad to have an office for the Middle East, as suggested in 1947 by Mr. Jacques Maritain and approved by the General Conference in Mexico City. Sooner or later, it will be necessary to revert to this project and it would be best to do so forthwith.

[32] Mention should also be made of the conditions Unesco has created for itself and which, to a large extent, account for the distrust and indifference with which it is surrounded. Unesco exists and works through its Secretariat alone as the heart and nerve-centre of the Organization. The men forming it must therefore stand for the highest principles, for it is surely futile to try to act well before thinking rightly. The Secretariat must be imbued with a desire for truth, uprightness and impartiality, equal to the high international mission to which it has pledged itself.

[33] To illustrate my argument, may I mention the following point? The resolutions adopted by the General Conference are inspired by the ideals of Unesco: peace, understanding, brotherhood and educational reconstruction. These resolutions are entrusted to the relevant Departments that have to consider the best methods of implementation. They then begin to be interpreted. The modern world is far too inclined to corrupt the most sacred truths. The same words mean utterly different things in different countries: the interpretation placed upon freedom, peace and human dignity depends entirely on political ideologies. Unesco should stand as the very symbol of rectitude and thus win for itself the most enduring renown. It should be the means whereby man may realize his aspirations and voice his rights to freedom and respect for the individual. But because Unesco has held aloof from the everyday life of the peoples, its prestige is seriously impaired today.

[34] When he so eloquently presented his report to the General Conference yesterday morning, Mr. Torres Bodet asked whether Unesco's work in 1950 should be planned along the same lines as in 1945. He stated that it was for the General Conference to define Unesco's attitude in the present world situation. Only by grasping what this situation is, shall we be able to determine what contribution we can make towards peace.

[35] I should like to reply to the Director-General's question by referring to the allegory of Botticelli's famous painting of Pallas subduing the centaur. It was discovered not long ago in an attic of the Pitti Palace and, with its lofty inspiration drawn from mythology, symbolizes not merely the trimphant power of thought, but also the supremacy of gentleness which conquers by compassion rather then by threats. The goddess is probably relying to some extent on her resplendent armour; but, garlanded with flowers, she turns with calm confidence towards the monster, on which she places her unarmed right hand. And the monster, as though inwardly subdued, offers no resistance. His spirit is tamed because he is forced to recognize a truth that is stronger than force, a grace that is fairer than beauty.

[36] Amid the growing threats of a new world war, we must realize that peace between the nations is not an unattainable aspiration. Hence the necessity, for peoples and international institutions alike, to take stock of the underlying conditions for peace. In this hour of moral and spiritual, rather than material and political, crises, palliatives are becoming worse than the disease

and noble intentions more dangerous than outright surrender. The drama of mankind turns upon a conflict of mutually incompatible ideologies: materialism and idealism. Peace may be won only if we, in all humility, grasp the true destiny of mankind. If the Herculean efforts of this Organization are not to remain futile, if we are not one day to admit, as peoples and as responsible individuals, "*ergo erravimus*", it is absolutely essential that we should, when preparing our programme, draw inspiration from the springs of true peace —that peace which was conferred upon mankind by the "Prince of Peace", as the true expression of his spirit and token of his kingdom.

[37] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of India.

[38] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) — We have listened with interest to the speeches of the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General. We have also read the Director-General's Report. May I offer my cordial congratulations to the Director-General and his staff on their earnest and enthusiastic efforts to make Unesco an organ of the new civilization, of the new society free, full and rich, a society of which we dream though we no longer dare hope for its early realization. The Deputy Director-General, Dr. Laves, will be leaving us at the end of the Conference. He has done a great deal for the clarification of our financial problems. We wish him good luck and express our hope that we may meet him again in the years to come as a member of the American delegation, even as we welcome today Dr. Julian Huxley as a member of the British delegation.

[39] The activities of Unesco are getting better known in my country than hitherto. The establishment of the National Commission last year which includes the leading workers in arts and sciences, in education and culture, the Field Science Co-operation Centre for South Asia operating from New Delhi, the recent Seminar on Rural Adult Education at Mysore, the book coupon scheme, which we have utilised to the extent of 75,000 dollars, the study of social tensions undertaken by the Department of Anthropology and some Universities, and several other matters have brought the work of Unesco to the attention of our intellectuals, artists and University men. One evidence of this increasing interest is that criticisms are often heard of what we do or fail to do in the General Conference and the Executive Board. The delegate of Iraq referred this morning to the complaints which small countries—small in size, small in industrial development—are making. They are not made to feel that they are also organic, integral elements of this great organization. The authorities should note this fact.

[40] Mr. President, it is a real joy to meet in this world-famous centre of European civilization, where we are reminded at every turn that man does not live by bread alone or by politics alone. There are other values for which our organization stands, the values of beauty and truth. It is not industrial prosperity or political achievements, important as they are, that preserve a people in the memory of mankind. How much do we know today of the proceedings of the Athenian Assembly, of the Roman Senate, of the Government of Byzantium, of the petty conflicts of the Italian States in the Middle Ages? But though many centuries have passed, we still regard with devout gratitude the marvellous works of the Greek poets and artists, the great literature of Rome, the lovely creations of Byzantium, the *Divine Comedy* of Dante and the works of Michelangelo, to name a few. These are the permanent possessions of the human race. The great achievements of art and religion, like those of science and philosophy are the results of what a man does with his solitariness, to use Whitehead's words. If we are never solitary, we are never truly human. In those moments of stillness, we transcend the contingent distinctions of race and class, nation and religion and touch the eternal human in man. What is most unique is the most universal. In great works of art, we recreate our most inward experiences by clothing them with universal significance. What lifts a work of art from commonplaceness is intensity of experience and universality of spirit.

[41] These are just the things we miss in the modern world. The dignity of man requires that his individuality be recognised, that he be not lost in an anonymous crowd. On all sides we see the perfecting of organization and the withering of man. Our thinking is done for us, our amusements are made for us, our standards of beauty and goodness are fixed for us. We have no personal opinions, no reasoned judgments. The eclipse of human rights by state compulsions, the debasing of ethical standards by demagogy in all spheres, politics and art, trade and international relations, the indoctrination by the press, radio and cinema, the bureaucratic control of education, information and publicity are dehumanising men and producing an anthill society. We are anxious to spread literacy, to raise the school-leaving age. We should see to it that regulation of thought and control of opinion are kept within limits and are not used for corrupting people's minds. In the last resort man lives by that which cannot be regulated. Again, international understanding is one of our central aims and yet in reality we are being educated in the wrong way. We are given to the contemplation of our own virtues and the

condemnation of other peoples' weaknesses. This nation is immoral, that other is decadent. This nation consists of prototypes of slave mentality, that consists of barbarous subhuman gangsters. This sort of idiotic chatter, vile nationalist propaganda goes on in the drawing rooms even of those who consider themselves to be cultivated. It is no answer to say that the other people indulge in abuse and wilful misunderstanding of us. If we do as they do, there is nothing more to be said. "I love my country because I love all countries", Mazzini said. Every country is someone's country. We must be taught to ponder over the defects of ourselves and the qualities of others, for no nation has a monopoly of either virtue or of vice. We are all human, much too human.

[42] Owing to the neglect of responsible thinking and the violation of the basic unity of mankind by nationalist vanity, we have suffered in recent decades. The demands of group loyalty, nation, race, class, religions, community dominated us. We snarled at one another, determined not to give in to the other. We have seen marvels of man's intellectual penetration, but we have also seen horrors of the savagery of the human heart. The American Judge, Mr. Justice Jackson, in his final speech at the Nuremberg trials said:

> It is common to speak of our time as standing at the apex of civilization. The reality is that in the long perspective of history the present century will not hold an admirable position. No half century has ever witnessed such slaughter on such a scale, such cruelties, such wholesale deportations and annihilations of minorities. These are the overshadowing facts by which generations to come will remember these decades.

It is no use crying over spilt blood. Are we struggling to get out of the rut, to improve the situation, to do something different from what we have done before? Are we taking any steps to relieve the tension, to break the rhythm of cruelty, to control events which are hurrying us to destruction, instead of being controlled by them? Are we not all still in that nightmare atmosphere where we are struggling for non-survival? The world is in an angry, inflamed condition where there are threats and counterthreats, where we have become armed missionaries for our ways of life. We are busy consolidating our teams, asking nations to line up this side or the other. We do not talk to each other but make faces at each other. We are facing one another across yawning psychological gulfs of suspicion and hatred. We do not wish to compose our differences for we have come to believe that human beings are like vicious animals who cannot be tamed except by the whip. We assume that only superior strength can resolve the present tension. We have developed an inordinate faith in power and arms.

[43] Tensions we have had before, sometimes even more acute than those which now afflict us. Many of them have been resolved by the force of arms; but in the present context of the world to attempt to resolve them by force will have disastrous consequences. The world is closely interconnected and conflicts cannot be localized. Besides, war has become totalitarian in character on account of the increasing importance of industrial war potential and the development of aerial weapons. Slaughter will no longer be confined to armed forces nor destruction to arsenals. The distinction between combatants and non-combatants has become meaningless and every part of a nation's life will suffer irreparable damage. Again the new weapons are so stupendous in power that any major conflict will bring disaster on a scale hitherto unknown. The persistence of the old attitudes in the new circumstances, when war has become universal, totalitarian and of an incalculable destructiveness, causes fear and trembling in men's hearts. Yet we are continuing in the old ways. The psychological and physical preparation for a third world war is going on. It will break out not by deliberate intent but, if the fates are unkind, by an incident or an accident. Democratic liberties are being curtailed; social welfare programmes are being postponed. While more than half the population of the world in Asia and Africa lives under normal subsistence level, the other part is spending its time, wealth and energy in building armies, navies and air forces which will avert nothing, which will solve nothing. While there are millions who are hungry, millions who have no homes, millions who have no hope, our governments are engaged in war preparations. Whatever may be the military result of another war, which is likely to be atomic, biological and bacteriological, its political results are obvious, the extinction of democratic ideas and ideals throughout the world. Nobody will stand to gain from it. Whoever may be the nominal victors, neither democracy nor communism would survive in their present forms. The legacy of hatred, disease, starvation would be incalculable. The destruction, moral and material, which would result would far outweigh any political or economic advantages we may hope to derive. If the present policies, whose bankruptcy the last half century has so conclusively demonstrated, are persisted in, another Justice Jackson at the end of the century will declare that opportunity was given to our generation to stop, think and do something different, but it missed the opportunity, it did not heed the warning but brought on the world a new dark age.

[44] We, in Unesco, cannot be content with tasks which are academic and technical in character. Are we to deal with every question except the one that really matters? It is yet a cold war, a war of

words, not of arms, though arms are piling up. Not weapons but ideas are struggling towards a conclusion. Our Preamble says:

Ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war.

So long as men are different, disagreements and tensions will exist. If we wish to secure a dominating position for our way of life, our religion, our method of social change and if there is another way of life, another religion, another method of social change, we develop an attitude of intolerance, of fanaticism. The blind uncritical devotion to an idea or a cause which is so utterly sure of its own rectitude that it refuses to argue or examine evidence is the temper of mind we call fanaticism. It may be racial or religious, national or ideological. The very existence of an opposite opinion is a standing offence to true doctrine and its extinction by violence, physical or psychological, becomes a sacred duty. We wish to crush our opponents, beat down our foes, not understand them. Our aim is conquest, not reconciliation. We denounce the fanaticism we dislike, little knowing that we ourselves are not free from it. The closed mind and the hatred of the heretic are not limited to any group. We preach the brotherhood of man and violently abuse those who deny it. We preach the abolition of war and are ready to declare war against those who uphold war. Fanaticism is a psychological bar to human unity. We, in this Organization, believe in tolerance. Tolerance is the first condition of peace and intolerance is its greatest enemy. Tolerance is not indifference but it is that most precious and difficult quality of impartiality that combines loyalty to one's own convictions with respect and fairness to the convictions of those who passionately adhere to other views.

[45] The peoples of the world who are devoted to peace are keen that we should take steps necessary for making a dynamic world possible without the perpetual threat of wars. We require a faith to live by. The charter of the United Nations and the Preamble of the Unesco Constitution provide such a faith. They ask us to work for a new society in which the good life may be realized by all. Our Preamble says that:

. . . the great and terrible war which has now ended was 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 of races.

It is not enough to deny the "doctrine of the inequality of men and of races" in theory, we must deny it in practice. It is an oversimplification to hold that other peoples' intrigues are the main source of our troubles. Thucydides said that the woes of Athens were due to her own faults rather than to the strategy of her enemies. We must not overlook the basic causes, the historic forces which are at work.

[46] The revolution which started over a hundred years ago in France is still in progress. It is not concluded. Those who are subjected to one form or another of exploitation are attempting to break the shackles of tradition, to liberate themselves from imperial rule, to modernise themselves. We cannot curb the aspirations of peoples for political freedom, for social justice, for race equality. If we restore privilege, if we prevent social changes, if we support reaction and vested interests, if we ally ourselves with corrupt administrations, if we do not help governments to reform themselves, we will not mitigate the pressures that drove the world in our generation into two wars. If we do not provide opportunities to peoples of Asia and Africa to rehabilitate themselves, they will lend a receptive ear to the other pattern of life which offers a vision of human equality and brotherhood, which promises deliverance from poverty and insecurity, and supports liberation movements of colonial peoples. If democracy is to defeat it, it must become disciplined, purposeful and sacrificial. The world does not want proclamations, it needs proofs. We do not want the announcement of a new doctrine but the manifestation of a new power, a new way of life. On the political plane, we must denounce every form of imperialism, condemn reactionary, corrupt governments and ally ourselves with the progressive forces. We must stand up for the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and the Pacific regions against the vested interests. Again, there are states which call themselves democratic where we have racial discrimination, and attempts to eliminate racial inequalities, when raised in the United Nations, do not get the support of democracies. We have no doubt published a Universal Declaration of Human Rights but we must show greater eagerness and earnestness in regard to implementing them. It is no answer to say that where we have the power, we are improving the economic position of the oppressed racial minorities, we are gradually raising their educational level, we are removing the terroristic devices which made a farce of our declaration of equal rights for all, but all this does not mean that there is a real change of heart among the oppressors and the oppressed are happy that their human dignity is recognised. The world is in a hurry and gradual reform is not an answer to the demand for a social overhaul. The slowness of evolution is the cause of revolutions.

[47] We are taking up the problem of technical assistance in under-developed areas under President Truman's Fourth Point. We must do our work in dispelling ignorance and raising the standards of life in backward areas. It is wise that the tractors, serums and services are supplied by a United Nations organization working under the concept of 'One World' and not by this or that individual great power as a political weapon in an ideological conflict. As the programme is administered by the United Nations, there will be no suspicion of any special interests on the part of the donor nations or any sense of humiliation on the part of the receiving countries. We may perhaps set up a world development corporation or a Capital Investments Fund, call it what you will, which work on the principle: from each according to its productive capacity and to each according to its urgent needs. This will impress the world with the genuineness of the democratic contention that we are anxious to promote the welfare of the world as a whole. Even Cominform countries will be attracted to the United Nations ideals if such a scheme is organized. It will remove one of the basic causes of wars, namely the wide gap between unprecedented wealth in a few countries and grinding poverty in many others.

[48] These are a few steps which will help to create world-mindedness. People who live in the shadow of hunger, poverty and disease do not care for 'isms'. They do not discuss abstract ideas; they want practical solutions to their problems. Millions spent in defence will not save us. Our ultimate security is in the contentment of the people. We can raise perceptibly the level of the world's welfare if we spend but a fraction of what we now spend on armaments. We, in Unesco, are pledged to the creation of a free world, a good society. We believe in the freedom of the mind and spirit. We welcome diversity and do not insist on conformity. The right to be different is admitted by us. We know that people do not wish to exchange intellectual serfdom for economic security. We want not only better standards of living but better ways of life.

[49] A worldwide social revolution is on. It is bound to be successful either in a generation of peace, if we are wise, or in a century of chaos, if we are blind. It is the act of wisdom to be the leaders of the revolution instead of spokesmen of the *status quo*. Why give others a seeming monopoly of social change? If we are to surmount the decline of the last fifty years, we must discover new forms of political, economic and social life. We have a great responsibility in this critical hour, we must give voice to the desire of the world for peace, democracy, economic and political, and gather round our banner not only the contented and the well-to-do but the oppressed and the suffering who are the great majority. Only if we become leaders of such a social revolution can we appeal to and attract the allegiance of the Asian peasant, the African native, the Southern Negro. The mission to lead the world to a new life is offered to us.

[50] When the greatest of Latin poets set himself to create a national epic, he did not choose for his hero the usual military hero, but gave the world a kind of pilgrim father, the pious long-suffering Aeneas who was charged with the providential mission to found a new city and bring the gods to Latium. The task assigned to us is a similar one, to be humble, to be poor in spirit, not to be overcome by the triumph of injustice, not to be tempted into belief in our own savagery, but to believe in humanity, to found a new civilization, to establish a new pattern of social behaviour. We have a faith to live for. "God has made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth." (Acts XVII.26). This is science, this is religion. This is common sense, this is wisdom. Our faith must be followed by works. Let us form ourselves into a secular priesthood, consecrate ourselves to this great task of achieving a new world of peace, of plenty, of good-will among men.

[51] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I now call on the delegate of Turkey.

[52] Mr. Huseyin Ragip BAYDUR (Turkey) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, before addressing this distinguished assembly I should like to express my gratitude to the Italian Government for the hospitality they have extended to us in this beautiful city of Italy. I also wish to offer my special congratulations to the Director-General, Mr. Torres Bodet, for the enligthened manner in which he has been conducting the work of the Organization.

[53] May I now make my modest comments? They come from one who earnestly desires the success of Unesco. Casting our minds back to the conferences and other meetings that have been held since the end of the last war, we must all acknowledge that, despite their impressive number, they have, unfortunately, produced meagre results. Most of these meetings, that began so auspiciously with a succession of fine speeches, have accomplished little of value; and many organizations with promising programmes have foundered in sterility and general apathy. It is obvious that conferences and commissions, fine speeches and learned discussions, programmes and paperwork are meaningless unless they are instruments for the achievement of same definite goal. The public in a great number of countries already seems to be wearied by these fruitless activities, which are readily forgotten after the first flush

of enthusiasm, kindled in the hearts of the people by the promises held out to them, has died away. This state of affairs should certainly claim our attention. Social conditions in the world today are being revolutionized by a new experiment in community life and work, on the success of which the welfare and very future of mankind depend. It would be dangerous to disappoint the hopes these experiments have awakened.

[54] Unesco, with its lofty ideals, holds out great promises to mankind in this respect. Nevertheless, its programme, which covers so tremendous a field, includes projects which do not seem to have been properly co-ordinated. The fact that for four years we have been concerned with matters of procedure and the preparation of the programme proves that it has not yet been possible to determine exactly what this Organization's true function is. I sincerely hope that the new programme, which seems to have been better prepared than those in the past, will mark the beginning of practical achievements. The peoples are, very rightly, looking forward to seeing positive results without delay. It is always preferable to do more than is promised than to promise more than can be accomplished.

[55] In the various commission meetings, we shall have an opportunity of discussing at greater length the important items on the agenda. However, I should like to make a few remarks on one question which, for a long time, has been waiting to be solved. Art is an ennobling expression of the human mind, giving the peoples a common basis for aesthetic appreciation. It is unthinkable that the artist who produces the masterpieces which are the glory of mankind should live and die in undeserved poverty, while those who buy and resell his works should make millions. It would be desirable, when the conclusion of an international agreement for the protection of works of art is being considered, for this Organization to instigate measures for protecting, at the same time, the welfare of artists. That would be the finest tribute we could pay to this beautiful city of Florence, the capital of art and culture in which we are now assembled. In conclusion, I offer my sincerest wishes for the full success of this Conference.

[56] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Colombia.

[57] Dr. Rafael BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. Director-General, gentlemen, the important report which the Director-General has submitted for consideration to the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco is more than a mere account of the work performed under his expert guidance; it is also a blue-print of what is to be achieved in the future and a complete policy for future activities.

[58] None concerned with the fate of peace can fail to realize that this Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco meets at a time when a world not yet restored after the tragedy of the past years is tormented by the threat of a new disaster. There can be no doubt that after the shattering experiences of the last two decades no one in the world could wish to turn his steps again along the same bloodsoaked path. We all feel that if a world plebiscite could be taken today, the vote for peace would be overwhelming. The truth is, however, that man is at best a mere partner in his own fate; in spite of the apparent freedom of his will, it is overridden by patriotism, by cultural loyalties, by the economic interests of particular groups, by the mighty forces of ancestral hatreds, by the play of political manœuvring and by the peoples' lust for domination. All this sets bounds to the individual liberty of men and binds them to the rock of their communities' fate, condemned to perish with them. The best symbol of a whole world thus martyred is probably Prometheus chained to the rock of his torment. The events through which the last generations have lived and the spectacle now offered to their gaze afford, indeed, few grounds for optimism.

[59] Yet there is another fact which we must never forget: war is made by men, with men and against men. Thus Man himself is the essential element making war possible or impossible, and it is in the minds of men that the great fights are fought for the peace of the nations. That undoubtedly was what was in the minds of those who drafted the Constitution of Unesco when they wrote in the preamble: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed." Until 1945 the problem of peace had been a question reserved for the Chancelleries of States. Since the signing of Unesco's Constitution, with the assent of the majority of the free States of the world, peace has also become the concern of the educators of all nations. No longer is the gate of the *Ara Pacis* opened by the sole and all-powerful will of the rulers—the intellectual leaders of the coming generation now claim a say. And though we can be sure that the only pressure they will seek to exercise will be that of moral influence, yet the irresistible force cannot but have a powerful influence on the future destinies of Man.

[60] The London Constitution also prescribed the means Unesco is to use to attain the lofty goals pursued. Among them a leading place is given to the vigorous encouragement of popular education and the dissemination of culture, "by sug-

gesting educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the whole world for the responsibilities of freedom". By "free" I take them to have meant the man who has found himself through the essentials of culture and who is able not merely to stand up for himself in the battle of life and to make use of the resources around him, but able also to understand his civic rights and duties, to exercise the first and perform the second. May I also draw the attention of this distinguished gathering of delegates and observers from sixty nations, to that part of the Director-General's report in which he says that "all these efforts are directed towards the single aim of improving international understanding, which aim it is Unesco's business to keep constantly before the world". Nevertheless international understanding and education for the building of a world in which all peoples respect each other's rights and feelings, that they may all live in peace, require a different approach in different countries. There are some countries with cultures already highly developed and where the manner of life ensures the prevalence of a degree of social and economic equality —countries which have reached a high degree of enlightenment and thus of capacity for international understanding. There are others which are still in the lengthy transitional stage between the pre-historic past and the age of modern civilization; and lastly there are others which have not even reached the intermediate stage as yet.

[61] Now the sole condition on which international understanding can be attained is freedom, alike for the individual and for the community. The history of mankind shows us that the prospects of war are in inverse proportion to the degree of liberty enjoyed. Absolutism gives strength to man's gregarious instinct and that instinct in its turn renders the notion of the totalitarian state possible, with all its accompaniments of overweening ambition, unchecked expansionism, will to domination and megalomania which have characterized the period immediately prior to every war. However, human freedom—the quality you have sought to embody in the last clauses of the famous Declaration of Human Rights—is only possible given a certain level of basic culture. For instance, if, as Christianity did long before the revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries, we assert the essential equality of all men and their right to life, liberty and personal security, we are asserting a theoretical proposition whose actual influence on life is conditioned by the degree to which the men in question have the capacity to exercise and safeguard their basic personal rights, and that capacity can only come from fundamental education. Mr. President and gentlemen, as I see it, that is Unesco's essential task: the equitable and world-wide sharing of the heritage of human culture, what, in a phrase already becoming hackneyed, has been termed "the democratization of culture," and what I should venture to call (as I think, more properly), "the universalization of fundamental education".

[62] In ancient times the simplest learning was the heritage of a chosen few. The Pythagorean school was the prime example of the essentially esoteric cultural citadel to which access was open only to the few. From the 5th century before Christ a praiseworthy movement began for the generalization of culture, and the man in the street claimed his share in the great heritage of learning. However, 24 centuries of human effort have not yet succeeded in making culture universal, and today nearly two-thirds of the inhabitants of our world lack such elementary tools of learning as reading and writing. Incentives and facilities for the higher levels of science, art, technology and literature have been created and still are daily, and it is well that this should be so. But another thing long needed was vigorous action, a powerful effort to make elementary knowledge universal, in a word an organization in which all the peoples might share and which, like a great kaleidoscope, should show the heterogeneous elements arranged in the pattern of a new world of understanding, tolerance, and universal brotherhood. That, I feel, is the spirit and object of Unesco. And because this is so, its main activities and its greatest effort should be directed to this supreme goal, the universalization of fundamental education.

[63] The conclusion we are bound to draw is that Unesco's main field of action lies among those peoples having the highest proportion of illiteracy. It might be argued that these peoples are those contributing least money to Unesco, but the answer to that must be that they lack a strong economy precisely because their human components have not yet been taught to make proper use of their natural resources. It could also be objected that it would be unfair that the peoples that contribued least should receive most—but, to enable them to give us more in the future, it is needful that they receive more in the present. As the Director-General, Dr. Torres Bodet, said in his admirable opening speech at the Paris Conference, Unesco is not a business enterprise. That means that it is not a limited company paying dividends according to the proportions of investments. As those countries who have belonged to Unesco from the beginning have always understood, it is primarily a confraternity of nations to secure understanding and peace between all the countries of the world through education, science and culture. It is that spirit of disinterested brotherhood which gives Unesco the lofty note, the

humanity, which sets it apart from purely selfish and material concerns.

[64] In his report the Director-General lays special stress on the importance of the work of National Commissions, and ascribes to them a decisive influence in the success or failure of Unesco's activities. Gentlemen, I want to say plainly that that work in many cases has not been as full or effective as was to be desired, and my own country is no exception.

[65] Nevertheless, I can say that in the last few months there has been a marked growth of interest in Unesco's problems. Colombia was one of the original signatories of Unesco's Constitution. Our National Commission for Unesco is a sub-commission of the Higher Council of Education, and the two-fold capacity in which its members sit enables them to relate Unesco's work to our urgent national requirements in education. The educational effort recently made in Colombia is reflected in the considerable increase in the public education vote, which today amounts to more than 30 million pesos. The most important step taken was probably the foundation of an institute for the training of high-grade teaching staff, the Faculty of the Science of Education (now Higher Teachers' Training College). This institute is training, along rigourous scientific lines, the heads of the ordinary Teachers' Training Colleges, teachers for all branches of secondary education and the general body of teachers for primary and secondary education. A recent law has set up a "National School Fund" designed exclusively to supply the needs of primary schools and teachers' training colleges, as regards both teaching facilities and school building. At the present time the Higher Council of Education, whose members are the highest type of educator, sociologist and statesman, has undertaken a complete revision of the primary and secondary educational systems to harmonize them with modern methodological requirements and the pressing needs of the Colombian people. In the educational field, as in all other sectors of our national life, the fullest liberty is the rule, governed only by those considerations of reason and order essential in every people conscious of its destiny. In Colombia, women have the fullest scope in education, whether as teachers or pupils, and the same chances are open to them as to men; they have full access to the universities and their contribution to the ranks of primary school teachers far outweighs that of the men.

[66] In addition, Colombia has already made a beginning, even if not on the scale that might have been desired, in the use of the services and opportunities Unesco offers. At the present moment we have in Colombia the social anthropologist Dr. Norman D. Humphrey, Miss Capó, an expert in domestic economy, and Mr. Patricio S. Sánchez, who is working on the Vianí social educational experiment.

[67] Colombia is prepared to study and introduce all measures necessary to facilitate the importation of every class of educational and scientific material. In this connexion, Mr. President, it is right that I should inform you that the Secretary-General of the Ministry, Dr. Becerra, has just submitted, for consideration by the Higher Council of Education, a draft Decree under which freedom from import duties and all other government imposts is accorded to articles sent in by Unesco and to all classes of educational, scientific and cultural material imported to meet the needs of educational establishments, museums, colleges and non-profit-making organizations. Information has just reached me from my Government that the passage of this Decree has been expedited as a tribute to Unesco on the occasion of the Fifth Session of its General Conference.

[68] Ladies and Gentlemen, this great institution, Unesco, represents one stage more on the road to the founding of an order of international understanding, a point of convergence where all efforts for peace may come together and where all forms of individualism may be reconciled.

[69] Nevertheless, the mere fact of its importance and the wide range of its possible activities expose Unesco to many dangers. One of those dangers is the lack of an order of priorities for the requirements which the Organization must meet. Another is the possibility of its attention being dissipated over a multitude of activities, either secondary or of relatively minor importance, and thus deflected from the main objective. Last but by no means least is the danger of its becoming overwhelmed by a haphazard growth of administrative organs, so that office work grows in volume but solid results do not.

[70] At all costs we must prevent an institution which can be a lighthouse of world culture from becoming a mere house of cards. In the forests of my country, near the banks of the Amazon, there is a tree remarkable for its strength and beauty, a species of giant ceiba which, left to develop freely and normally, attains an enormous height and an amazing luxuriance of foliage. But often that tree becomes the host of parasitic plants which lodge in the hollows of its boughs and spread until they cover the whole of the tree on which they live, suffocate it with their foliage, strangle it with their stems and in the end destroy its former beauty and condemn it to premature decay. I do not in the least wish to suggest that this is actually happening to the stout tree that is Unesco, but that it could happen in the future if the wise policy of the Director-General and the distinguished company of his high officials were obstructed by the growth of vested interests or

the prejudices born of scepticism or failure to understand the high and practical ends which this great Organization is designed to pursue.

[71] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Pakistan.

[72] Dr. Mahmoud HASAN (Pakistan) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, two nights ago when I went to the Opera as a guest of the Government of Italy and enjoyed its magnificent hospitality, I saw bouquets of flowers in the theatre. To my mind those flowers symbolized one aspect of this Conference, the beauty and grace of this lovely city of Florence, where we are the guests of the people and Government of Italy, and also the bouquets of well-deserved praise which have been presented to the worthy Director-General of Unesco for the splendid work which he has done in this great Organization. I am adding small blossoms of congratulation and praise to that bouquet which has been presented to him. I listened with very great interest and pleasure to the speeches of the Director-General and my respected friend, the Chairman of the Executive Board, Sir John Maud, and I admired their eloquence, the beauty of phrase and concept; but I am not here only to praise those things. I am paying my tribute to their passionate sincerity and burning desire to arrest the downward flight of this world of ours along the path of destruction. Reference has been made to the terrible clouds that are on the horizon and which threaten to destroy the shattered and broken lives of this world of ours. We who have seen the beauty of Italy and the art of Florence, have also seen the terrible scars and wounds of war in the destroyed buildings, which warn us that if ever a third war comes perhaps we shall be reduced to that stage which was represented in a cartoon of *Punch*, when two monkeys, a male and a female, sat on a tree and said "Let us start over again the whole work of creation".

[73] The East, ladies and gentlemen, has a great and glorious history because it was the torch-bearer of culture and civilization and humanity through the ages. During more modern times it is the West which has been the leader of progress, civilization and culture. But what we people of the East have seen in the last war has really shaken our belief in that culture and civilization which we thought was permanent and unalterable. We have some indication of that terrible carnage that took place. When I accuse the West, I am fully conscious that the hands of the people of the East are also not clean. Probably because we people of the East are not as thorough as the people of the West are, probably because we do not possess the wonderful but terrible atomic weapons which can create havoc and destruction, the destruction which we have created is comparatively small. If progress and civilization mean that, the creation of more and more terrible engines of destruction, then I would rather be uncivilized, I would rather go back to the times when warfare was as it is represented by these beautiful paintings round us, where people met and fought and the destruction was relatively small. The clash of man and man in the great battles of the past was not nearly as destructive as in the great battles of today. This is the feeling which is uppermost in our minds when we think of the work and the ideals of Unesco. I listened with rapt attention to those beautiful and wise words of the Director-General when he spoke about the purpose of Unesco and the means of achieving it. His words find an echo in our hearts—I am speaking now as a Mussulman and a Pakistani, because we have always believed in peace.

[74] Only three months after the establishment of our country, a conference was called by my Government, of all scientists, men of letters and scholars, who decided that the educational ideology of Pakistan should be based on universal brotherhood, universal tolerance and social justice. These are the ideals which we have been following for the last 1,400 years and, if I may say so with all respect and humility, in this regard we have nothing to learn from Unesco, but a great deal to learn about the methods, the practical ways in which these ideals can be realized; and it is in this respect that we look forward to the great work which Unesco is doing and in which we want to be very humble sharers.

[75] Sir John Maud asked some questions in his address. Are the National Commissions and the countries really doing what they ought to do in order to carry out the ideals of Unesco? I feel that the answer to this question from most people in those countries will be—if we are honest and sincere—very unsatisfactory. Let us admit that. But the defect and default lies not only with these nations and these countries but also with Unesco, because Unesco has not made itself a living spirit, a vivid reality to the people of most countries. I am speaking only as one who comes from the East. Therefore we have to find out how best Unesco can achieve those great and noble ideals in which all of us have faith and with which we all agree. Unesco has created a vast organization, a very large and effective machine. But I just now referred to the mechanical progress of the West, and I am afraid that the western mechanical mind is apt to worship the machine, much more so than the purpose for which the

machine was created, and the machine goes on multiplying itself and complicating itself and, therefore, when we look at Unesco's work and see that it is attempting to do everything, I am afraid we are filled with some fear. And here I am afraid I do not agree with that worthy and great professor, Professor Piaget, when he said that Unesco was attempting everything and having some success in everything. It reminds me of a story from my country. There was a couple, a middle-class labouring couple, who had a son about twenty years old. The wife said to the husband: "Go and find a bride for our son. The bride should be twenty years old." The husband thought a little and said: "If I cannot get a bride of twenty, may I bring four girls of five years each?" A little success in everything, to my mind, is not as desirable as a great deal of success in a few things. And I think Unesco is at the present time rightly blamed for burying itself under an avalanche of reports, memoranda, pamphlets and directives. I am not blaming the Secretariat; nothing is further from my mind than that; I think the Secretariat has been doing splendid work and its difficulties must be enormous. Even though I have not had the privilege of being inside Unesco House and being associated with its work, as Secretary of Education to the Government in my country I see the vast amount of literature which is brought into my room every month or every week, and which, I must confess, I have not the time to read. So that it is really a question of the machine multiplying itself. If I may be permitted to change my metaphor, it is like a vast building such as the very vast building of the Pitti Palace, where we cannot find our way at all—I think the metaphor is appropriate—a vast building which goes on growing and growing and which reminds me of two lines of the English poet, who in speaking about such a building says: "Windows that exclude the light and passages that lead to nothing." I am not suggesting that the work of the Secretariat of Unesco is of that type; I am merely submitting that if Unesco were to confine itself to that very great and noble task, that of rousing the people of the world and compelling them to do things in order to achieve our ideals and objectives, perhaps that would be better than Unesco trying to do everything itself.

[76]' In my own country, for example, we have very great difficulties. We are a backward people in a certain sense, as the great leader of the Indian delegation said, but we also know what are our difficulties and what the remedies for those difficulties are. I do not think that people who do not know our own problems intimately can tell us much about them or the means of overcoming our difficulties. What I would, therefore, suggest is that the Director-General and his worthy colleagues should come out into the world, as it were, and meet the peoples of the world, the National Commissions, the governments, the unofficial organizations of different countries, and discuss with them their difficulties and their problems, and arouse and inspire them. These are the few words which I emphasize. I am fully conscious that we have occasional visits from the Adviser or liaison officer of Unesco, who comes to our country—I suppose that is true of other countries also. He says, "How do you do?" to the Education Secretary, has an audience with the Education Minister, distributes a few pamphlets, and arranges his 'plane journey for the next country on his list. This is not really going to arouse the conscience of the people of those backward countries. I would like, for example, that people in my country, those honest workers in the paths of truth, those who want to achieve the ideals which Unesco has before it, should have the opportunity to meet the great personalities of Unesco, so that mind will be rubbed against mind, and there would come a torch, a flame, to set alight the world. It is no use sending out what we call in our language "the horses of paper ". These do not really achieve anything. I would go even further, even at the risk of being regarded as Utopian; I would suggest that Unesco should charter a large ship and put in it four or five hundred honest workers from every country who would go round and visit as many countries as possible and meet, very informally, large numbers of people and workers, so that they could make that intimate personal contact, and arouse that enthusiasm which alone can achieve something in this world. These are, to my mind, far more important things to do than having the poor harassed Director-General and his associates sitting in rooms and poring over reports and directives and things of that type. I have been an educationist, an active educationist all my life, and for the last two years I have been a Secretary to the Government, sitting in a room and doing that kind of thing, and I realize that one week of coming into the field, as it were, and working with the people, is far more valuable than any amount of mere talk and conferences. I am a great believer in conferences; I think these international conferences have very great value, but they are merely a means to an end. To quote a Persian saying—with the permission of the Persian delegation—"they sat down, they talked, they dispersed". I am afraid this is a description which could apply to many of our conferences. Therefore, I would, in all humility, urge that Unesco should change its outlook, that Unesco

should realize that it can only achieve its purpose if it arouses the conscience of the world and compels us, as it were, to carry out these objectives.

[77] We have heard of wars, we have heard of crusades. I believe that Unesco must launch a new crusade, a new crusade of peace. Sir John Maud spoke about the wandering scholars of the 20th century. I would like Unesco to send out the wandering missionaries of peace, the roving ambassadors of love and affection and mutual co-operation among all the nations of the world. We have to work in the spirit of the great Savonarola, who, in this very city, five hundred years ago, spoke fearlessly against tyranny, against all kinds of wrong, when the Medicis were at the height of their power, and who, called to the bedside of the dying Lorenzo, refused to give absolution because Lorenzo refused to free the country, which alone would earn him absolution for his sins. I am a great believer in Unesco. Sir John has said that Unesco changes the minds of people. May I humbly suggest that we should change not only the minds, but also try and change the hearts of people, because we are afraid of the mind, the reason, alone. I think that if we change the hearts and the minds of people, if we really create in them the consciousness that they must come together if they are to survive, if they are to be civilized, that they must come together and gird their loins and work in the great and noble cause of peace, I think Unesco will have achieved its purpose. Whether a scheme here, a programme there, or a project is achieved or not, to my mind, that is a small thing, and insignificant. Our national problems are different, they must be different. I do not believe in one world, I do not believe that you can reduce all the nations to one great uniform pattern. I hope not. We must retain our individualities. We must have our particular problems, our peculiar problems, and we must solve them in our own way. What we need, therefore, is not one uniform panacea for the evils of the world which Unesco, or any world organization, can put forward; what we want is the rousing of the consciences, the minds, the hearts, the souls of the people, so that all can come together and say that each of us, in our own way, in our particular manner, shall all contribute to the building of that noble edifice of peace which will withstand not only the blast of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs, but all the savagery that the scientific mind of men can create. If this be the ideal of Unesco, I hope that we shall be able to come together, to meet together and not only discuss programmes and projects to be applied to the world at large, but to deal with men.

[78] To become a master of words is a very good thing, but mastery of words, I am afraid, also sometimes degenerates into slavery of words, and instead of deriving inspiration from life and reality, we are apt to derive inspiration merely from words. Let us try to avoid that danger. Let not Unesco merely concern itself with words, whether spoken or written, let Unesco come out in the open field, let it go out and meet every one; whether he belongs to those savage and half-savage countries to which reference was made by previous speakers, or to the highly developed and civilized countries of the West, it does not matter. If you search men you find a common humanity, and it is for Unesco to try and bring out this common humanity so that all men of all countries, of all stages of development, may combine together and work for the achievement of the ideal of peace and love in this world.

[79] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Persia.

[80] Mr. Ali Asghar HEKMAT (Persia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I feel it my duty to begin by expressing, on behalf of the delegation of Persia, my sincerest gratitude to the Italian Government which has extended such hospitality to us and supplied all that is required for a Conference such as ours. This splendid city of art and beauty in which we are being received cannot but leave an indelible impression on the hearts and minds of all who have the privilege of visiting her.

[81] On reading the interesting report of the Director-General I noted a few points which may perhaps be worth drawing to the attention of this distinguished assembly. The first point which struck me was the Director-General's allusion to the inadequate co-operation of certain Member States in the carrying out of Unesco's aims. In my opinion, it is absolutely necessary for Member States and Unesco to co-operate closely; it is superfluous to mention here that Unesco's success depends to a large extent on the contribution that Member States make to the work of this international Organization, since it is they who, in fact, carry out Unesco's plans. The delegation of Persia desires a tightening of all bonds uniting Member States and Unesco.

[82] In the Director-General's report, an important place was given to education, and there can be no doubt that the work being carried out in this field will achieve the success it deserves. The establishment of the Clearing-House for Education is one of the most promising developments; it will be a means of centralizing all information

on education and of communicating it to the countries wishing to keep abreast of the experience acquired by other countries. Fundamental education is another of the activities being encouraged by Unesco and tried out in a number of countries. In our opinion, this type of education should be extended even further—a task which is the responsibility of Unesco, with the assistance of the Member States concerned. I cannot refrain moreover from mentioning the work that Unesco has been doing over the past few months in connexion with adult education; and may I say, gentlemen, that at least as much importance should be attached to adult as to fundamental education? The best means of achieving practical results in adult education is to apply the simplest methods. It should here be emphasized that any work carried out in countries belonging to the same language group and using the same script should take account of regional conditions; it is impossible to adopt the same teaching methods in all countries. For instance, entirely different methods must be used for teaching the Arabic script and the Roman alphabet. Regional conferences organized by governmental or non-governmental organizations in the neighbouring countries would be one of the most valuable means of promoting adult education.

[83] While I am on this subject, may I add that these countries should collaborate closely in preserving everything that relates to their common culture—museums, historic documents, monuments, language, etc. They should do all in their power to prevent discord due to national pride and aggressiveness, sparing no efforts to eradicate, in a spirit of peace and brotherhood, all prejudices traceable to such feelings; lastly, they should realize that scientists, inventors and scientific achievements cannot be considered as belonging to any one country, since science is the property of the whole world. Avicenna, the Persian philosopher, Balzac, the French writer, Confucius, the Chinese legislator, and Bach, the German musician, have rendered signal services to their several countries and thus enhanced their glory, but, while each belongs to a particular people, he cannot be regarded as a citizen of one country only. We pay tribute to them here, because mankind as a whole was enriched by their works and thoughts.

[84] Just as there can be no question of introducing the same teaching methods in all countries, we cannot expect National Commissions in all countries to adopt the same standard methods for the performance of their duties. National Commissions should be organized in accordance with the educational conditions in each particular country. The aims of all Commissions are naturally the same, but that does not alter the need for adopting different practical methods. Similarly, we feel it would be desirable for Unesco to divide the countries of the world into special regions and groups for the implementation of its programme of education, culture and science, and for it to assign to each of these groups the programme best suited to its geographic and historical development. Many are the nations which would, but cannot, contribute through education to improving the lot of the mass of the people and to strengthening international understanding. It is Unesco's duty to give these people the necessary moral and material assistance and the benefit of expert advice.

[85] I now have only two other matters to discuss: the book coupon scheme and the exchange of persons. The book coupon scheme is undoubtedly one of the greatest contributions Unesco has made towards the dissemination of thought, and, consequently, to the improvement of international cultural relations. We must acknowledge how highly we approve this scheme, but we should be yet more pleased it all Member States decided to participate in it. With regard to the exchange of persons, while appreciating the substantial services rendered by Unesco, I may perhaps be allowed to suggest that the Organization should do its utmost to add to the number of fellowships and seminars, arranging for several fellowships to be granted to certain countries so that more fellowship holders may have an opportunity of studying matters of interest to their country. Book coupons have already facilitated the circulation of printed material, and many of the obstacles due to the need to obtain foreign currency have thus been removed, at least in the case of countries that have joined the scheme. We now have to seek means of solving the same currency problems for all persons wishing to undertake study tours. For there are countries which, owing to hard-currency shortages, find great difficulty in sending their nationals abroad. The elimination of such obstacles is primarily the responsibility of the great powers with centres for study and scientific research. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the economic difficulties that afflict the world today, and particularly the smaller countries, are the direct consequence of disputes between the great powers. They therefore have the primary responsibility and duty of remedying this situation and helping the smaller countries to find a way out of this economic crisis.

[86] Lastly, I feel it necessary, in all frankness, to draw attention to one important point. Unesco is above all an educational, scientific and cultural organization and not a political institution.

Unless we save it from the encroachment of political issues, we may endanger the very life and work of the Organization. Ladies and gentlemen, I attended the London Conference which drew up the Constitution of Unesco in 1945, and now at the present Conference it is some disappointment to me to find not only that Unesco has been unable to stand aside from politics over the past five years but that it is becoming increasingly entangled in those very chains that Unesco was created to shatter.

[87] Another danger is that, perhaps through the Organization's failure to come to an understanding with men of good will, both the Secretariat and future conferences are likely to be deprived of the services of those persons who have hitherto been inspired by the sincerest faith. Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, fellow delegates, let us not forget that Unesco is founded above all on faith, and that its aim is to promote international understanding. If that faith and understanding were to be shattered even in the Executive Board, the Secretariat or the General Conference, how can we expect them to achieve those results Unesco desires for the whole world? Some claim that Unesco is a subject on which the general public is ill-informed and on which there are too few publications. I, on the contrary, am of the opinion that our Organization should make itself known by its results and achievements, for these would be its best advertisement.

[88] I should have liked to make some mention of the educational reforms still needed in the country I represent, and of what I consider to be weaknesses in the Organization itself. But, so deeply have I been impressed by the beauty of Florence, this centre of art, that all such matters are forgotten. A few lines of our national poet, Saadi, run: "I intended on your arrival to tell you of my grievances; but what can I say when they all melt away at your coming?" An interesting comparison may be drawn between these words and a passage from Dante, the father of Italian poetry and a native of this very city. In the *Paradiso* we read: "I have visted the most radiant of heavens but the sight was such that on my return I am left without the power of words . . . and even of memory. For nearness to the desired object so absorbs the mind that the memory is paralysed." I feel convinced that Unesco, whose work has made such headway since the Organization was established, will continue its onward march and that, thanks to the efforts of its loyal supporters, the world may at long last enjoy the blessings of a true and lasting peace, based on the mutual understanding of all peoples of the world.

[89] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before closing the meeting, I should like to read some announcements relating to the second meeting of the General Committee of the Conference, this morning in the Hall of the Two Hundred:

(1) The General Committee recommends that the General Conference should work on Monday 29 May and suspend its meetings on Thursday 8 June for the Italian National Day. The draft time-table of meetings (document 5C/BUR/1, Annex 1) should be amended accordingly.

(2) The General Committee has decided to refer to its next meeting the consideration of the United Kingdom proposal to place a new item on the agenda, namely the draft resolution concerning associate membership for non-self-governing territories (document 5C/20).

(3) The Committee has decided to consider at a later meeting the draft resolution presented by the delegate of Czechoslovakia (document 5C/17).

(4) The Committee has referred to the Commissions and Committees of the Conference several amendments and draft resolutions submitted by Member States (documents 5C/2, 5C/10, 5C/11, 5C/12, 5C/13, 5C/14, 5C/15, 5C/16 and 5C/19).

(5) The General Committee has decided to extend until Thursday evening the time-limit for the presentation of new proposals and amendments involving substantial changes in the programme and budget estimates.

(6) The General Committee has decided that item 23 of the Agenda: "Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new Members" should be discussed in plenary meeting immediately after the close of the discussion on the Director-General's Report.

(7) At the suggestion of the Chaiman of the Budget Committee, the Committee is requesting all organs of the General Conference not to consider any proposal with budgetary implications or to take any decision in this connexion without reference to the Budget Committee and before receiving its report. This recommendation is in accordance with the terms of reference of the Budget Committee adopted by the General Conference at its third plenary meeting (document 5C/BUR/1, Addendum and Corrigendum).

(8) The General Committee has approved the time-table of meetings for Wednesday, 25, and Thursday, 26 May.

I should also like to announce that I have received several telegrams from various parts of

Italy wishing the Conference every success in its work. I would draw special attention to the message from the Society of Friends of Unesco at Milan, which offers its services to Unesco in the pursuit of its work on behalf of culture and of improved living conditions for all mankind.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XII.	Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*continuation*): Speeches by delegates of Cuba, United States of America, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Sweden and Norway	106

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XII. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I declare the meeting open. Ladies and gentlemen, in view of the considerable number of those who have put down their names to speak and the absolute necessity of our concluding the discussion of the Director-General's Report by tomorrow evening, I propose that tomorrow morning's meeting, which is scheduled for 10.30, should instead be held at 9.30; and that the afternoon meeting, scheduled for 4 o'clock, should be held at 3.30 and continued until all those concerned have spoken. If no one wishes to make any comments on this arrangement, this time-table will be adopted and will appear in the Journal of the Conference. I now call upon the delegate of Cuba.

[2] Dr. Mariano BRULL (Cuba) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, fellow delegates, I want to speak this afternoon, in concrete terms, about a feeling—the feeling for peace, as I experience and understand it at the present time. This is a subject that should take priority over all others, and about which we should clear our minds to the maximum possible extent.

[3] There are now so many adverse influences being brought to bear upon the great problems of the hour that, however optimistic we may be, it is impossible for us to do our daily work without the grave issues that today divide the world occupying some corner of our mind, with all their attendant uncertainty. The international tension created by the so-called "cold war", so far from lessening or balancing itself, is increasing, and the prospects of either side finding any formula for agreement are becoming ever vaguer. The situation, as described to us by the Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Laugier, at the opening meeting of this Conference, leaves no room for doubt that we are living in a world in which the "time is out of joint", and many minds like Hamlet's are asking themselves whether it is they that were born to "set it right".

[4] The Director-General of Unesco, Mr. Jaime Torres Bodet, in opening the Conference of National Commissions a few days ago, has already felt impelled, in a speech that was as masterly as ever, to use these comforting yet judicious words in connexion with the disquieting signs of international tension and the dangers that threaten peace: "I am convinced that Unesco can make an important contribution to the maintenance of peace, but the vigour with which we act will not be governed solely by the material resources we can bring to the task; it will also depend in large measure on our faith, our will and our devotion." This amounts to saying that peace depends on the spirit of self-sacrifice present in each one of us. Nothing great in the world has ever been achieved that has not involved some measure of sacrifice, whether actual or symbolical. In my

view, these words, which with their weight born of mature reflexion show so great a realization of the responsibilities of the hour, are an invitation to us to turn once again, with fresh energy and determination, to the supreme aim of Unesco—the aim of Peace.

[5] If, however, we talk simply of "peace", we find, I think, that our vocabulary is not expressive enough. Peace is something that we seek, something to which we aspire—since, because of our hesitations and uncertainties, peace has become like the prodigal son, launching itself upon the world to live its own life and travel abroad under the mask of a pilgrim but under the other masks, too, that are provided by the "carnival of existence". There are other forms of peace that obey the command of their masters and reply, like individuals, to names and numbers. All this teaches us that true peace, peace that promotes well-being, confidence and security (as Spinoza would have said), is like the light that can only be substituted by another true light, the true light of peace, which we wish to shine with all its radiance over our present troubled world, just as the sun casts its rays upon all of us.

[6] Unesco has contributed much to this difficult and delicate task of enlightening the minds of men; but that much is still too little, in the special circumstances of today. So much remains to be done that, in order to do it, we cannot rely upon material resources alone. But though material resources may be inadequate, there remain the intangible resources of "our faith, our will and our devotion"—in a word, our readiness for sacrifice. Civilized peoples are, by instinct and natural inclination, pacific. It is their "bad shepherds" who, from lust for power or other obscure ambitions, launch them upon warlike adventures, the consequences of which are always fatal. History—unwritten history—tells us that arms are always taken up in the name of the people, without regard to the justice or otherwise of the cause. While we cannot escape from history, we can no more escape the moral consequences of our own actions; just as the shadow follows the body, and we create an inner philosophy that is externalized in our own conduct, so, consciously or unconsciously, we create a religion from the process of our everyday thoughts.

[7] There are certain types of human conduct, certain ways of human existence, that may to a certain degree be regarded as "constant" and invariable, and as such are valid for all men, at whatever time and place they may live. I remember, from the far-off days of my university studies, the conclusions reached by Garofalo, the celebrated Italian expert in criminal law, on the question of what constituted the essential, invariable elements of natural crime, applicable to all men, whatever level of culture or civilization they had reached. His conclusion was that all men regarded as a crime any offence against feelings of compassion or sincerity. Two words—compassion and sincerity—that sum up, in their rich ideological content, everything that the world has to offer us in the way of charity and justice. To use poetical language, charity is "the milk of human kindness", and the justice to be safeguarded is that which, like that of light, is "la justice aux armes sans pitié".

[8] Their implications, as man passes, eternally the same, across the stage of history, are so obvious that comment is superfluous. That type of lesson is never forgotten. It teaches us, in the last resort, that neither the volume of industrial, scientific or artistic progress, nor the volume of political power, can be the sure sign of a superior civilization, except to the extent that that civilization respects and pays due heed to compassion and sincerity. In so far as we depart from the minimum requirements of those basic human feelings, we depart from what constitutes human dignity and true human greatness, and fall sure prey to that barbarism which Europe overcame more than two thousand years ago. What we require to know today is, not so much the nature of the ills from which we are suffering, but whether we are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to cure them. Unesco is the sole means of penetrating and exploring every path calculated to bring truth and light to the peoples, provided that we do not lose our way or fall a prey to any illusions, mistaking fiction for truth or committing the still greater sin of mistaking truth for fiction. There is a fine task for those who have not yet lost hope of saving man from himself, a fine opportunity to make full use of the most effective of all Unesco's weapons, "Human Rights", understood as principles of daily conduct, rigidly applied; Mr. Laugier himself reminded us of this, not so long ago. This pragmatic Declaration is the outcome of many centuries of hope, faith and charity. From the time of the French Revolution until today, no true war for the liberation of man has ever been lost, because it was always possible to count on the amount of faith and sacrifice required to win them.

[9] And now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to read out a proposal I have to present, a proposal I consider to be essential if the work of Unesco is to be better known, appreciated and developed:

Inasmuch as the Fourth Session of the General Conference of Unesco, held in Paris, took note of a proposal by the Cuban delegation for the institution of a course of studies that should culminate in the conferment of the title or diploma of "Unesco Journalist",

Inasmuch as this proposal is based on considerations

touching the very organization, and the strengthening, of Unesco, given the essential task of popularizing and spreading a knowledge of its work that could be carried out by such means, through the creation, in each country, of an atmosphere conducive to a better knowledge of the Organization by the people as a whole and, throughout the world, of a current of opinion that would support its disinterested labours in the cause of peace,

Inasmuch as the said proposal is designed to fulfil the immediate purpose of providing journalists of the associated nations with the opportunity of engaging in such studies, a facility that Unesco could make available to them, thus fulfilling one of its specific functions in the field of education and culture,

Inasmuch as the said proposal met with a favourable reception at the previous Conference, which referred it to the present session for discussion,

The Cuban delegation to the Fifth Session of the General Conference proposes the institution of a title, diploma or certificate showing that its holder has completed the studies that the Director-General shall deem necessary for the person in question to be regarded as a "Unesco Journalist" specially qualified to spread a knowledge of the work of the Organization; and the authorizing of the Director-General to organize the short course of studies involved.

[10] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of the United States of America.

[11] Mr. Howland H. SARGEANT (United States of America) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I must express my own great personal satisfaction and that of my colleagues on the delegation that Italy should have been chosen as the site for this Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco. I think it is particularly fitting that this meeting which symbolizes education, science and culture, should take place here in Florence. This is the city in which the first great light of our modern civilization, as we know it, was kindled, by men such as Leonardo da Vinci, whose great contributions to the arts were matched by his contributions to scientific advancement, and Galileo Galilei, father of mechanics and therefore the father of modern science as we know it. The original instruments which came from the minds of these men can be seen here in Florence. They typify the great contribution which this city has made to human life and knowledge and are also representative of the contribution which our host country, Italy, has made. Florence, in fact, perhaps more than any other city can symbolize the values in our common past which Unesco has been created to serve in the interest of our common future. Now here in these historic surroundings Unesco is called upon to prepare the way for a Twentieth Century Renaissance. We are asked to become masters of the tremendous forces released by modern science and technology. We are asked to maintain and to develop a free society in which both men and nations trust in each other. We are asked again to release the great power for friendship, for cooperation, for creativeness, given to the human race. Let me say this with all the dramatic force that I can command. We are compelled to move in that direction or we move toward death.

[12] The members of the United States delegation have read with appreciation the Report of the Director-General. They have studied the detailed account of the activities of the Secretariat during the last six months. The meetings of the Commissions will afford opportunities to consider these activities. At this time I would like to talk about some cardinal questions of policy. The Director-General prefaced his Report with some remarks on the major problems faced by Unesco. Clearly, the central problem is: "What shall Unesco do?" The Director-General at the beginning of his Report asks these questions:

> What is Unesco's position? How useful is the Organization and what can it do to fulfil the lofty purpose laid down for it by its Constitution in the present-day world? What aims should be set it? With what resources should it be supplied? What methods should be prescribed for it to follow?

The Director-General adds to these questions the comment:

> I have no doubt that the General Conference will want to discuss these fundamental questions.

It is not enough for the General Conference to discuss these basic questions. We, the General Conference, should reach fundamental decisions concerning them.

[13] The United States delegation wholeheartedly agrees that we must do more than simply listen to a mere recital of facts here. It is up to the Member States to take stock of Unesco's resources and Unesco's responsibilities. Having done these things, we, the delegates to this Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco, must make decisions. Can we leave Florence without giving answers to those fundamental questions of what Unesco shall do in its basic programme for the future and how Unesco shall execute that programme? I call your attention to the Director-General's subsequent remarks. He says:

> Any real concentration in our administration presupposes concentration of the programme and simplification of our methods, neither of which depends solely on the Director-General.

In the opinion of the United States delegation, the General Conference must answer not only the question, what shall Unesco do, but also the

question, how can the programme of Unesco be concentrated more clearly and more directly upon the achievement of Unesco's central purposes. There is another major problem set out in the Director-General's question:

> Can Unesco engaged as it is on long-term peace work, the results of which are all the more fundamental because they are not immediate, ignore the dangers by which peace is threatened at the present day? Can Unesco remain indifferent to the passions by which the minds of men are assailed from all sides?

This problem of tensions also must be met squarely. The United States delegation agrees with the Director-General's contention when he says that the General Conference cannot ignore these serious considerations.

[14] Last year at Paris, the Chairman of the United States delegation reminded the Fourth Session of the General Conference that a nation—or an international organization—tends to get the directive it deserves. He said then that confidence in Unesco would be justified if Unesco deserved the leadership of Dr. Torres Bodet. I should like to regard the remarkable personnality of the Director-General as a symbol of the challenge which faces this General Conference. As the Chairman of the Executive Board pointed out Tuesday morning, we have a first-class Director-General. The Director-General brings to bear upon every task the qualities of courage, imagination, vigour and intellectual coherence. I have only the greatest admiration for the thoroughness with which he has carried out the assignments of the General Conference. Similarly, I admire the outstanding competence of the Deputy Director-General, Dr. Walter Laves, whose valuable services Unesco is unfortunately soon to lose, and I also admire the loyal work of the entire Unesco Secretariat. I should also like to pay tribute to the effective work of the Executive Board, under the skilful and vigorous leadership of Sir John Maud.

[15] To be worthy of the Director-General's leadership, the General Conference at this session should make sure that the basic programme of Unesco embodies a clear and bold statement of the major tasks which the Organization undertakes to fulfil. Since the close of the Fourth Session of the General Conference, the United States National Commission and its Programme Committees, under the vigorous leadership of Dr. George Stoddard and Dr. George Zook, known to many of you here, have been studying the programme. Members of our delegation have been comparing the impressions reached by our National Commission with the opinions held by other delegations at this Conference. There is much ground still to cover and the ideas of the United States delegation will certainly be clarified and refined in the give-and-take of discussion here in Florence. We welcome this as an important element of that democratic process in Unesco to which Sir John Maud so movingly referred in presenting the Director-General's Report. The United States delegation has, however, reached certain general conclusions about the future programme of Unesco.

[16] First, we believe that learning and the arts should move ith little impediment across national boundaries from people to people. Obstacles to this flow are established by certain laws, regulations and practices of Member States. Under its Constitution Unesco is obligated to lessen obstacles, so as to "promote the free flow of ideas by word and image". Unesco is working to overcome obstacles to international communication, so that the scholars, scientists, teachers and workers in one country may learn about, and work with, the nationals of other countries. By clearing-house and bibliographic services, the promotion of translations, and subsidies to international non-governmental organizations, to name only a few, Unesco is attacking these barriers of the mind.

[17] Unesco is also concerned, and properly so, with obstacles rooted deep in the social and economic circumstances within Member States. Up to now barriers of this kind have prevented the majority of mankind from sharing the knowledge, arts and achievements which are man's chief instrument of social progress. These are the great stumbling blocks that lie across man's path to the goal once described so eloquently by that great Indian leader Gandhi, and I am indebted to His Excellency Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan for this quotation which he recalled to my mind:

> The world is one in fact; the world must become one in truth in the minds and hearts of men.

Unesco has an immeasurable task of helping to place scientific knowledge at the disposal of all people and of waging war against illiteracy. The sincerity of the governments which are Members of Unesco in forwarding this great design is amply attested by their resolution to support, beyond the regular budget of Unesco, an extraordinary programme of technical assistance for economic development in under-developed areas.

[18] But Unesco has a pre-eminent responsibility which, in the judgment of my delegation, has not yet been explicitly stated by the Conference, nor adequately financed, nor adequately organized. It is the responsibility which flows directly from the first paragraph of the first Article of Unesco's Constitution. Let me read that paragraph:

The purpose of the Organization is 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.

[19] This statement of purpose implies that the work of Unesco, in all its elements and through all its departments, should be viewed as the discharge of a mission. Unesco has a central responsibility to promote an understanding of, and confidence in, the goals and purposes of the United Nations. Unesco cannot be divorced from a respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Through whatever channels, media and methods are available, Unesco strives to turn the ideas of people of all ages and levels of educational attainment in the direction of working through international institutions for the maintenance of a just, free, tolerant and therefore peaceful society. The mission with which Unesco is charged by its own Constitution requires it to pose and answer the question: What does mankind need to know and understand which will be most likely to contribute to "building the defences of peace in the minds of men?" Unesco's business with creators in all intellectual fields is to enlist their help in answering this question. Unesco's business with the media of communication and education is to ensure that this knowledge be widely diffused.

[20] In numerous speeches I have said, first, we must develop the potentiality of mankind to understand, to receive communication by abolishing illiteracy, and by improving education at all levels; second, we must bring into the channels of communications the ideas which strengthen the defences of peace as developed by the greatest creators in all intellectual fields. I hope I have been right in these speeches.

[21] The United States delegation has examined the draft basic programme of Unesco in the light of these considerations. This excellent document sets forth in brief compass and in a well-organized system the current activities of the Organization. The new programme proposals clearly reflect the conscientious and vigorous leadership of the Director-General and the hard work of his associates in trying to carry out the directives of the General Conference. It is my belief that no one can read the Director-General's Report without a conviction that Unesco is making progress. The Director-General has taken the General Conference into his confidence. He has told us what we should be told as we set our hands to this work here in Florence. My delegation believes that our task here is to search out those programmes that give the greatest evidence of impact and service to Unesco's purposes and to work toward their accomplishment. Further, the United States delegation believes it is appropriate to suggest ways in which Unesco's future programme can be improved. I offer a few observations only as suggestions, with the thought that whatever merit they may have can best be determined by subjecting them to the scrutiny of the General Conference and of its subsidiary Commissions and Committees.

[22] Briefly stated, the United States delegation finds the proposed basic programme of Unesco consists too largely of a summary of programme activities, not always clearly related to Unesco's purpose of peace and security, and at times carried on independently by the several departments of Unesco, without subordination to a common unifying purpose, and therefore lacking full effectiveness. These activities should be integrated around a limited number of major objectives in line with Unesco's purpose. Frequently the co-operation of the several departments will be required. These major objectives which presumably should continue over a span of several years should be approved by the General Conference. The heads of the several departments should jointly, under the leadership of the Director-General, plan and carry out their respective activities in order to make the most effective contribution. There is an idea that we are suggesting which might be useful in this respect: it might be that a council of Directors of Departments under the immediate guidance of the Deputy Director-General would be helpful in this respect.

[23] It is the diffuseness of the Unesco programme that gives my delegation its greatest concern. I suggest that we set as our task at this General Conference, the providing of a basic programme to the Director-General and to the National Commissions of Member States, which will be a challenge to their capacity for executing a unified programme based upon resolutions that are clearly and positively inter-related. Much more work by Unesco could be organized under major projects. For each major project there could be developed an "outline plan", the result of extended consideration by the Director-General and the Secretariat under the review of the Executive Board. The outline plan could include specific projects limited in scope and time, but involving definite stages in the achievement of the objectives of the major project. The major project as defined by its outline plan could be submitted to the General Conference for approval as one of the main objectives of Unesco for the next few years.

[24] As a unifying statement consistent with the Charter of Unesco I propose:

(1) That Unesco's mission be to develop through Education, Science and Culture the foundation for a world peace based on human rights, fundamental freedoms, the rule of law and respect for justice;

(2) That Unesco's mission be to reduce those obstacles to the sharing of knowledge, ideas and arts which prevent the development of a sense of world interdependence; and

(3) That Unesco's mission be to develop those means and to support those agencies which contribute directly ot the fulfilment of its purposes.

[25] With these concepts in mind, we should examine the problem of concentrating the 1951 annual programme of the Organization. Time and time again, the Director-General, the Executive Board, and heads of delegations to the General Conference have said that the programme should be concentrated. None of us has been willing to accept the responsibility for concentration. No one wishes to eliminate activities which were recommended by the Director-General and the Executive Board, while the Director-General cannot very well eliminate an item after it has been approved by the General Conference. Further, I think we all wish to avoid merely amputating the programme by ill-considered surgery. The United States believes that it is time to come to grips with this problem. We believe that this can be done with positive benefit to the work of the Organization. We propose that the General Conference agree that Unesco will intensify its work on a limited number of projects that relate directly to its central purpose. We believe it will find from within the present budget estimates an adequate sum, perhaps of the order of several hundreds of thousands of dollars, to permit the Director-General to do more effective work on the chosen tasks. Having made the decisions, the Conference should review the estimates and the programme resolutions, with a fixed determination of making the necessary economies.

[26] In this connexion, I wish to suggest one practical step which this Conference should take to answer the Director-General's plea for more time to plan methodically and to concentrate the resources of the Secretariat on the actual execution of the programme. It is a step which would in fact produce some of the economies required by the U.S. proposals. I believe the Conference should approve a proposal that the Constitution be amended to provide that the General Conference of Unesco should meet once every two years. Let us recall at this time only two brief remarks in the Director-General's Report:

> . . . We have been so occupied with reporting on the past and preparing for the future that we have scarcely had time to do anything in the present;
>
> and ...
>
> . . . The Fourth Session of the General Conference was to be 'a short business session'. Nevertheless, owing to the regulations in force, it was necessary to produce some 5,000,000 pages of documents for it.

By savings resulting from such changes as elimination of annual General Conferences and some items of the programme, the United States delegation believes that Unesco could intensify its work on a limited number of projects directly related to its central purpose. We propose, as examples, that Unesco intensify its work of helping the German people in their efforts toward international co-operation, and that Unesco undertake a more comprehensive and integrated effort to win a practical acceptance and observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

[27] The first project which I have stated as an example is of immediate relevance to world peace. We have already set under way a study of tensions conducive to war. It should be pursued vigorously. It should look not only to the pathology of tensions but to the ways in which they can be alleviated. But throughout the world today there are specific danger points, centres of potential discord which all can foresee as threats to peace. Unesco can act on these only in its own sphere, for budgetary and other reasons only in a limited number of places. I believe that the point at which our effort should be focused and intensified is in Germany. The future of Germany is not a local or regional question. It is an integral part of a great world problem—the problem of peace. If Germany is to win a place in the community of free and peaceful nations, it is essential that all Germans, and not only a courageous few, should recognize their responsibility in the protection of individual rights and of the processes of justice among men and among nations. To win the people of Germany, and above all the youth of Germany, to a re-appraisal of values and a break with those traditions which hitherto have resulted in misery and disaster, this is a task to which Unesco turned its attention in a serious way during the current fiscal year. This programme should now be strengthened administratively and made more effective through a choice of a limited number of activities consistent with Unesco's major objectives.

[28] Similarly the work of Unesco in Japan has

made a promising beginning. The Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, assisted by Japanese nationals, has co-operated fully in implementing the programme resolutions. What is needed now is a steady expansion of this work, which is designed to bring Unesco into the thinking of the Japanese people.

[29] Another project which I propose as an example of an area in which Unesco might intensify its work is that of promoting understanding and practical acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and I am happy to associate myself with the eloquent words of the distinguished leader of the Cuban delegation in citing this project as an example of the kind that should be considered with seriousness by the General Conference. Men are sustained by a faith that a world society can be organized, with the institutions needed for co-operation under law, within which men are free to think for themselves, to speak and work freely, to choose their leaders, to practise their religions, and to associate with others for the peaceful redress of grievances and the peaceful accomplishment of lawful ends. Unesco symbolizes the aspirations for a world society in which human rights are exercised under law. Unesco, a Specialized Agency of the United Nations, is an instrument to help to achieve that society. As Unesco fulfils this mission, Unesco discharges its duty of speaking to the passions and the conflicts of the times. In this regard I welcomed the observation of the distinguished leader of the delegation of Yugoslavia, Minister Vladislaw Ribnikar, yesterday when he said that his country now believes Unesco's concept of its mission is firmly based on helping the many national cultures to develop freely, each in its own way. This seems to the United States delegation—and has so appeared to my Government from the beginning—to be the very bedrock upon which the concept of Unesco must be founded. Tolerance of diversity is an essential principle for a society in which human beings want to co-operate. Therefore I call on this Conference to act now to strengthen Unesco in its educational programme about Human Rights. I know that we can claim that elements in our programme are already working to this end. But as we study the Director-General's Report, as we scan the Draft Basic Programme, how hard it is to find the clear direction! Under "Mass Communications" there are references to an exhibition on Human Rights; there is a volume of essays under Philosophy; a pamphlet on freedom of scientific enquiry under Natural Sciences; and so forth. But we lack the impression that the talents of our Secretariat have been mobilized on behalf of a master plan involving scholarship, the skills of educators, the technical resources of mass communication, and the diffusion of basic knowledge throughout the world—all this not for its own sake but to win men to a respect for fundamental human rights. It is not for this Conference to improvise in detail the manner and content of this gigantic task. It is for this Conference to determine that to this undertaking a substantial part of our resources should be pledged.

[30] Examples of other major projects of the type I am describing will occur to many of the delegates present. Work in the whole area of the interdependence of modern man might be so considered. The important issue before the Conference is to determine that Unesco will in fact place greater emphasis on several major projects of this kind. Once this is decided, the Conference can go ahead resolutely to find how the savings can be made to finance the major projects. The United States delegation will be prepared to submit in the appropriate Commissions and Committees of the Conference proposals as to ways in which some economies might be made. I wish to make it entirely clear that the United States delegation understands that such major projects will require money for their execution. There are only two ways to get money: (1) to cut down on less essential items, or (2) to add to the total budget of Unesco. It is the first course of action I am advocating. I believe that, for the present programme, Unesco would find it difficult to obtain financial support beyond the present level of its budget.

[31] On the other hand, if Unesco would submit to the world dramatic pleas for major activities, directed to its basic purpose, perhaps it would find the means of financing them. The United States delegation believes that the Director-General should be encouraged to draw up such plans, without being circumscribed by the limitations of the regular budget, and to take appropriate steps for obtaining financial support. The technical assistance programme for economic development in under-developed areas furnishes an example that might be followed in other areas. The United States will propose that the Director-General be authorized to plan such extraordinary projects bearing directly upon the central purposes of Unesco, with a view to special financing from outside sources of funds. I am personally convinced that such projects, boldly and imaginatively conceived, would receive support. Further, such extraordinary projects would constitute a challenge to Member States to throw their tremendous resources directly into the tasks that lie ahead.

[32] The Director-General has told us, as plainly as tact will allow, and I commend him for taking us into his confidence, that "with the exception of a few fields of activity in a few countries—the

action of Member States is still unsatisfactory". He has rightly urged us to guide our actions on the premise that . . .

> . . . only through the will and acts of Member States can Unesco fulfil its true purpose: to be a network of mutual services . . . and a directive force working for the transformation of the world. The Secretariat, no matter how zealous, cannot make up for any apathy on the part of Member—it can do no more than serve their will.

In such ways, as in others that will occur to delegates, I trust that this General Conference will signify to the world that we are fully prepared to support a programme for Unesco which does in fact consist of something more than instructions to the Secretariat. It is the delegations constituting this General Conference that represent the Member States. It is our duty to see that the programme we approve is so clear, so challenging, that no National Commission can fail to accept its share of the responsibility for common action.

[33] It is true, as I have said, that the Unesco programme has up to now seemed diffuse to many Member States. This is made clear in the reports of National Commissions. The report of the United States to Unesco, to my mind, indicates that certain tasks have been well done, a number of other tasks have been started, and others thus far have been neglected. I am conscious of the accomplishments of our National Commission, which I am confident have helped to fulfil the purposes of Unesco. These are described in the Report of the United States National Commission. In reading the Reports of Member States, I have come to the conclusion—and I think you will agree with me—that the forces of the Unesco Secretariat and of the National Commissions could be more effectively employed if the General Conference were more careful in passing programme resolutions. Recognizing the urgency of Unesco's task and its limitations in budget and personnel, we should regard it as a special challenge not to permit any dissipation of resources. Rather, we should insist, before voting for any programme resolution, that it be clearly and validly inter-related with other resolutions to accomplish an approved Unesco objective.

[34] I now turn to the final question raised by the Director-General in his Report. The Director-General asks: "Can Unesco remain indifferent to the passions by which the minds of men are assailed from all sides?" The answer is clear: Unesco cannot be indifferent. What course of action is open to Unesco, to Member States through Unesco, and to all who work through the National Commissions? In the Director-General's words: "The world has the right to know exactly what we can or cannot offer." It is the conviction of the United States that the answer must be found through Unesco's programme, or through new extraordinary projects for which Unesco can find support. Above all, the answer will be found in the work which Unesco is carrying out day by day through its Secretariat in Paris and in far parts of the earth, and in the work carried out by Member States and National Commissions. If Unesco's regular programme is so dispersed, so specialized in technical and professional services that it seems, rightly or wrongly, to thoughtful people to be unrelated, or only slightly related, to the common man's aspiration for a free and peaceful world society, then this defect cannot be remedied by the declarations and resolutions of this Assembly. But if Unesco's work is planned, organized and presented so that it is clearly related to the underlying causes of tension, if it reaches out effectively to all peoples with a message and a call to action to which they can respond, then Unesco will in fact be playing its part in resolving the conflicts of our time.

[35] Please do not mistake me on this point. The passions of our times will not be set at rest by any immediate project or act of Unesco, or of this General Conference. Ours is a task far harder than the quest for an easy and magic solution. Such a solution does not exist. Our task is to dedicate the principal resources of Unesco's Member States to the central purpose of establishing the unity of this world we all inhabit. Our task is to seek a world that is "one in truth in the hearts and minds of men." Let the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco be known to our successors and inheritors as the one that brought the Programme of Unesco into a direct chain reaction with the forces of peace, with the peace that begins in the minds of men!

[36] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Venezuela.

[37] Dr. C. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, the Venezuelan delegation wishes to conform to established practice and take the opportunity of the discussion of the Director-General's Report to outline, generally, the views of the Venezuelan Government on the main issues raised in that important document. In the Commissions, we shall have occasion to state our views in greater detail. If ever there was a happy initiative, it was that taken by the Italian Government in offering Unesco the hospitality of this city for the purpose of the Fifth Session of the General Conference. Florence, like Athens, is one of the perfect creations of the human intellect. City of the Renaissance *par excellence*, there

could be no better venue for the discussions of the various nations' delegates who have met to exchange ideas and evolve methods designed, following the recent world catastrophe, to ensure that the life of the spirit shall never again be threatened, and to place at the service of peace everything that the genius of each civilization has produced throughout the centuries. A wonderful breeding-ground of geniuses, the home of enlightened Maecenases, and the erstwhile scene of fierce and dramatic struggles, Florence is an outstanding example of beauty, truth, energy and faith. It teaches us—as Mr. Torres Bodet told us yesterday with his inspired eloquence—both humility and hope. Our first duty therefore is to express our most sincere gratitude to the noble Italian nation, which has invited us to see here once again, as part of our work and with the help of Dante, Leonardo and Michelangelo, how to write, how to think, and how to sculpture.

[38] Speeches by the heads of the various delegations have shown that the governments of Member States are concerned to bring about important reforms in the structure of the Organization and to see that it aims at the execution of a restricted but effective programme. Venezuela shares this general desire, and its delegation will support some of the proposals, as regards means, that will be made to that end.

[39] One of the matters about which we feel concern is the continued expansion, in terms of staff, of the Secretariat's services. I am not one of those who insist on drawing a distinction between the so-called purely "administrative" services and the services that are actually entrusted with the execution of the programme. That distinction is a subtle one, and the administrative machine is really a single whole, whose task it is to carry out the programme. There is, however, no doubt that the considerable increase in the number of posts not only complicates the work of the Secretariat and renders it less efficient, but also consumes, perhaps, an excessive part of our meagre financial resources. As a member of the Executive Board, I know the often insuperable difficulties that the Director-General encounters in recruiting staff, particularly in the higher ranks; and I would like to pay a tribute to his efforts to provide the Organization with suitable personnel. Something still remains to be done if the Secretariat is to reflect to the greatest possible extent, as it should, equitable distribution as between cultures and geographical areas, combined with the necessary technical competence.

[40] The Venezuelan Government will welcome any steps taken by the Conference to promote co-operation between the Member States and the Organization, and the speedy turning to account of the latter's initiatives. In this respect everything depends on the activity of the National Commissions, many of which have not yet been established or are not functioning to the full extent desirable. Proper collaboration between Unesco and other international organizations is essential to the fulfilment of its mission of contributing to peace. The existence of other Specialized Agencies, moreover, enables Unesco to confine its work to the clear-cut fields of education, science and culture. The head of the Canadian delegation emphasized, yesterday, that we had to prevent other forms of activity, extraneous to our own, invading the field of intellectual co-operation. As a member of the Organization of American States, which was formed sixty years ago under the name of the Pan-American Union and whose cultural services are based on funds and a programme approved by all its member countries, Venezuela attaches special importance to the co-operation which is being established between that Organization and Unesco.

[41] My Government is much interested in those items in the programme that are concerned with education—firstly, for general reasons, which it would be superfluous for me to describe to you here, and secondly because its own national needs impel it to consider this part of Unesco's work. The literacy campaign is fundamental to what is known as the "education of the masses". The Venezuelan Government regards this campaign as one of its main tasks today, and hopes that in this connexion it will receive practical aid from Unesco.

[42] The Field Science Co-operation Offices established in various parts of the world would appear to be one of the best forms of agency for dissemination, and especially for co-ordination, that lie to Unesco's hand. The Venezuelan Government will support all steps taken to develop them.

[43] It would likewise be glad to see an extension of the so-called studies of social tensions. These studies should not be confined to an explanation of the reasons for a catastrophe such as that recently experienced, but should be concerned, above all, with an examination of the current factors that might, in the event, lead the nations once again to war. I shall not say more on this point, in view of the short time at my disposal.

[44] I also approve unreservedly the remarkable achievements of Unesco in the field of culture. What has been undertaken as regards arts and letters, the theatre, music, libraries, and the protection of historic monuments merits full support, and our Government is not backward in providing it. We welcome particularly the new trends that

have developed in the Organization with regard to the encouragement, in the cause of international co-operation, of philosophy and the humanities. Whether these are called by their classical name or by the new name of "humanistic studies", the essential thing seems, to us, to be to show that what is being aimed at is the rehabilitation of the supreme spiritual values, in contradistinction to, or at least on an equal level with, those materialistic considerations which may, perhaps, serve to solve certain economic problems but are, in themselves, inadequate when it comes to stating properly the tremendous problem of man himself.

[45] My Government approves the general plan for publications designed to disseminate culture, in accordance with Unesco's methods and programme; in this connexion, it is particularly interested in the project for the translation of the classics, and has signified its intention of participating in it.

[46] We favour the development of the system of fellowships and everything calculated to promote the exchange of persons and study abroad, since these are suitable means of enabling young people to understand one another and, through fixed courses of instruction, to compare the various cultures and processes of the human mind.

[47] Lastly, we would like to express our warmest approval of Unesco's work in the field of reconstruction and of assistance for refugees, though we would point out that, as in other fields (but particularly in this field), the Organization should be careful not to undertake responsibilities that should more properly fall to other specialized bodies.

[48] In conclusion, it gives me great pleasure to express to Mr. Torres Bodet, on behalf of my country as a Member of Unesco, its acknowledgement and appreciation of the intelligence, energy and self-sacrifice with which he is carrying out his task, and of which I myself have been the daily witness.

The meeting adjourned at 5.30 and resumed at 5.45 p.m.

[49] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before we continue with the official business, I would like to call upon the Director-General, who has, I am sorry to say, a grave statement to make.

[50] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] You have perhaps heard the grievous news that has just been telegraphed throughout the world—the destruction of Cuzco, the magnificent old capital of the Incas, and one of the finest achaeological centres of Latin America. Mr. Ventura Garciá Calderón, the distinguished Peruvian author and poet whom we all of us so much admire, is head of the Peruvian delegation at this Conference. Unfortunately he is indisposed and is confined to his room, so I cannot express to him personally my own and the Secretariat's very deep regret at learning of this sad news. I think, however, that the Conference would wish me to convey to him an expression of its distress and sympathy.

[51] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I am sure that, in associating myself with our Director-General's moving words, I am speaking on behalf of all of those here present. I would ask the meeting to rise for a moment, in token of its feelings, and beg the Director-General to convey an expression of those feelings to the noble nation of Peru. Thank you gentlemen. I call upon Dr. Parra Pérez.

[52] Dr. C. PARRA PÉREZ — [*Translation from the French*] M. Garciá Calderón, who is unfortunately indisposed, and my Latin American colleagues have been so good as to authorize me to speak on their behalf in order to thank you all, in the name of our countries represented at the Conference, for having associated yourselves so movingly with the touching words of the President and of the Director-General. No disaster, gentlemen, could afflict America more than this destruction of the monuments of one of our oldest civilizations in that place where our common Spanish civilization was also, later, to erect its own monuments, monuments which have now, likewise, been destroyed by the hand of nature. Gentlemen, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for your sympathy with us in our sorrow. I am sure that Peru, in particular, will deeply appreciate the tribute you have paid to its civilization and the message of sympathy you have sent to it in its great loss.

[53] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the representative of the Dominican Republic.

[54] Dr. Pedro TRONCOSO SANCHEZ (Dominican Republic) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, fellow-delegates, I should first like to express, on behalf of the Dominican Republic and its delegation to the General Conference of Unesco, our keen gratitude to the great Italian nation for having offered us its magnificent Florence as the seat of our Fifth Session. I should also like to express to the Italian Government and the authorities of Florence my warm appreciation of their first-rate hospitality.

[55] The delegation of the Dominican Republic

associates itself with the tribute of admiration and confidence paid by the Conference to the Director-General of Unesco with regard to his report. I have considered carefully his reflexions and his requests, and also the distinction, to which he refers, between the Basic Programme and the draft resolutions for 1951. I have also considered the urgent need for diminishing that distinction in the coming years. My Government is deeply associated with the ideals of Unesco, so far as the Organization has been able to put them into practice during the short time it has been in existence; and is sparing no efforts to make its own contribution. It is grieved to see, like the Director-General, that the wave of brotherhood which swept over us all in 1945 is receding more and more; but this very fact should spur us on to persevere in our work and to hope for a return of brotherly feelings between the peoples.

[56] There is, in my country, a Commission for Intellectual Co-operation, which fulfils, generally speaking, the following functions: By seconding the official efforts of the State in the fields of education and culture, it assists in spreading a knowledge of Unesco's ideals and purposes, through the media of the press and the radio. It co-operates in Unesco's plan, with which my country is associated, for the translation of representative literary, historical and scientific works. It takes part in the study of Comparative Law problems as regards Copyright. It establishes relations with non-governmental institutions within the country and co-operating bodies abroad. It collaborates with the Government in disseminating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In accordance with Unesco's suggestion to Member States, the day of 10 December 1949 (the first anniversary of the Declaration) was commemorated in all schools throughout the country. It arranges for the representation, on the Commission, of the various groups within the country that are concerned with educational, scientific and cultural matters. It co-operates with the technical services of the Secretariat for Education and Fine Arts with regard to teaching, in the schools of the Republic, about the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, with a view to promoting international understanding. It has adopted a new plan for the organization and work of the Commission, as a result of which four sub-commissions have been set up: one for scientific and social matters, one for educational and cultural matters, one for legal matters, and one for related matters, the object of these sub-commissions being to facilitate the study and treatment of questions connected with one or other of these specialized subjects and the proposing of any measures calculated to further Unesco's aims.

[57] The work of the Dominican Republic in this respect will be greatly facilitated and will doubtless develop considerably (and this applies to the other Spanish-speaking countries too) when the indisputable fact of the remarkable extension of the Spanish tongue throughout the world has been recognized, as as permanent feature, by Unesco itself. This extension of Spanish has not, as in similar cases with other countries, militated against the uniformity of the language, thanks, among other factors, to the authority exercised over our peoples, in the matter of linguistics, by the Spanish Academy of Language.

[58] The Director-General's words of yesterday have sufficed to direct our thoughts towards the basic objects of the Organization. After the last great war, the United Nations recognized that they had to organize themselves for the purpose of co-operating in the task of giving the peoples education and culture, this being one of the ways of establishing peace and prosperity. In fact, the improvement of man through culture is an end in itself, and not a means to another end. Man is educated in order that he shall attain values, rise above the purely organic, physical plane, and become a free, creative being. This process of elevation is achieved through culture, and, at the same time, gives rise to culture. Culture enables man to reach his ultimate goal, namely, spiritual existence.

[59] In this epoch of disaster and danger, however, it is right that education and culture (including science) should have been selected as means to peace and prosperity; this they certainly are. I would however suggest, as even more applicable, the converse: that peace and prosperity are means to education and culture. Viewed in this light, it is essential that international political organizations should ensure peace and prosperity in order that Unesco should be able to help to give the peoples education and culture, so that they may attain to their highest spiritual and intellectual development and make this the object of their lives.

[60] Inasmuch as education and culture are means whereby to attain to the social values of peace, amid the host of afflictions through which we have to pass, I think it would be desirable for Unesco to take two practical steps, additional to those already taken, or to be taken, in the future. The first would be a recommendation in implementation of which the Member States would, in their primary and secondary school syllabuses, provide methodical instruction about the organization and purposes of the United Nations. The object would be, not to talk to the children about these matters occasionally and sporadically or merely to show children and adolescents attractive

charts, but to give them regular and frequent lessons, successive courses each covering a whole year, on the subject of the Organization, with almost the same thoroughness as that observed in the teaching of arithmetic or languages. Experts chosen by Unesco would be responsible for preparing the necessary textbooks. If this form of teaching were adopted, it would help to form a new conscience in the younger generation and create in them a "supra-national" moral outlook, from which all tendencies towards violence would be removed.

[61] The second step would be for Unesco to recognize that religious values must stand high in the centre of every culture, and accordingly to recommend Member States to arrange for religion to be taught in their schools. The present crisis is, as we know, taking on to an ever greater degree, the character of a struggle between religion and atheism. It is a matter of urgency, therefore, that the present divorce between religion and the other blessings of culture should be brought to an end. It is essential to encourage the most genuinely spiritual feelings of humanity and to combine our efforts with those of religious institutions throughout the world, so as to nourish the roots of culture and, therefore, of peace. Having expressed these wishes and hopes, I now bring to a close my statement in support of the Director-General's views and of his urgent task, and pay my tribute to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[62] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the representative of Sweden.

[63] Mr. Ingemar DÜRING (Sweden) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to associate myself and the Swedish delegation with those speakers who have congratulated the Director-General and the Secretariat, on the remarkable work which they have accomplished during these eight months, and particularly I wish to stress how much we appreciate the realistic tone adopted in the Director-General's Report and in his subsequent address, in its criticism of the General Conference and the action of Member States, in its confessions of weakness and doubt, as well as in its claim to success. We were also very glad to hear Sir John Maud's comments on the Report, so lucid and so full of common sense.

[64] The Swedish delegation is happy to be able to take part in this year's work. We are late arrivals as a Member of Unesco, and I do not intend to take up time stating the reasons for that here, but perhaps I might be allowed to say that my country, even before it joined this Organization, did some work in the spirit of Unesco. We have a rich network of international relations with many countries of the world in the field of education, science and culture, and in the Scandinavian Cultural Commission, in which Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden are taking part. We have, in fact, already the kernel of a kind of regional centre for cultural relations between the Nordic countries. Our National Commission was appointed a year ago, and a brief statement on its budget and activities is included in our report to this Conference. During and after the war, we have had the privilege of taking part in the work on reconstruction and cultural relief in Scandinavia, in Eastern and Western Europe, in Greece, the Middle East and in Ethiopia, and we have attached to our report to Unesco a memorandum on this matter.

[65] One of the main features of Swedish—and I may as well say Scandinavian—cultural life is the importance attached in our countries to adult education, education in people's colleges, in study circles, university extension work and in the popular movements. About one seventh of the total population of Sweden, that is to say, about one million people, are constantly on the roll in adult education. A Swedish Government Commission has recently published a detailed survey and report on this matter, which we will be glad to put at the disposal of Member States. The development of effective organizations and agencies in the field of adult education is, I believe, one of Unesco's main programme activities, and was discussed at the Conference last year at Elsinore. We are looking forward with great expectation to the seminar on adult education, to be held this summer in Austria, and we hope that the election of a Swedish specialist as leader of this seminar will lead to further close co-operation in this field. The channels of adult education are, in my country, also the channels through which, most effectively, the ideals of Unesco can reach the masses.

[66] In order to increase the possibilities for a free flow of ideas between the Member States, an Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials has been prepared and is now before this Conference. I wish, on behalf of my delegation, to compliment the Secretariat upon the work done for preparing, in co-operation with GATT, this agreement, which my Government welcomes as an important contribution towards facilitating the relations between Member States.

[67] I now turn to another point. The discussion in which we are taking part has shown what all of us knew before, namely that there is a wide difference of opinion as to the main functions of Unesco. We have listened this evening to an important statement on the programme of Unesco

by the Head of the United States delegation and, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to associate myself with his general remarks on the necessity to define more clearly the aims and methods and future policy of Unesco at this Conference.

[68] In his Report the Director-General has found a particularly happy formulation of what Unesco really is at present, "a network of mutual services". In the opinion of the Swedish delegation, it is extremely important that Unesco continue its functions as an instrument for the advancement of international relations in the fields of education, science and culture, where, already, excellent results have been achieved. We believe that this work is really work for peace. I particularly wish to stress the importance of continued support to the international unions with consultative status. These organizations are highly valuable instruments for the execution of Unesco's programme and we would like to recommend the use, as far as possible, and more than hitherto, of these already existing bodies of specialists for the execution of Unesco's programme. This is, in our opinion, far better than to enlarge the Secretariat. It is in fact with a feeling of uneasiness that we observe the rapid expansion of the Secretariat, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the delegate of the Netherlands on that part of the report.

[69] The international unions are, just as the National Commissions, active parts of this Organization. Unesco has supported them in different ways. I would like to say a few words on just one point. There are undertakings in all fields of science and culture which are of particular international importance and which must be financed through international support. Allow me to avoid generalities and take some concrete examples, even if they may seem unduly special in this general discussion. We have, in this country, which has received us so generously and amicably, an important institution in the field of biology, the *Stazione Zoologica* of Naples. At present, six different countries support this institution, which is open to specialists from the whole world. During the last eighty years the Station has played an immense part in the development of zoological research by the most prominent scientists of many countries. The *Stazione Zoologica* has received financial support from Unesco and, particularly from the standpoint of the small countries, it is of first importance that this support be continued and, if possible, increased. Let me take another example from an entirely different field. Indian philologists are at present at work on an edition of the *Mahabharata*, an immense undertaking. In Germany the work on the publishing of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* was interrupted during the war and now proceeds very slowly. I refrain from giving more examples, although it would be very easy, but I wish to stress emphatically, that undertakings of this kind are particularly important because they are, or provide, tools for the advancement of science and culture and because they are too big to be financed by one country only. It is the opinion of my delegation that Unesco, from a realistic point of view, makes a considerable contribution towards ensuring peace by maintaining and producing tools for the workers in the various fields of science and culture.

[70] In all countries there is some criticism of Unesco. This is inevitable, since each country has its own particular notion of what Unesco ought to be. To those uninformed critics, who, after a superficial look at the programme, are ready with their verdict, Unesco is a huge catch-all of international schemes in the field of education, science and culture. This kind of criticism can be brought to silence by more information and I hope the Director-General will take into consideration a little more than has been the case so far the fact that Unesco's publications of a more general character cannot, in a majority of the Member States, reach the "man in the street", as long as they are available only in English, French or Spanish. Only in, at the most, 25 of the 55 Member States, are these three languages universally understood.

[71] A word we have heard again and again during these discussions is the word concentration, but delegates seem to be at variance on what kind of concentration is meant. Unesco's work must, by its very nature, be multifarious. It is very easy to pick up a single item, for instance, the determination of the tone pitch of A in the musical scale and make a witty and malicious remark on "fiddling while Rome burns", etc. This is the kind of unjust criticism we are wont to meet in chatty articles. The kind of concentration we would like to recommend has more to do with priority and quality, along the lines suggested by the leader of the United States delegation. We have for Unesco a very restricted budget and I am sure that many governments (like mine) have instructed their delegates to vote against any rise of the budget ceiling. We may regret this but we, like all bodies of this kind, are obliged to cut our coat according to our cloth. As one of the members of this Conference, who has attended all meetings of the General Conference, I have the impression that not only the Director-General's Report, but also the discussion on this Report have become more realistic and business-like. Problems cannot be solved by eloquent speeches, but only by action. We hope that, in short, the burden of the Secretariat will be made easier by

the adoption of the proposal for biennial conferences, and that the Secretariat—and here I quote the Report—will get rid of this Conference mentality and find time to think of the programme activities instead of writing reports which are ends in themselves.

[72] We hope that by these few remarks we have made clear our position and have succeeded in convincing this body of our spirit of co-operation, of our desire to take our job seriously, of our confidence in the Director-General and of our loyalty to Unesco.

[73] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Norway.

[74] Mr. Hans MOHR (Norway) — Mr. President, delegates, the Norwegian delegation entirely agrees with those speakers who have expressed their admiration for the excellent work done by the Director-General and the Secretariat. In this connexion, the Norwegian delegation would like to join the United States delegation in expressing the wish that Unesco's work in Germany should be intensified.

[75] The Norwegian delegation admits that there may be things in the work of Unesco which may be criticized. We think there are too many projects, a fact which again necessitates too much administration. But here we must remember that the projects are given to the Director-General by the General Conference. It is for the General Conference to reduce the number of projects.

[76] One important criticism was, it seems to the Norwegian delegation, incorrect and unjust. It has been said that Unesco has not succeeded in making itself a real living organism in the world, in the thinking of the peoples, in the minds of men. The Norwegian delegation considers that if this criticism is addressed to the Director-General and the Secretariat, the Director-General has every right to forward it to the Member States and to the National Commissions. The National Commissions in most countries have certainly an unpleasant feeling of not having done enough. At any rate we in the Norwegian National Commission have that feeling. One reason is the difficult financial situation. Unesco's task is to direct, to stimulate, to spread ideas, and Unesco has done that. The task of the National Commissions is to do information work in their own countries. We, the Member States and the National Commissions, have to make Unesco a living organism, each in our own country, and the Norwegian delegation entirely agrees with the Director-General when he in his Report underlines the responsibilities of the National Commissions. The Norwegian delegation would like to express the wish and the hope that we all, during this Session, may have a growing feeling of the importance of the National Commissions, and that after the Session, we may return to our countries with a clear understanding of the responsibility of the National Commissions and of the necessity for the National Commissions and Member States to do better work, to do our best.

[77] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, no more speakers have put down their names to speak this evening. Those who are to speak first tomorrow are not here at the moment, and I cannot therefore call upon them now. Accordingly, I have no option but to declare the meeting closed.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

	Page
XIII. Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*continuation*): Speeches by delegates of Mexico, Brazil, Guatemala, Israel, Egypt, United Kingdom and New Zealand	120

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XIII. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I declare the meeting open. I call upon the delegate of Mexico.

[2] Mr. Antonio CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, fellow-delegates, this is the second time that I have had the honour to comment on the Director-General's Report at a session of the General Conference of Unesco. Eight months have passed since the Conference in Paris; eight months of intensive work by the Director-General, the Executive Board and the whole staff of the Secretariat. During that time I have closely followed the work of the Organization and its relations with the various Member States, and have had opportunities of appreciating the efforts made to increase Unesco's activities and direct them into the most useful channels. It was necessary to establish, in the vast field of science, education and culture, a system of priorities, of grades of urgency and importance, and, within that system, to direct the Organization's efforts to the strengthening of weak points and the solution of the most pressing problems. During the time that has passed since the Paris Conference, Unesco has never ceased to exercise and extend its influence, to work to the best advantage and to direct its action into the most useful channels. Unesco has emerged from these eight months stronger and with a better realization of the detailed implications of its aims. It has also established closer and more active working relations with the Member States. Unesco's ideals, proposals, projects and schemes have, indeed, to be carried out at the national level, through the activities of Member States and, in particular, through the governmental or private organizations concerned with education, science and culture with which Unesco co-operates. Unesco's role is sometimes confined to the encouragement, assistance and guidance of those organizations. Once a plan of work has been thought out and launched by Unesco, it is for the Member States to ensure its continuation, for the benefit not only of themselves but also of the common ideal of a peace based on education, science and culture.

[3] There has been an increase in the number of National Commissions, those essential links with Member States, and new and improved methods of contact have been brought into use. The world is made up of many differing countries; in its relations with those countries, in seeking to implant and develop in them the spirit of mutual understanding, Unesco must take account of varying national and regional characteristics. In the past eight months Unesco has set up working and liaison centres away fom the Organization's headquarters—such as the Regional Office at Havana—as well as special departments within the Secretariat responsible for ensuring that measures for co-operation are better adapted to the interests and characteristics of each country.

[4] An equally important development has taken place in another direction. Unesco has reviewed its relations with private organizations concerned with education, science and culture. The Executive Board has worked hard and long, assessing the results of co-operation at this level. Through the application of stricter criteria, it has been possible to draw up a list of organizations likely to collaborate more enthusiastically and effectively in tasks that are in harmony with the ideals of Unesco.

[5] The foregoing activities, of which I have been an interested spectator, are all described in the Director-General's Report. The work done by the Director-General, the Executive Board and the

Secretariat has been intense and of a very high order. In addition to the concentration of Unesco's work and the pruning of its programme, the devising of a more effective system of relations with Member States, and the review of working relations with private organizations, they have had to do the preparatory work for this Conference, draw up a draft budget for 1951 and also the general programme of the Organization. This work, as I have just said, has been admirably done, and Member States should be satisfied with it; it has been done as well, as efficiently and as energetically as possible.

[6] But, in his report, the Director-General puts the question whether we have achieved, or are achieving, all that was expected of Unesco. He is concerned—and very rightly so—at the tardiness with which Member States are co-operating and undertaking the activities incumbent upon them. Once the staff of Unesco has examined a problem and found a solution for it, once a committee of experts convened by Unesco has confirmed or improved on that solution, and it has been approved by the General Conference, it is for the Member States to give practical effect to the scheme they have approved. Unesco can then do no more than stimulate the activities of the States themselves. In his report, the Director-General emphasizes this point; and it is obvious that, once the States have decided on their line of action, they must follow it consistently. Changes have been introduced in the actual wording of the resolutions, in order to bring home to governments the fact that the execution of the various resolutions is within their sole competence. Moreover, the advisability has been considered of investing some of the resolutions with the form of a treaty or international convention, to ensure that they shall be carried out at the national level with the force of such an instrument behind them. This seems to be a very suitable idea, of which I think a good deal more may be heard. It would be an excellent procedure to group resolutions of a like nature into a single instrument and so deal, in a series of basic conventions, with points on which agreement had been reached. In that way principles of capital importance would be brought out and given the character of categorical international obligations. It would be for Unesco to decide which principles might suitably be incorporated in an international convention of this kind, and how far this procedure could effectively be applied to the various items in its programme.

[7] Between 1945, when Unesco was founded, and 1950, the year of our present Conference, many grave and significant events have occurred. Unesco was born in the atmosphere of optimism which followed a long and costly war; all the peoples wished to live in concord; all desired that education, science and culture should lead them towards peace, towards a peace which they fondly hoped would be permanent. Five years later, however, the peace that first seemed to be so assured was found to be precarious; the rivalries between the nations, so far from disappearing, seem to be becoming more acute. The longed-for peace seems to be in peril; there is a feeling that it may disappear at any moment. The Director-General is entirely right to ask that Member States should face this situation and consider the problems it raises for Unesco's existence and programme. At the time when Unesco was born, there seemed no reason why peace should ever again be threatened; there seemed to be ample time at the world's disposal, and no cause for thinking that governments would not be able to carry out their plans in their own time. But now that peace has turned out, so it seems, to be one of those summer skies that are so often the prelude to a storm, how should Unesco set its course? No one will deny that the Director-General has every reason for his anxiety; no one will claim that he has not been right to call our attention to the situation that confronts us, and to ask us to consider whether the programme evolved by Unesco at a time when peace seemed secure is still valid now that peace appears, after all, to be ill-secured. Unesco was established so that it might combat war with the weapons of science, education and culture; now that peace has, as it were, been crushed into a small space, are those weapons still of service today? Is the initial programme still to be followed out? It is for the nations present at this Conference to confirm the programme or to alter it, to maintain or to modify the methods by which it is implemented.

[8] Science, education and culture are one of the ways in which the mind has moulded the world. Once nature casts itself in the forms that the mind has created—whatever be the scientific constancy, the material analysis, the thought processes or the art forms involved—man gains in quality and in spiritual stature. Science, education and culture can, however, only operate in accordance with their own nature, helping to create in the mind of man a less superficial, more peaceful, richer and more harmonious world. It is this world that each of us must set against disorder, anarchy and war. Unless this ideal world of harmony can be established in men's minds, nothing can save us. But, like the process of life itself and the stars in their courses, it has its own rhythm, its own essential period of incubation and development. Given the pre-

sent world of unbalance and menace, Unesco must continue to fight with its own arms—science, education and culture, and everything that forms, in man's mind, that impenetrable shield through which no falsehood or violence can pass. While Unesco may be unable to change the rate at which each of these weapons gains its ascendancy in men's minds, it can, with the help of Member States, shorten the time required for preparing effective action, the carrying out of joint plans, the initiation of new projects, and the study of the speediest means of bringing to all parts of the world the message of revelation that can only be deciphered at the rate for which the human mind is equipped. The triumph of Unesco can only be ensured if that message is properly understood by all. The message is of value in itself, and should it not have been completely deciphered at a moment when Attila's hordes descend upon the world, others will certainly retrieve it from the dust when peace has returned and draw fresh inspiration from it.

[9] I do not think that the Director-General, who is a humanist and a man of letters, views the matter in any other light, though he has undoubtedly done right to ask us to examine our consciences. This is an occasion when we ought all of us to promise solemnly to do all that lies within us to hasten the implementation of every recommendation, project, resolution and plan that Unesco has formulated to establish in the world a peace rooted firmly in education, science and culture. I would close my remarks by expressing the Mexican delegation's satisfaction at the development and progress of Unesco, as revealed by the Director-General's excellent report.

[10] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Brazil.

[11] Mr. Clemente MARIANI BITTENCOURT (Brazil) — [*Translation from the French*] I am happy, Mr. President, to pay my respects to you on behalf of the delegation of Brazil, of its Government, of which I am a member, and of its people, whom I have the honour to represent in our National Assembly. By way of illustrating the bonds uniting our two countries, it is enough to refer to modern Italy's contribution, from an ethnic standpoint, to the development of our young nation. The Latin civilization of which we are both proud is not the least of the ties between us. Our continent as a whole has welcomed people from every part of this older continent who have come in search of new ways of existence. There is no part of it that does not bear the mark of Latin culture. All the peoples in these far-off lands have sought their common ideals in the shade of Rome, cast upon them across the centuries and across the oceans. And it is, perhaps, because of this common spiritual and racial origin that there lie buried here, beneath these green Tuscan hills, some hundreds of our countrymen, the first soldiers of Latin America who came to the sacred soil of Europe to fight and die for freedom. Having crossed the rich plains of the Po, seen throughout Emilia and Tuscany the grim marks of the ravages of war and of the sufferings our soldiers had to endure, and having renewed acquaintance with these now war-scarred streets, bridges, houses and time-honoured monuments, with the pleasant hills surrounding them, I rejoice, Mr. President, that Unesco's aims—the elevation of man through culture, and the disarmament of the mind—are, and will remain, those of my own country. We must hope that Unesco, whose democratic ideals are so well framed, will be able to rescue man from the mistakes of the past, by enabling him to create new conditions of life for this world, which prejudice and ignorance have all but annihilated.

[12] Scientific impartiality and objectivity, which are at once a method and a moral attitude, impel us to be sincere, and to have faith in the ultimate fruits of unity. This is the first lesson to be drawn from the report of our eminent colleague Mr. Torres Bodet, the Director-General of Unesco. He has not been content merely to describe events; what he has aimed at is a real searching of conscience, a comparison between the Organization's responsibilities and its resources. This approach, which is as inspired as it is well-advised, calls, I think, for an equal searching of conscience on the part of all delegations, as to how far each of our countries has contributed to the success of our joint enterprise.

[13] There are two general points in his report: a better definition of the responsibilities of the Secretariat and of the Member States, and the preparation of a long-term programme accompanied by a parallel short-term programme. As to the first point, it would be difficult for everything to be foreseen, defined and prescribed. Though there are many valuable lessons to be learnt from what the International Bureau of Education had done in the past, Unesco's task had to be envisaged from fresh angles—it was, for instance, an imperative and urgent duty to restore media of culture in the devastated areas. It is this that may have given rise to the erroneous but widespread idea that it was for Unesco not merely to provide technical aid but itself to engage in educational activities in the most varied areas and in every country. It would be a mistake to judge Unesco's work in the light of that idea. Unesco will never have the resources or the staff required for the

execution of such a task. It is not an entity over and above the Member States; it has simply been created by them, for well-defined processes of co-operation. What is required is to organize the National Commissions, with a view to that programme of co-operation being carried out. The varying political and administrative conditions obtaining in each country are a bar to any uniform solution; but experience will show, objectively, the best course to be followed, according to circumstances.

[14] As regards the work of the National Commissions, however, two questions arise. In the first place, Unesco must be in a position to help the leading spirits in each country, so that they in their turn may be able to act on the masses of the people and direct their aspirations towards cultural progress and international understanding. If, in this field, Unesco is to achieve its objects with the necessary freedom, the Commissions in each country must, as the report emphasizes, organize themselves with a view to facilitating a rapid exchange of ideas and information, of value both to each country and from the point of view of the common cause. Encouragement for the work of scientific and cultural institutions, and the co-ordination of local activities with the activities of international organizations, are tasks that rightly fall to the National Commissions. But are these in a position to act likewise with regard to the normal, regular services concerned with education and the dissemination of culture? Here, the influence and the competence of National Commissions are variable factors. Some countries, though for educational purposes their organization may be adequate, have no cultural services so organized as to permit of their effective co-ordination with the work of Unesco. Any expansion in the number of services would merely involve pointless expense. Moreover, as our Director-General reminded us in his fine speech to the Conference, there are always national policies in education that have to be taken into account and that reflect political and other conditions governing the lives of the countries concerned. Culture, in its widest sense, can only exist on an unrestricted basis. But education, though it seeks to free the individual, is subject to the circumstances and conditions attendant upon the evolution of each social milieu; it operates within the framework of "national contingencies", such as the political structure, the form of religion, etc. —in a word, the permanent and stable community existence characteristic of each country; there will always be room for technical improvements. Such improvements cannot however be based on general, abstract principles; they must have realistic, though certainly progressive purposes, in view.

[15] Here is one of those delicate problems that merit the attention of the Secretariat and the technical commissions of this Conference—namely, how to stimulate educational programmes in each country by co-ordinating them, if possible, with the programme of Unesco. Unesco already has praiseworthy and fruitful work to its credit in this field, despite the difficulties with which it has had to contend. We in my own country's Ministry of Education, for our part, are considering the possibility of setting up a suitable body to co-ordinate the Government's activities with Unesco's programme, and so facilitating the task of our National Commission. The problem, therefore, may be stated in definite terms. On the one hand, educational questions, when raised to a world level or analysed with a view to a general solution applicable to every place and time, lose much of their actual substance, content and reality. On the other hand, viewed from a practical standpoint, education aims at the training and elevation of man, adjusted to the various attendant circumstances. Moreover, as we have pointed out, educational services give rise to a form of culture within the framework of certain social circumstances which must be accepted as they are. The equating of practical problems by an international organization will merely amount to the stating of very general and hence vague and ineffective formulae; alternatively, it will aim at concrete solutions that may be suited to some countries, peoples or areas, but not to others.

[16] Unesco has, it would seem, recently tried two ways of avoiding this dilemma. The first is the holding of regional seminars, and the second is the establishment of regional study and action centres, of which the initial ones, as the Director-General's report tells us, are being set up in Latin America; these are the Regional Centre at Havana, and the Training and Production Centre and Office for Fundamental Education in Mexico City and Washington. I am glad to recall that, ever since my country joined Unesco, this is the course that we have always favoured, as the only one calculated to ensure that all quarters benefit from the advantages that Unesco is in a position to offer. We have noted the good results secured from the regional seminars, like that which took place in Brazil—the inter-American literacy and adult education seminar held at Petropolis, near Rio de Janeiro, in which all but two of the American States took part. Apart from the comparison of ideas and technical processes for which it afforded an opportunity, the seminar undoubtedly helped to bring into relief a new conception of

education, in which our distinguished Director-General has always pioneered: the education of the masses. The practical results of the seminar were at once felt in various countries, several of which, including Brazil, have already embodied in their educational policy, and even in their permanent legislation, the conclusions that their experts have carefully worked out under the auspices of Unesco and of the Organization of American States.

[17] These facts provide the best possible justification for the comprehensive and thorough-going plan presented in the report I have in mind, in particular, the need for a "long-term" programme, parallel and co-ordinated with a "short-term" programme, the latter however being more flexible and adaptable to any special conditions that may arise. Though this may at first sight appear strange, the two programmes will, to a large extent, be based on the work of departments other than that of Education. I may mention, for instance, the forthcoming conference of experts on education, which is being organized by the Social Sciences Department of Unesco. A study of the general circumstances, internal or external, in which industrialization is accompanied by social tensions, will provide material for standing directives for the practical organization of educational systems in each country. Furthermore, the great health campaigns now being undertaken in my country against endemic diseases, tuberculosis and infant mortality have already begun to exert a direct influence on educational programmes.

[18] In the field of education, Brazil is carefully following Unesco's investigations and is making use of their results, adapting them to her particular circumstances. Thus, as regards fundamental education problems, to solve which my country has taken action even ahead of the Organization's appeal, as long ago as 1947 we began to carry out a programme that was completely in line with Unesco's directives. I was fortunate enough to be in charge of this work; thanks to it, we have been able not only to make fresh progress in education in Brazil, but to give effect to our Constitution, which lays down that everyone shall have the right to education. The work has also produced a profound change in the public conscience so far as education is concerned. What strikes us is not so much that we have been able, in barely three years, to place two million pupils on the educational roll, or that we have been able to provide over one million adolescents and adults with the elementary techniques of culture. What impresses us more, so far as the results of this popular education movement are concerned, is the change in the mentality of the community, which is brought out by actual facts, such as the immediate increase in the average number of children undergoing education or the rise in the rate of entry for primary education in general, the figure here having increased, for the whole of Brazil, from three and a half millions in 1945 to 4,700,000 in 1948 and very probably to over five millions in 1949. These results are mainly due to the Government's determination and to the circumstances attending the restoration of democracy within the country. But we are happy to recognize, that Unesco, by its encouragement and its activities, has facilitated the steps we have taken to bring about this remarkable degree of progress in our educational system.

[19] An intensive programme of school-building, regarded by Mr. King Hall, of Columbia University, as the greatest current educational movement in the world, has enabled us to build, in four years, 7,000 rural schools, with houses for teachers attached, in areas where lack of communications and a small population render living conditions very problematical. We have also built 500 schools, of three amalgamated classes, and 50 rural teachers' training colleges, not to speak of the effort that has been made by the various States of the Federation. But it is not solely in the field of fundamental, and especially adult, education, or of school buildings that we have tried to carry out Unesco's programme in our country and, in that connexion, to give an example to the world. In an educational bill now before Parliament (for a law prescribing directives and principles for national education, as enjoined by our Constitution) many passages reflect Unesco's creative ideas, which also inform various constitutional provisions and administrative and legislative measures, like the earmarking, for educational purposes, of 10 per cent of the Federal revenue and 20 per cent of the local taxes; the exemption from taxation of teachers, educational establishments, and paper used for books and papers; the extension of the network of secondary education institutes; a grant for establishments that devote themselves to the education of adolescents with slender financial resources; the foundation of universities (which numbered only four in 1946 but which now number 11), and the maintenance, by the Federal Government, of some dozens of faculties at the university level, involving the possibility of improving their equipment, reducing education fees or even providing education free of charge, as well as social assistance for students with no financial means. All this shows that the Government of my country has continued, within the limits of its powers, to proclaim and put into practice the ideals and aspirations to which all of us here present subscribe. I would like to refer here, as

the Director-General has done in his report, to the important part played, in the co-ordination of these efforts, by Brazilian experts who have lent their services to Unesco; and particularly to Professor Arthur Ramos, who died in harness, when carrying out his duties as Head of the Department of Social Sciences. Let us pay a tribute to his high skill, constructive idealism, and faith in the perfectibility of man through culture. I should also not omit to mention the work of Professor Paulo Carneiro, that man of learning and educationist who has made Brazilian co-operation such a reality in the Executive Board; nor should I pass over the contribution made by other Brazilian experts who have so often been called upon by Unesco to take part, on a permanent or temporary basis, in its technical work. Under the principle of geographical distribution as regards the recruitment of the Secretariat, we hope to continue to serve the ideals of Unesco, so that its collaboration in the peace mission of the United Nations shall, as the Executive Board desires, "be carried on vigorously, now as in the future".

[20] For this purpose, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Torres Bodet has all the dynamism, clear-headedness and grasp for which we could wish. I shall not, I think, be wrong in describing our Director-General as symbolizing that young American outlook, which is bold and courageous but at the same time characterized by moderation and accuracy, both of which are essential if our work on behalf of world understanding is to be carried to a successful conclusion. However "dionysiac" and "cosmic" the New World, as is claimed, may be, it none the less aims at attaining order, moderation and beauty, of which Florence—*municipium splendididissimum, "bellissima e famosissima figliola di Roma"*—is *par excellence* the externalization. In this magnificent atmosphere, redolent of the creative genius of the Latins, we become more than ever aware of our duty not to fall into the error of those who, in Dante's words, *"si son disfatti per lor superbia"*—fell because of their pride—but to put forth all our efforts to achieve what Unesco demands of us—the improvement of the world through culture, and the disarmament of the mind. In that way we shall pay tribute to the ideals of all men of good will, those men who, on the day our Saviour was born, were promised "peace on earth".

[21] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the representative of Guatemala.

[22] Dr. Carlos MARTÍNEZ DURÁN (Guatemala) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, fellow-delegates, this is the first time that the voice of Guatemala has been heard in Unesco. Guatemala is a small country in terms of American geography, but it nourishes a full measure of faith and hope that the world will, on the basis of freedom and democracy, build up a true and lasting peace. Through its Government and its old-established University, and by reason of its humanist traditions, Guatemala has brought to international discussions, in all fullness, clarity and good faith, its message on behalf of human dignity and a practical, generous and all-embracing peace—a peace not imposed by the strong, nor by those who are ever avid of economic power, nor by technicians with no concern for ethics, nor yet by those proud and prejudiced quarters whose idea it is to establish an ideology with a racial or nationalist label that sacrifices small and heterogeneous civilizations and, clothed in a wealth of falsehood, aims at "planning" all the more important forms of human activity. Guatemala sincerely supports and greatly admires the dynamic and well-directed efforts of the Director-General, Mr. Torres Bodet, that old combatant on behalf of the education of the Latin American peoples, whose clear vision impels him to say that Unesco can never have a part in intellectual "planning", since the mind is synonymous with freedom.

[23] We must also express our sincere thanks to the Italian Government for having furnished so delightful and, indeed, so incomparable a venue for this Conference. No city can provide such a background as Florence for free creative activity, grace, harmony, calm meditation, or true universality. Speakers from various countries, especially Italy, Yugoslavia and Canada, and yesterday India, Lebanon, Colombia and many others, have spoken of fine achievements based on respect for all-embracing truth and on a desire that the eternal, transcendental values should be revived.

[24] It is the keen desire of the Latin American countries (and especially my country), expressed through their universities, that it should be Unesco's object, in its forthcoming programme, to carry out a real crusade for the humanization of science, the humanization of scientists and technicians; in that way new prospects will be opened up for peace. Within the hills surrounding this Tuscan city—divinely protected, and a fruitful field for all branches of learning—Sarton has already evolved and formulated the new "humanism of science". If we wish to free ourselves from complexes and banish the spectre of war, which, for the "Pharisees" of peace, already has form and substance, Unesco must work for the humanization of the peoples, and for the regeneration of all those barbarian intellects that have made the power of technology into one of the most formidable

weapons to be used against culture. Science loses all educational value, and becomes dangerous, if it is not tempered with the supreme values of the mind.

[25] It must be Unesco's task to inform and educate the masses from youth upwards, in every sphere, directly or through their leaders, with a view to the full development of the human personality, and to respect for human rights and the fundamental freedoms, all the people being given the right to participate freely in the benefits of culture and the historical aspect of the various communities being preserved, without prejudice to the universal aspect. This is the line we have been assiduously following in the so-called Charter of Guatemala, subsequent to the Latin American University Congress.

[26] If Unesco steers clear of all influences, interference and centralization and makes no distinction between the various ideologies, it will be able to do good work through "unity in diversity". The world—and this was never so true as since the last war—teems with practical, "positive" men who are deaf to the voice of the spirit and who, closed as they are in a subterranean cell, see the universe only through the grating in the roof. The world is full of men, races and nations who, blinded by pride and material power, speak only one language, are ignorant or contemptuous of others, and have no time to read the new signs in the sky or to take account of present and future spiritual revivals; and so, while believing they are seeking peace, they are in fact moving towards war. Religion has established men's equality in the sight of God and various revolutions have established their equality before the law; but we have not yet established equality between man and his fellowmen. If we are to seek peace through culture, if it is Unesco's purpose to achieve unity and concord between all the peoples of the earth, the Organization must accept, with no restrictions, all ideologies, all that believe themselves to be the true ones, since the white flag of peace is made up of every colour, just as a ray of light is white and vivid by reason of its blending of all the coloured waves that go to make it up.

[27] In its programme of assistance and dissemination of its ideals through culture, Unesco must turn its eyes, with sympathy and understanding, towards Latin America, foster regional centres and set up new ones in the East and other areas. In the words of Marti, our America does not seek to disturb the world with new elements of rivalry and discord or to restore, by other methods or in other forms, the imperial systems which corrupt democracies and lead them to their death. On the contrary, what it seeks is a just, productive, worthy and honourable peace.

[28] My last word shall be my hope and prayer that Unesco will carry out its programme, which may perhaps be on a smaller and less ambitious scale than before but will be more realistic, thoroughgoing and effective. May truth triumph with grace and majesty, like Giotto's tower, eternally in converse with the skies; may "unity in diversity" be everywhere established, like the hills of Florence that surround us; and may the hope of a better and more peaceful world, in which Unesco has a basic mission, be brought to fruition in the same way as was this marvellous city, the cradle and culmination of the Renaissance.

[29] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before calling upon the next speaker, I would like to inform you of a telegram I have just received from Rome, to the effect that at the Italian Chamber of Deputies' session of yesterday, 23 May, Mr. Ambrosini, the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission, addressed a message of greeting to those taking part in the Fifth Session of Unesco's General Conference, expressing the fervent hope that its work would be crowned with complete success and would achieve the desired purpose of bringing the peoples closer together by a process of mutual understanding and reconciliation. Expressing the unanimous feeling of the Assembly, the President of the Chamber associated himself with these words, and said that the President of the Republic and members of Parliament and of the Government had, by their presence at the opening meeting of the Conference, wished particularly to mark this demonstration of human solidarity in the field of education, science and culture. This statement was applauded by every section of the Assembly. I now call upon Mr. Gallone, the representative of the International Labour Organization.

[30] Mr. GALLONE (International Labour Organization) — [*Translation from the French*] I am asked, in the first place, to convey to the General Conference of Unesco the sincere good wishes of the Director-General of the International Labour Office for the complete success of its work. In the second place, I have to invite the Conference's attention to those fields in which collaboration between our two organizations seems to be of most importance at the present time.

[31] A little while ago the ILO embarked on a large-scale programme of direct action as regards labour. This programme, which began in Europe and was subsequently extended to the countries of Asia and the Far East, has now reached the

stage of practical application in Latin America. Its main aspects are the organization of an employment service, professional and technical training, and the organization of migration. Labour problems are vast and complex, and from the outset the ILO has been fully aware of the need for securing the collaboration of several other international organizations in the execution of this programme. In February 1949 the Director-General of the International Labour Office took the initiative of assembling representatives of the United Nations and the other international organizations concerned, including Unesco, with a view to examining how far these other organizations could participate in carrying out the ILO labour programme and deciding, on the other hand, what contribution the ILO could make to the implementation of the related programmes of the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies.

[32] It is clear that professional training, which is an essential feature of the labour programme, is closely associated with the problem of general fundamental education. Such education makes professional training systems considerably more effective, by providing workers with the necessary basic instruction and stimulating their intelligence. This is of special importance in those vast areas that are still under-developed, where the need for fundamental education is most acutely felt and where, at the same time, technical training is one of the capital problems that must be solved if the best possible use is to be made of labour, in the interests of economic development. It is clear, therefore, that so far as this problem is concerned, Unesco and the ILO are called upon to play an important part and to complement each other's work since, with the aid of Unesco's fundamental education programme, possibilities in the way of training can be fully exploited. The ILO, therefore, is directly interested in the progress achieved as a result of Unesco's programme in this field. Following on exchanges of views between the representatives of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, who met in 1949 to discuss the labour programme, it was agreed that the two Organizations should maintain and develop the close contact they had already established in this manner. The opinion, in particular, was expressed that Unesco could assist the execution of the ILO labour programme very effectively by compiling printed information that could be used in the training of those who had already received a certain degree of rudimentary instruction. Another possibility of useful collaboration lies in the assembling of information regarding films on professional training—a task which the Governing Body has instructed the Office to undertake.

[33] Another basic aspect of the labour programme is migration. The ILO recently convened a preliminary conference on migration, which was attended by representatives of governments concerned in the matter of migration from Europe to Europe and overseas, and by representatives of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. The ILO was glad that Unesco was able to take part in this preliminary conference and make a valuable contribution to its work. Unesco stated that it was prepared to provide technical assistance by obtaining material that would enable future emigrants to acquire a knowledge of foreign languages; by enabling a better conception to be gained of the type of life and social conditions prevailing in the countries to which the emigrants were proceeding; by encouraging a receptive attitude, on the part of those countries, towards immigrants, and by promoting the cultural assimilation of those immigrants and mutual understanding between workers in the countries of emigration and immigration.

[34] The labour programme therefore holds out prospects of constructive co-operation with a view to the solving of urgent problems, including the possible establishment of joint technical assistance missions to deal with certain labour matters that are the concern of more than one international institution. When these problems are dealt with empirically, theoretical questions of competence do not arise. While the ILO is essentially concerned with technical and professional training for industry, it is glad to recognize the joint nature of the responsibilities it shares with Unesco as regards the professional training imparted in educational establishments. These are not functions that can be strictly delimited. What matters, in each given case, is the definition of the part that each organization can play in solving specific problems.

[35] Another field in which Unesco and the ILO are mutually concerned is that of vocational guidance. Unesco is mainly concerned with educational guidance, i.e. guidance as a general means of education. Vocational guidance however, in so far as it is connected with the operation of employment services, vocational guidance centres, appointments boards, and in so far as it depends on openings for employment, is essentially a matter for the ILO. It should perhaps be recalled that at its last session, in June 1949, the International Labour Conference adopted a detailed recommendation on vocational guidance. Existing co-operation in this matter was shown by the fact that Unesco was consulted when the projects submitted to the Conference were being worked out.

[36] The training of specialized staff is another vast and complex problem, and this too is connected with the general question of labour. Apart from training of workers in the various branches of technology that are essential to economic development, one of the prime problems with which under-developed countries are faced is that of finding the directing and specialized personnel they need. There is however at present no international organization that is considering making itself fully responsible for the training of specialized personnel and of administrative or planning staff. This is a matter that concerns both Unesco and the ILO, as well as other organizations, including the United Nations and the International Trade Organization. It will need to be seriousy considered when the general problems raised by the development of economically under-developed countries are studied.

[37] The International Labour Office has collected information on the international movement of apprentices, with a view to keeping the latter informed of the practical opportunities available for them to acquire technical qualifications and experience abroad. In this matter there has been close co-operation with Unesco. Mention should here be made of the joint meeting of ILO and Unesco experts, which was held in February 1950, on exchange programmes in the matter of education and culture. One of the main problems discussed by this Conference was that of the cultural guidance to be given to learners who were sent abroad. It marked the beginning of joint action in a field where such action should produce the best results in future, and this co-operation is now being continued in the shape of the preparation of a joint programme as regards the exchange of learners.

[38] For many years the ILO has striven to secure, on an international level, a reduction in hours of work, the observance of a weekly day of rest, and a system of annual holidays with pay. This campaign, waged over many years, has now borne fruit. In recent years, there has been a remarkable increase in the time and energy that workers can devote to leisure-time pursuits. We have arrived at the point where the problem of organizing leisure and the time spent on annual leave is becoming a social problem no less important than those arising as regards the education, the health and well-being of workers. From its earliest days, the ILO has taken a special interest in the question of workers' leisure time. The International Labour Conference adopted, in 1924, a recommendation regarding the use of workers' leisure time. Recently, the study of these problems has been actively resumed and special attention paid to the time of adolescence, particularly to the organization of holiday camps for young workers. In the same context, special consideration has been given to the question of group travel, which, if organized on an international scale, may be of great value in bringing the peoples closer together. In all these matters we shall not fail to ask Unesco for aid and advice with a view to the successful execution of the ILO's programme.

[39] From its earliest days, the ILO has been concerned with the problems of intellectual workers. Just before the war, the Organization had to concern itself with the question of performers' rights in the matter of broadcasting, television and mechanical sound reproduction. This work was interrupted by the war, but the matter has recently been taken up again by the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, in whose activities Unesco has been asked to take part. In this matter too the ILO will continue to remain in close contact with Unesco.

[40] Finally, the ILO has for many years been concerned with the development of the co-operative movement. This movement is a matter of special interest, particularly in the countries of Asia, where its organization is an important feature of development plans. The governments of those countries have adopted, with regard to the co-operative movement, a policy designed to widen its scope by extending it to every branch of the national economy, with a view more especially to the increase of production and productivity and the improvement of distribution. At a recent regional Asiatic Conference, held in January 1950 in Ceylon, the International Labour Office was asked to supply all the aid it could to the countries of Asia in connexion with the preparation and execution of plans for the extension of the co-operative movement. This is a field in which various organizations other than the ILO —and especially Unesco—are concerned, and there is a clear need for joint action.

[41] To sum up, I have been at pains to mention some of the fields in which, in the view of the ILO, there seems to be a need for joint action by our two Organizations in the interests of social progress throughout the world. I would like to end what I have to say by emphasizing the close and permanent relations existing between the International Labour Office and the Secretariat of Unesco, which exchange views on all matters of common interest. The ILO, so far as it is concerned, keenly hopes that this close co-operation will continue.

[42] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Israel.

[43] Mr. S. GINOSSAR (Israel) — Mr. President, the delegation of Israel joins in the general chorus of appreciation and of gratitude to the Italian people and to the City of Florence for the gracious, warm hospitality which has been extended to us in these beautiful surroundings, which challenge those of our generation to express the finest and noblest in us, even as have the men who have created these great masterpieces of art.

[44] We also express our appreciation for the work of Unesco and of its Director-General, done in such difficult circumstances. We have heard here words of criticism of Unesco's programme. At this stage we do not presume to judge of its efficacy; first because our experience in Unesco is so recent, and second, because in general there are no convenient measuring rods for spiritual achievement such as Unesco's programme in aiming to promote the will to Peace through education and culture. We do remember, however, the ancient wisdom contained in the advice of the Bible: "Despise not the day of small beginnings." In proportion to the gigantic task facing Unesco, its present programme is of necessity in the nature of such small beginnings. But it is from such that great structures are built, if we have but the faith and the will. It has been suggested in this Assembly, that the spiritual message of Unesco cannot carry weight so long as this or that people has, or thinks it has, a grievance against the United Nations for not preventing a wrong or for not putting it right. We submit that this attitude amounts to putting the cart before the horse. In this troubled world of ours many people unavoidably nurse grievances, real or imaginary. The right way, however, is not to reject the message of Unesco until the world achieves perfect justice, but on the contrary, to put our faith in the United Nations, and to work for and with Unesco in order to achieve gradually a better world. This is how we in Israel feel, even though we too have had our moments of disappointment with the United Nations.

[45] This is the second year of Israel's experience in Unesco. What we have done is indeed in the nature of small beginnings. We have translated the Declaration of Human Rights into Hebrew and are teaching it in our schools. We have a provisional Unesco Commission, which is soon to become a National Commission. We have begun to co-operate in international projects relating to the Natural Sciences, and are particularly concerned with programmes of conquering the wilderness and of irrigating arid zones. We look forward to co-operative studies and projects in the social sciences, for Israel, as a new State to which are coming homeless immigrants from many lands, offers an unusual human laboratory for studying and directing the social, psychological and economic adjustment of groups of men of different cultural backgrounds. From the extraordinary experience of Israel as a re-created State can be developed a large body of knowledge concerning human problems of tension and adjustment, such as would take many years, over much wider areas, to gather elsewhere.

[46] But it must be evident that Israel has been greatly handicapped in its cultural and educational work. *Inter arma tacent musae.* Our State was born in the throes of a war waged against our wishes and against the decisions of the United Nations. We still live in conditions of an armistice; we still have no peace treaties with our neighbours, who so far have rejected our repeated offers to sit down with us around a conference table. For after all, it is a peace conference that provides the proper occasion to settle, once for all, and all together, the problems arising out of the war, including the difficult problems of refugees. We believe it is quite in the spirit of Unesco that we express here Israel's deeply felt desire for peace with our neighbours near and far, as a desideratum both for its own sake and for the sake of educational, scientific and cultural co-operation in the reconstruction of our part of the globe and our sector of humanity, so necessary a phase in the reconstruction of our troubled world. In this body, dedicated to peace through culture, we can do no better than repeat the brief remarks of Israel's President, Dr. Weizmann, uttered at the recent semi-Jubilee celebration of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I quote his actual words:

> As we enter upon the threshold of a new era in the life of the University and of our nation, I feel impelled to look forward, and to express the thought for which I cannot think of any more fitting occasion. For in the very year when we laid the foundation stone of the Hebrew University in 1918, we also laid the foundation for a house yet unbuilt: Jewish-Arab friendship. The words of mutual reassurance of good will which I then exchanged with King Feisal may not have been in vain, and perhaps sooner than enemies of peace think, the day may come when the two nations will, to their mutual benefit, contribute to the establishment of a belt of flourishing countries, stretching from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, where the people of Israel and the people of the Arab countries may co-operate in peace and harmony. Then this University of ours will join hands with its sister institutions in our neighbour countries in teaching the youth of this historic region the secrets of nature and the precepts of mankind. Surely this is not a narrow chauvinistic ideal. It is a large and inspiring human conception worthy of the sympathies and enthusiasm of the best of our youth. Nor do I think this thought to be either premature or irrelevant. In fact, I am confident that beyond

the ephemeral noise of war propaganda and the clamour for revenge in our neighbours' camp, reason will prevail. May then, from this unique city of Jerusalem which embodies all that is most sacred in our heritage and from this Hebrew University which is the cultural centre of our State and a rallying symbol for Jewish communities the world over, may from Mount Scopus come forth a message of peace and constructive work for the benefit of our people and its neighbours.

[47] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I should now call upon the representative of Egypt. But the representative of Iraq has asked leave to make a statement. I therefore call upon the delegate of Iraq.

[48] Dr. Mohamed Fadhel JAMALI (Iraq) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, I do not wish to enter into political polemics here; Unesco is not the place for it. I wish, however, to present a quotation from the *New York Times* which I have received this morning from New York, and which will answer the desire for peace which was expressed by the previous speaker. From the *New York Times*, 10 May:

Armed Israeli forces using mortars and automatic weapons have driven 12,000 Arabs from two villages and 55,000 acres ready for harvest, south of Hebron in Palestine, an informed source reported today.

The paper then goes on to say:

The Arab villagers were reported embittered by the armed attack carried out on the night of 3 May. Informants said that the Arab villagers have returned the fire with rifles. One farmer was reported injured and three taken prisoners. The residents of two villages, Yatar and Assamu in the south of Palestine, said they had farmed the land for generations and had had no advance notice of the occupation. They said the Israelis had not exercised the right to move up to the new boundary until the area of wheat and barley was ready for harvesting.

This is the desire for peace expressed by the previous speaker.

[49] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I must point out to the Iraqi delegate that this matter is not a point of order, because it deals with a question that is not on the agenda of the Conference. The Conference, therefore, cannot take note of what has just been stated. I now call upon the representative of Egypt.

[50] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Italian Government and the town of Florence for the welcome they have extended to the delegations. But when one has given to the world what Italy has given and offered it what Florence has offered, praise or compliments are superfluous. I would also like to add the Egyptian delegation's modest but very warm tribute to the other eloquent tributes that have been paid to the Director-General of Unesco since this Conference began.

[51] I have a few words to say about the Director-General's excellent report. I have the greatest admiration for this exceedingly well-prepared document, which I have read with the same pleasure as if I had been reading one of the best books in the world. But the Director-General, to whom so many compliments have been paid in these last few days, will not, I am sure, object to receiving, also, a few complaints. There is too much paper, too many documents, and this reminds me of the story of that Arab scholar of the past who was found dead under his own mass of books. I wonder whether there is not a danger that all the members of the delegations may be buried or submerged beneath this mass of documents that increases every day, whether we are at Florence or at home. Frankly, there are too many of them. There are too many of them, and we receive them in the certainty that we shall never read them, which is sad. Everyone knows how unsatisfactory it is to have interesting matter before one and to know that one has no chance of reading it. I do not know whether the Director-General and his colleagues realize that Unesco's papers and documents arrive in a Ministry of Education addressed to a poor Minister who is completely precluded from reading them, overwhelmed as he is by the countless notes that he receives from his own Ministry. If the Director-General really wishes to secure from Member States the co-operation, and from National Commissions the assistance, he desires, the first thing to do is to send them somewhat fewer documents, somewhat less paper. I remember a passage by Paul Valéry in one of his books. He imagines the world for some reason waking up one day and finding there is no more paper. I would like to think that for some reason Member States might wake up one day and find that no Unesco paper or document had arrived for them. I am certain that the States would be little the worse, and Unesco none the worse; and that it would be quite easy for relations between Unesco and its Member States to be preserved, and for everything to proceed very satisfactorily, without all these documents.

[52] I am an assiduous reader, so far as I can be, of the Director-General's reports, and I am a most obedient person. He has asked us to examine our consciences vis-à-vis Unesco. I have

examined my conscience, and have even examined the conscience of the State I represent, and after this double process my conscience is quite clear; for in order to carry out Unesco's wishes it is not indispensable to be in daily contact with it, or to read all the notes and reply to them. The main thing is to be in agreement with Unesco as to the essential features of its programme. I am convinced that Egypt is one of the countries that carry out Unesco's wishes as faithfully as possible. This it is doing because to do so corresponds to a tradition, the great tradition of Egypt that has been handed down from the most ancient times. One only needs to read Herodotus to realize that Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece were, perhaps, the first in the world to establish some form of intellectual co-operation. Since that time, Egypt has never ceased to play the part for which its history and geographic situation have cast it. Because of its place in the world, it is a bridge between the West and the East. Because of its traditions, it has always interpreted the West to the East and the East to the West. It has absorbed, preserved and spread Hellenic culture; it has absorbed, preserved and spread Moslem culture. These two roles which it has played throughout its history have enabled it to help to bring the East closer to the West and to carry the most important cultural values from one to the other. Today, Egypt is continuing in its traditions, and doing just that which Unesco asks that other States shall do for the purpose of advancing its aims. Since the nineteenth century, Egypt has resumed its role of interpreter between East and West; and collaboration between Egypt and Eastern and Western countries has not ceased to develop, to become closer and more intense.

[53] As soon as Egypt achieved, in 1922, some measure of independence, it founded its first university and appealed for the co-operation of professors from the whole of the Western world. From 1925 up to the war, French, English, Italian, German and Russian professors taught at one and the same time in the Arts School and the other faculties of this Egyptian University. These professors met as members of the Boards of Faculties, so that it was said, with some justification, that these Boards were in fact tiny "leagues of nations". This co-operation has continued ever since. In 1942, during the war, when Egyptian territory had just been invaded, Egypt founded its second university, at Alexandria, and succeeded in obtaining for it the services of professors from all the then Allied countries. This year, Egypt has founded a third university, and intends to do there what it has already done in the first two, namely to secure the services of as many foreign professors as possible, in the required cases, from every Western country. But this is not all. In secondary education, Egypt engages foreign teachers to teach foreign languages and literature. There are in fact Egyptian teachers who teach French and English, but it is our view that, in the case of instruction in foreign languages and literature, there should be some of the relevant foreign as well as the Egyptian teachers. Even in secondary education, therefore, there is international collaboration between Egypt and Europe.

[54] Moreover, thanks to its celebrated Religious University of El Azar, students have from the earliest times come to Egypt from all over the Moslem world. The first university has, from its inception, never ceased to extend its hospitality to students from the Moslem world as a whole; and before the war it even received students from the Far East—from Japan and China. There are in Egypt over 5,000 foreign students who have come from the Arab and Moslem world. Many of them have entered an Egyptian university. None of them pays any university dues, and some (mainly students from poor Palestine, and Arab students who have been driven from their homeland) receive assistance from the Egyptian Government, so as to enable them to live. But Egypt is not content merely to receive foreign students. She sends her own graduates to European countries, like France, England, Germany, Italy and Switzerland, and also to America to complete their studies; the extent of this movement may be estimated by the fact that there are some 1600 Egyptian students working abroad.

[55] Finally, as regards translations, in the year 1949-1950 alone 98 foreign books were translated into Arabic, and the Egyptian Ministry of Education has just decided that this year the complete works of Shakespeare and Racine shall be translated.

[56] Egypt is really doing everything that it or any other nation possibly can do to carry out Unesco's wishes. I am quite sure that if the Director-General were to visit Egypt he would feel himself absolutely at home just as if he were in his office in Paris, because he would find there an atmosphere of co-operation, understanding and agreement between Egypt, Europe and America, and especially between the East and the West.

[57] So much should be said as regards the part of Unesco's programme and recommendations concerned with international collaboration. As regards education and mass communication, here

too I would invite the Director-General to visit Egypt. He would find a country that has lately gained its independence and is seeking, in a sincere spirit of good will, to introduce Eastern peoples to whatever is best in Western civilization. It is from the West that Egypt has received its institutions, its constitutions, and especially the "democratization" of teaching. The first modern Egyptian Constitution laid down (1923) that there should be compulsory education for all Egyptians. Schools are being set up and developed so far as the financial situation permits, and I should add that for some years now Egypt has been making quite a special effort to foster and spread education and to bring it within the reach of all. The Egyptian Government has now this year, decided that secondary and technical education, up to the *baccalauréat*, shall be entirely free of charge. Primary education has been free of charge since 1942. All this is not a full description of what Egypt has done in the educational field. The country is not egotistical; it is not egotistical because its history, traditions and geographical position have impelled it to think not only of itself but of others. There are, in the Eastern Arab world, some 400 Egyptian teachers who are teaching in neighbouring countries. Many of them are paid for this work by the Egyptian Government itself when, for instance, they are asked for by charitable organizations or by schools that are independent of State control.

[58] If the Director-General considers all this, he cannot, I think, reproach Egypt with not conforming to Unesco's wishes or not helping Unesco to achieve its aims. Nor, I think, can such criticism be levelled at other States. A State has its duties towards the people for which it is responsible. It has other things to do than to receive, read and reply to every document sent it. There is an Arab proverb which says "only your own nail can really scratch your own skin". Forgive me this homely expression; but if Unesco wants the various States to take an interest in it, it is for Unesco to visit those States, make contact with them, see what they are achieving, and tell them what, in its view, they should or should not do. But Unesco is not well enough informed. There is an office in Paris, a machine about as cumbersome as can be imagined, that produces an unending series of documents, distributes them throughout the world and waits for the various countries to reply to them. It is not thus, in my view, that Unesco will secure co-operation from its Member States. Unesco should have a representative accredited to the Minister of Education in each Member State. That representative would see with his own eyes what was going on, keep Unesco informed, and transmit Unesco's reports or ideas to the Minister of Education; he would constitute the daily contact between the Ministers and Unesco. A Unesco representative is a living, intelligent, thinking being, who creates life around him. A Minister, on learning of the Unesco representative's arrival, would receive him in the same way as he receives the representative of a friendly State. He could not say that he would not receive him; he could not ignore him; whereas he has little hesitation in ignoring a document, which is, after all, a lifeless thing. If I have any proposal to make to the Director-General, it is a very modest one. I do not ask that regional or local centres should be set up everywhere; I merely ask that Unesco representatives should be accredited to the various Ministers of Education. After all, Unesco today has a staff of some 810 persons; it is not a great deal to ask for 56 more. I think we should all be prepared to help to find or save the money required for appointing these Unesco representatives accredited to Member States.

[59] In the Director-General's report and in all the speeches we have so far heard, much has been said of Unesco and peace. I am a newcomer to Unesco, and this is the first time I have had the honour of taking part in its work. I am not very familiar with Unesco procedure, and I have the grave defect of distrusting anything that is said or done vaguely. I fear that Unesco will never succeed in bringing about peace here and now: and I think that the cobbler should stick to his last. Politicians can make peace just as they can make war, but the people concerned with science, culture and education must first of all do their own job; in doing their own job honestly and sincerely, in accordance with Unesco's ideals, they may, it is true, not achieve peace today; but they will prepare the way for peace tomorrow. By creating, by doing all we can to create, and by giving a better humanity to the world, a humanity that is better aware of itself, more immediately conscious of its duties than of its rights, and more conscious of human and social solidarity; by doing our best to create that humanity, we or our successors may some day, sooner or later, succeed in bringing about a world that may perhaps think of how to avoid war. But all that we can say today, to banish the spectre of war and bring about peace on earth, is just so many words, and nothing more. I do not know; perhaps I am superstitious; but I do not like it when people talk too much of war, especially in learned and cultured circles. Quite enough, indeed too much, is said about it in political circles, in the press, and on the radio;

everywhere there is constant talk of "war and peace". Peace is threatened, war is imminent, peace is no longer threatened, war is no longer imminent . . ., that is all one hears, outside scientific and cultural circles. I would have liked scientific and cultural circles to be a refuge in which one could spend a few peaceful moments, without eternally hearing about war and peace. If too much is said of war, I fear there is a danger of its being brought forth. If too much is said of peace, I fear peace may be scared away and become an ideal impossible of attainment. Once again, let everyone do his own job; let the politicians pursue their policies of peace or war, but let the people concerned with education, culture and science occupy themselves with education, culture and science. They can be quite sure that if they stick to their job, and nothing but their job, they will sooner or later succeed in establishing that peace for which we all long.
[60] An Arab poet writes of some travellers who are so exhausted by their travels that they have become as thin as a lance. They travel on camels which are so emaciated that they too are as thin as a lance. It is a case, he says, of lances mounted on lances. They are travelling in search of something, something of which they simply want to see the beginning; they are not concerned with its end. Gentlemen, let us emulate those travellers; we are weighed down by our task, and our mounts, our means, are likewise tired and jaded. To use the poet's words, we are lances mounted on lances. Let us concern ourselves with beginning our task well, and leave it to our successors to complete it.

[61] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

[62] Mr. D. R. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I want first to apologize to those delegates who have already spoken this morning that I had not the privilege of listening to their speeches. But, as you will recognize when you receive the report, many of us have been engaged on an important meeting of the Credentials Committee. I am sure, however, I am voicing the opinion of all the delegates present that it has been a privilege to listen to the speech of the delegate of Egypt who has just resumed his place.
[63] In common with members of other delegations, the United Kingdom delegation wishes me to express, in warm terms, our delight and honour in taking part in this Conference in this lovely city. To be in Italy is indeed a most refreshing experience. We in England—and I say particularly England here, though I know I represent a delegation of the United Kingdom—we in England, have particularly strong ties with Italy. That Renaissance which began here produced in England the perfect flowering of Shakespeare's poetry, one star in a galaxy of stars at that time.

> *When he speaks*
> *The air, a chartered libertine, is still*
> *And a mute wonder lurketh in men's ears*
> *To steal his sweet and honeyed sentences.*

Then to Florence, later, poets have come from England to enjoy in person the sweet sway of Italy, Shelley and Byron, Walter Savage Landor, the Brownings. Nor do Englishmen ever forget that, lying side by side in Rome, are the bodies of Shelley and his Adonais "... he whose name was writ in water"—John Keats. And with all the warmth that I can command, I will say on behalf of my delegation, that the supreme gift of Italy to civilization and to the arts is that "... she doth teach the torches to burn bright". We are honoured also, fellow delegates, to be under the distinguished chairmanship of a Senator of Italy. We are honoured also to have received a welcome from the chief citizen of this historic city. While we are here, "beauty doth of itself persuade the eyes of men without an orator" and so I will resist more eulogies and leave Florence to cast her magic upon us.
[64] In commenting upon the Director-General's Report, I am somewhat at a disadvantage this year, in that my distinguished colleague, Sir John Maud, speaking as Chairman of the Executive Board, has already said many of the things which my delegation wished to hear said. Those inimitable phrases of his often expressed, in his comments on the Report, what has been in our minds at meetings of our national Co-operating Bodies. His praise for the Director General and his Secretariat finds an echo in our minds, as does also our conviction that Unesco has already changed the minds of some men, and his confidence that Unesco has power to extend its work and widen its influence. Above all, we support with enthusiasm his words about the Director-General's Report as a whole. It is an admirable Report, and as a Conference we should be proud of it and of the man who has written it. The Director-General has set a high ideal before us in language both moving and inspiring. But then, I suffer from another disadvantage, and that is that I follow the speech of the distinguished leader of the delegation of the United States of America. In fact he has pinched three of my quotations. There was no collaboration either on his part or on mine. We did not collaborate in the preparation of our speeches. So perhaps

there is some significance in the fact that we both built the body of our remarks on the Director- General's Report, first of all around the questions which the Director-General asks in his second paragraph. "What is Unesco's position? How useful is the Organization? And what can it do to fulfil the lofty purposes laid down for it by its Constitution in the present-day world?"

[65] We must face facts. One fact is that there is tension and conflict in the world today. That again echoes what the leader of the American delegation said to us yesterday. And the Director-General's first question puts this problem squarely before us. The answer is, to my mind. clear. There are at least two ways of tackling this problem—a political way and a more fundamental way; both are necessary but both cannot be done by one organization. The political way is not Unesco's. That is the way of the United Nations; it is their responsibility. Unesco is dedicated in its Constitution to the creation of mutual understanding between peoples as a long-term objective. Nothing that has happened since 1945 makes this objective any the less desirable or necessary. Just because it is fundamental no one but Unesco can do it. My delegation was, therefore, gratified to hear the Director-General say in his great speech on Monday, that Unesco's authority is of a moral character. It must be moral, not political, a long-term objective eschewing delusive short-cuts. How delusive short-cuts can be, I, as one who has climbed many mountains in different parts of the world, know only too well. The short-cut can be extremely tedious on the way up and completely disastrous on the way down.

[66] There has been some suggestion that a programme of a more short-term character is required for Unesco. But let us remember that if some things seem intangible, difficult to define, like actions of a moral and spiritual character, that does not mean that they are not intensely real. The long-term approach is more difficult, but that is because it is new, and, indeed, revolutionary. The alternative proposals I have heard put forward in this hall are not new. They have been tried before and many of them have failed. Conferences about peace, conventions about peace—have we not heard of them before? The really new approach, I suggest, is the one which Unesco has been initiating these three years, the slow painstaking building of international understanding in the common everyday tasks of teachers, scientists and, indeed, of man in all his vocations and professions. This is a task that calls for faith and farsightedness. Let us not abandon it because of impatience. Let us continue to serve it, improving our methods, perfecting our organization. We now have before this Conference a list of these methods, let us concentrate on applying them while keeping our eyes fixed on our goal.

[67] Now, when the Director-General asks, how useful is the Organization, I have no hesitation in saying that his own words in his Report illustrate the service that the Organization is performing. Whatever we may say about certain particular activities, there is no doubt in my mind that the form of programme which Unesco is developing is the right and proper one. But, having said that, we must take thought in a mood of sober realism for the means which will enable our ends to be achieved. So naturally we must ask ourselves: What about those who do the job in Paris? Of the undue burden now placed on the Director-General and his staff I can only speak with alarm. Ladies and gentlemen, we must sit up and take notice when our Director-General says—again quoting from the report by the leader of the American delegation—"We have been so occupied with reporting on the past and preparing for the future that we have scarcely had time to do anything in the present. This is not the way to imbue a new organization with energy and enthusiasm." Then, later, he refers to the general critical attitude that we find in many countries of the world, in the press and in speech, about Unesco's bureaucracy. The Director-General says:

> The general public often criticizes Unesco for becoming entangled in the frustrating meshes of bureaucracy. In every session of the General Conference, many delegations protest against this tendency, and in particular against the excessive number of documents produced by the Secretariat.

And at past Conferences my delegation has made some of the loudest protests.

> Although, the Director-General goes on, the Secretariat is the instrument of these bureaucratic procedures, it is not responsible for them; it is, in fact, their first victim. The General Conference itself, by its general regulations or particular decisions, has gradually evolved those procedures and extended them at every new session.

That, surely, does call for an economy of suggestion and resolution from all of us who are delegates here. I am not sure, however, that that is the whole story. I think that there may well be—and we are much to blame for it as a Conference—a side to this bureaucracy which the Secretariat itself can eliminate at headquarters. Then the Director-General goes on:

> If the effective energy necessary to achieve the programme is to be preserved in the Secretariat, the burden of office work must be appreciably reduced. Action is one thing, preparing reports is another; and

the necessity of having constantly to give an account of one's work gradually saps all initiative. The Fourh Session of the General Conference was to be 'a short business session'. Nevertheless, owing to the regulations in force, it was necessary to produce some 5,000,000 pages of documents for it. As for the forthcoming session, the Secretariat has never before been asked to submit so many or such voluminous reports.

All of it apparently part and parcel of that modern conceit in administration in your countries and in mine, and in international organizations, that thinks that when it has printed something, even whether it is distributed or not, a good job of work has been done. That is a prevailing disease, I suggest, in governments and international organizations all over the world.

[68] May I refer, then, to the short session that we must soon begin to plan for 1951. It is again described as it was in 1949 . . . "a short business session". I must say my delegation was very, very dubious that it would ever come off, when it was first discussed for 1949. We are a bit dubious that it will come of in 1951, as a short business session. We are certain that it should be a short and a business-like session. In the present state of the Organization, we cannot yet forego this annual review. Perhaps the suggestion, which I heartily support, made by the United States delegate, that we should review our statutory obligations, is the way out in future years. In 1951 we are bound to hold this Conference, but for heaven's sake let it be short, and let it be concerned solely with the statutory jobs that need doing. Let us all agree to cut out the blarney and let the Secretariat get on with the job of priming the national pumps.

[69] Every one must agree with the Director-General that to get on with the job in Member States is the crucial issue that faces Unesco Conferences at this time. He rightly says that the Secretariat is merely one of Unesco's organs, that with the least authority and the most limited resources. What are we to do in our own countries with our National Commissions? At every Conference we attend, ought we not to be asking also, not merely what has the Director-General and his Secretariat done, but what have we done at home? Somehow we have to focus the attention of delegates on the work of National Commissions. One way I believe of doing this would be to devote the first few plenary meetings of each Conference to factual reports on what we have all been doing within our own frontiers, what our National Commissions have been doing. Those first few plenary meetings at General Conferences—I am not, of course, wanting to add this to the short business conference—should be devoted by delegates to listening to and discussing suggestions from those who can speak of National Commissions at home. We spend so much time talking about our ideals in the first week of the Unesco Conference. I take it for granted we have all got them, otherwise we should not belong to the Organization. Let us think, in the Conferences that lie ahead, of talking about our work at home instead. This factual review would be a better stimulus than many resolutions on the matter. I also think that the Director-General and the Executive Board have a responsibility here. The participation of Member States is not secured simply by passing resolutions. I think it is for the Executive Board to make sure that projects are planned right from the start and in detail to give National Commissions definite work to do. Too often it has seemed in the past that the part that can be played by National Commissions has only been considered after a project has been planned. In short, one of the criteria to be used in planning a programme should be the degree of participation which it allows to National Commissions, and I would like on behalf of my delegation to suggest that the Executive Board bear this in mind. Membership of Unesco means not taking but giving. It is not a question of how much the Secretariat can give to the individual State, but the reverse. We must use plain words —words stripped of their shirts, as an old writer puts it. I believe that if more planning of this sort were done, the result would be a decrease in the size of the Secretariat, not an increase.

[70] In Mexico City my delegation called for a streamlining of effort. We admit and are delighted that much has been done in this direction, but we suggest that still more remains to do. One of Unesco's pressing problems is to achieve a Unesco-wide approach to the planning of projects instead of a departmental one. We know from the Director-General's Report that he has this objective at heart, and we hope that he and his Heads of Departments will assume a collective responsibility for the planning of the programme. What Unesco needs, using a British term—or a democratic term—is "cabinet" government under the Director-General's own inspiring leadership. This suggestion too was put forward by the leader of the United States delegation. It would mean that the Heads of Departments in the Secretariat would consider projects, decide which were of prior importance, decide against those which were not. Such a cabinet might decide that the only way to co-ordinate the programme effectively would be not to concentrate exclusively on a short series of priorities, to the work on which everything else is sacrificed, but rather to consider the grouping of items in the programme under—if you like using a colloquial term—"shop-window titles", titles that appeal to the general mass of

people. Would it not be better to do this than leave them listed, as they are today, a series of files for which separate sections of an international civil service are responsible? Details of any such plan can be worked out as was suggested yesterday, but one might perhaps throw into the arena of discussion right away one or two suggestions to indicate what I mean.

[71] For instance, when I go to address the United Nations Association branch in my own country—a meeting of 200 or 300 people, intelligent as a rule, distinguished citizens of their town or city—and I begin speaking about Unesco's desire to promote the breaking down of barriers, the desire to effect the exchange of persons, when I use terms like that, which are strictly official terms and descriptions, I find the response of the faces of those in my audience is not very great. But if I say we are passionately concerned in Unesco with the promotion of freedom and these are the things that prevent freedom, if I give the many ways, scattered throughout Unesco's programme, of how we are trying to re-establish freedom, for instance, across frontiers, then I find the light of understanding begins to come over the faces before me. I go on to say we are out for equality of opportunity. That means much more than saying that part of our programme is fundamental education, that there are Field Science Co-operation Offices, there is President Truman's Point 4, there is the problem of handicapped children, the problem of reconstruction. When I speak about the establishment of human rights, am I not using a heading which means something and which grips the imagination of the ordinary man? In other words, I am pleading for far more co-ordination in the Secretariat for the working out of the programme, and in such co-ordination something should emerge which should appeal to the "man in the street". We must learn—and intellectuals I know find it most difficult to do this but they have got to learn to do it; we politicians are always doing it—Unesco, I say, must learn to dress its shop-window, not with Himalayas of memoranda and reports, but with colourful presentations of jobs being done now and jobs we intend to do tomorrow.

[72] Perhaps such an integrated approach to planning would help to eradicate one of Unesco's worst handicaps, the faults of its Information and Publication Service. Relations with the press and with the public generally have not been inspiring, and that is putting it mildly. During the last few months there have been some improvements, and under Dr. Schneider, who will be the officer departmentally responsible, we expect, and we know we shall not expect in vain, further improvements. But there are many improvements that require to be made: the nature of some of the press releases, the notifications of publication dates and above all, the imaginative writing of copy material. Before coming to this Conference I received a Unesco release to read on Wordsworth, an important centenary celebrating the death of one of our major poets. I do not know to whom that release was addressed, but I can say this, their intelligence quotient must have been very low indeed. And then I think the Unesco *Courier* could be a much bigger force than it is, if its matter and form were improved. And I still think, and one has said this before at previous Conferences, that the Publications and Press Service Sections of Unesco can learn a very great deal from the education schemes run for the Services in many countries represented here today. I can speak from first-hand experience of the admirable Bureau for Education in the Services that was organized by the United States Government, and one can also, of course, speak of the efforts we made in Britain, and I think made successfully, to get factual documentation—not propaganda, but an objective statement of the problems that faced us in the war, before the war and in the peace to follow—to millions of men and women in all parts of the word. And it may be—I am strongly sure myself that it is the answer—that an alternative to the *Courier* and to many haphazard publications, is a systematic series of publications in short form, in pictorial form, in map form, and by booklet and pamphlet and leaflet, at stated intervals throughout the year. I need not remind the Director-General of the importance of this means of ensuring the interest of Member States and of National Commissions. Nor need I remind him, I am sure, that a swift, efficient documentation service is absolutely essential if National Commisions are to play an effective part in the work of the Organization. I am sure that the requirement is in the forefront of his mind.

[73] The Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board have commented upon the gratifying increase in Unesco's membership. My delegation hopes that the General Conference will welcome our proposal to bring Unesco's message more directly to millions of our people in the British overseas territories. We recommend, in the resolution and memorandum you are to discuss, the creation of associate membership for those of our non-self-governing territories, which are already responsible for their domestic affairs. We believe that they will welcome the opportunity to come to the General Conferences and to begin to play their part, although as non-voting members, in our work. Unesco's hopes and aspirations are such that I am sure we shall all

welcome any peoples who will help us to translate those hopes and aspirations into reality.

[74] I have welcomed the Director-General's Report on behalf of my delegation, and expressed my admiration at his fine speech already delivered to this Conference. This view of that speech has been expressed by every delegate, but I think not all delegates have shared the superb optimism which is the flame lighting up his Report. I suggest to those delegates that they forego for a little the pleasures of pessimism. Our age has very real achievements to its credit, which have not been made by proclamations, but by day-to-day work in parliamentary and local governments. This parliamentary democracy, which so many nations have built up, is no sham. It works. It has provided men, women and children with the bread of life and with that harbour for the human spirit which is called freedom. I am not ashamed of the twenty years which have made this contribution to the history of mankind possible. I am indeed proud to represent a delegation belonging to a group of nations, democracies, which have done the exceedingly hum-drum job of giving the common people food to eat and freedom to think as they like. Even to our political opponents in democratic countries freedom is given to publish their own daily papers and to have their own parties in a freely-elected parliament, even to those who are doing their best to undermine free institutions. It is on this strength and with this token of ultimate success that we should pursue our long and arduous task. We must not rest content with our participation in this task. We must not rest content with our present membership. Let us think of ways in which to bring yet more members into our circle, as I have suggested, not merely self-governing members, but also communities which have still to achieve nationhood. That great English Catholic writer, the late G. K. Chesterton, called upon those who were entering the world of Charles Dickens' novels to "dream for one mad moment that the grass is green. Unlearn the sinister learning that you think so clear, deny the deadly knowledge that you think you know, abandon hopelessness all ye who enter here." That was the spirit of the Director-General, I suggest, in his concluding words at the third plenary meeting. Do we not share that conviction with him, when we remind ourselves that things of the spirit do prevail? Mohammed, Confucius, Jesus, the other gread leaders of the life of the spirit—in our own century, Mahatma Gandhi—have all founded empires wider and more enduring than those of Alexander and Napoleon. In this magnificent hall where we sit, we are surrounded by scenes of triumph in battle of the Medici, scenes for the glorification of the Medici above our heads—the Victory of Michelangelo surveys the scene, the labours of Hercules are commemorated in the marble of Vincenzo di Rossi. In one sense, all that is recorded around us this morning has shrunk to this little measure. In another, more vital sense, what we see is immortal—the triumphs, slaughters, spoils are but the episodes of history. The art which commemorates them, the skill of craftsmen, scientists, architects, engineers, which has made them physically possible, lives on.

[75] So in Unesco we are creating something greater than we know. I am certain we are building something which will free men's minds from suspicion and cruelty. Our destiny as from birth is still to teach the torches of art, science and culture to burn bright. We thank Italy and our Director-General for holding the flaming torch fearlessly before us today.

[76] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of New Zealand.

[77] Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, may I first say how happy we of the New Zealand delegation are to meet here in this city where no man who loves beauty could feel a stranger. Even we barbarians from the Southern Seas—I don't include Australia—find here, in almost every street, and almost every square, some object of beauty that we have known by word or by picture from our youth. Florence and this fair land of Italy have been built into the very stuff of our minds, and it is little wonder that we feel entirely at home here.

[78] Now, may I join the delegations who have spoken, in their congratulations to the Director-General not only on his Report but also on the speech with which he presented it to us. Together they represent that fusion of courage and common sense, of insight and passion, that we who know him best have come to think representative of the man. This Report, in fact, is the mirror of the man, and as one who has worked with him in closest association for twelve months I can think of no greater praise for the Report. Indeed, I have only one serious objection to make to it, and that is that among all the many wise and profound thoughts that he had to give us, he still found time to say a few small things that I had wanted to say myself, but since he has said them incomparably better than I could, I will forgive him even that.

[79] I find myself today in a rather difficult position, as a recent and renegade member of the Secretariat. I have attended five sessions of the General Conference now, two as the leader of a delegation, two as a member of the Secretariat, and now I find mysef raised, or lowered, to this position. I still feel myself hung between the

national and the international worlds, suspended like Mohammed's coffin between heaven and earth, and I refuse to say at this moment which I regard as the heaven and which the earth. But if I praise the work of the Secretariat I might be regarded as a semi-official member. If on the other hand I criticize, I might be considered as using inside knowledge to discuss faults which should remain within the bosom of the family. And in this dilemma it did occur to me that there was perhaps one small contribution I could make, and that is to make some attempt to interpret some of the problems of the Secretariat to the members of this Conference. Even here, Professor Piaget forestalled me. I have only one advantage over him, and that is that he was a member of the Secretariat for three months and I was one for eigtheen months. And a lot can happen in fifteen months in Unesco. I remember when I first entered the Organization, when I had been there three weeks, the Deputy Director-General, Walter Laves, said to me one day: "Well, how is it going?" and I said, "Fine, I have not yet found any of the difficulties that they talk about." And he said, "Never mind, wait till three months are up and you will be like the rest, and you will think the job just cannot be done." But he was wrong. I had come to that decision in two months.

[80] There is, I think, a kind of life-history of the international civil servant that might be compared to that of the butterfly, or perhaps more appropriately, the moth. After three weeks he feels that there is nothing he cannot do—and how far his introduction to the air and wines of Paris account for that, I cannot say. After three months he feels that there is nothing he can do; after six months, in his drearier moments, he either wishes he were dead or he wishes the Organization were. After nine months he will feel and see some gleam of hope. After twelve months he knows that, if he does not die first, he has a chance of doing something that is worth while. And after eighteen months, if he is lucky, he comes out and finds himself the master of new skills and with a new faith in the Organization and in his colleagues—a little sadder perhaps, but with a faith no less strong and much more real than that with which he went in. Maybe I exaggerate this life history, maybe it is a personal thing, but of one thing I am sure, and that is that every member of the Secretariat at some time in his period of office feels a longing for the concrete and the real and the stable job at the national level. It is quite unreasonable, I know, but he gets a sense of unreality about his work. He feels that he is lost in a world of words. Now, it is perhaps of no great significance to the Conference, but my ex-colleagues in the Secretariat may find some little comfort from the fact that I have now gone back to the firm earth of national administration and I sometimes now find myself wondering if the concrete work I am doing is anything like as real as the work that is being done in Unesco, if many of the solid and homely tasks within our national borders can have any meaning at all, if the things for which Unesco stands should fail. I find myself asking myself, what can it matter if the education system of New Zealand is ten per cent better or ten per cent worse, when countless millions in our neighbouring lands of Asia have no access to education of any kind.

[81] But what Professor Piaget said two days ago —I think his phrase was "the moral dissatisfaction within the Secretariat"—is not a thing to be dismissed by polite and easy phrases. There is there from time to time an unhappiness, a malaise, almost a miasma, that descends, either individually or collectively, upon the Organization. I have tried a score of times to analyse it and to find out what is the cause; and the causes are, I am sure, complex. There are certain unavoidable factors. There are many people there who are working in a language that is not their own and who feel the constant strain of that. There are others who are in danger of losing their roots in a national system, those roots which still to us, poor mortals, seem to be essential for mental health. But there is more to it than that. Professor Piaget spoke of the tempo of the work, of the tight cycle of operations within which the Secretariat works. And that, I am sure, is one of the dominant factors. It is not so much the amount of work to be done; it is the tension that comes from constant fears of crisis following crisis, of deadline following deadline. Now a deadline can be a stimulating and an exciting thing if it is used, and can be used, infrequently. But when deadline follows deadline in an endless chain it is no more exciting and no more stimulating than a series of epileptic fits. Now, it would be easy, in looking for the cause of this, to blame the Director-General. It would be easier still perhaps to blame the much abused administrative system and its Bureau of the Budget. It would not, however, be fair, if I felt that the blame, or the main blame of any sort, lay there, for me to speak of it today. I do speak of it because I feel that the responsibility for much of the state of affairs does lie with us here, with this General Conference. We can do more than anyone else to reduce the intolerable strain under which our servants are working. Mention has been made of the fact that we have had three Conferences in eighteen months. May I be personal? I entered this Organization in April 1948, and the first day, as Dr. Huxley will remember, I was rushed into a meeting to discuss the Programme for the Beirut Conference. And from then on a very large pro-

portion of my time, and my staff's time, was taken up with making programmes, budgets, work plans, working papers, reports on the work in 1948. And no sooner had we returned from Beirut than we were rushed into the business of preparing for the Paris Conference, which was no more a short working Conference from our point of view than this one is. And the moment we had finished with Paris—and before we had finished with the Paris Conference, while you were sitting in the Paris Conference—we were working on the Programme, if you please, for 1951. With the work for 1949 not half done, with 1950 almost forgotten, we had jumped a gulf and were working on the Programme to be presented here at this Conference. In between, we worked for Executive Boards, we made reports on this and that, on the work we had done, the work we were going to do, the work we could not do, and when we ran out of all that we made reports on other people's reports.

[82] Now this is an impossible state of affairs for human beings to do creative work. Our only comfort is that an organization that could stand eighteen months of that can stand almost anything that it is likely to meet in the future. I need not labour the point. I know my good friend the Director-General will agree, if not with every word, at any rate with a large amount of what I say. The miracle is that in spite of all this, some results have been achieved. Extremely important results were achieved, and members of the Secretariat did find time, from the writing of reports and the preparing of programme documents, to do valuable work, but at a cost, Professor Piaget said, which is too great for us to demand in the future. Now there are practical applications for the New Zealand delegation and for all delegations, I think, following from this. We of the New Zealand delegation will do certain things. We will support, we will listen with sympathy to, the scheme of the United States delegation to alter our Constitution to allow of two-yearly Conferences. We know that this may mean a change in the functions of the Executive Board. We know that it may mean the developing of other methods of keeping closer contact with national States in the intervening years. We will support anything that makes for fewer and shorter meetings of the Executive Board, for any change in regulations that will enable that Board to free itself from the mass of detail and to devote its high abilities to matters of equally high policy. We will exercise, I trust, a fierce restraint on ourselves in asking at this Conference for special reports. It is a chastening thought that every time you ask for a special report, every time you ask for the presentation of material in a new way, you are taking up scores and hundreds of hours that should be spent on the development of the programme. We shall support any movement for fewer programme items. This multiplicity of items in itself can be extremely exhausting to a staff. We think that there should be fewer publications and that the publications that come out should be of the highest possible standard. Half a dozen good publications in the year are worth scores of second-rate ones.

[83] We would support also, wherever possible, a reduction in the number of internal checkings, checks within the Organization. Do not let me be misunderstood here: there is a need for these checks. If you had worked in the Organization with people with so many different ideas of administration, with some people with no idea of administration at all, who had never had any experience, you would realize that some of these controls, which may seem within a national system to be unduly onerous, were at one stage in our life entirely necessary—though not all perhaps; we must keep a balance in these matters. We, you and I, are responsible to our governments for the expenditure of public monies. We are responsible to see that there is no unreasonable waste within the Organization. Yet we must remember that in an Organization whose fundamental purpose is inspiration and creation, the greatest waste of all may be that efficient and systematized waste that comes from using creative minds perpetually on routine work. I am even tempted—not to be misunderstood thereby—to say that in some ways I would even stand for less co-ordination. I think it was a tired member of the United Nations Secretariat who invented the phrase, which may not be translatable, that co-ordination is the thief of time. Co-ordination, of course, is necessary, but co-ordination does not consist in attending one another's meetings and writing one another's reports. Co-ordination between all our Specialized Agencies and co-ordination within the Secretariat is not some super kind of activity carried on by a superior individual. Co-ordination consists in creative human beings working together on a common concrete task that has meaning to all of them.

[84] There is another factor, a more subtle one, I think, that is a cause of this curious tension and periodic unhappiness that tends to sweep the Secretariat. And that is the gap that exists between our high purposes, our high ideas, on the one hand, and the means at our disposal, on the other. And here, I am afraid, I am not speaking of financial means. Even from 12,000 miles, the cold eye of the New Zealand Treasury prevent my speaking rashly there. I am speaking of the techniques, of the tools, of the skill that we have (I am speaking of myself as if I were still in the Secretariat), that the Organization, as a whole, has.

The members of the Secretariat know, as we know, that there is a sick world to be cured, and what can they do about it? They can call a Conference, they can write a paper, they can organize a seminar, they can send a mission, they can make a study; and even these skills they have only half learnt. The conscientious member of the Secretariat is all too often liable to feel that the world expects him to raise a tower to the high heavens and all he has to do it with are a few poor stone tools. He feels sometimes as an atomic physicist would feel if he were expected to split the atom with nothing but the mental and physical equipment of the alchemist of the Middle Ages. Now here, I think, the professional Unescan does himself an injustice. The Secretariat is doing in the main a completely new kind of job. It is doing a job which has been done in part before, but which, in the main, has not been done before, and of course the skills are inadequate. But one of the most encouraging things about Unesco, to us who have known it from its birth, is the amazing advances we have made in the last four years, just in the skills of our job, in the skills of our crafts. Consider, for example, the organization of this Conference. With the organization of our first two Conferences, due to nobody's fault, we just had not the skill; the amazing skill that is now shown by the members of the Secretariat is a thing that was impossible four years ago. The very budget document that you have before you, you have only to compare, in its form and its reasonableness, with the kind of documents that were the best we could produce four years ago. Consider our skills in such things as the organization of seminars, in the exchange of persons; the skills that consist in bringing human beings of different countries, of different creeds together in such conditions that they will like each other better instead of worse, as a result of meeting. There are certain tools that we do not yet know how to use thoroughly. I have never felt, for example, that we yet know how to use expert committees to the full. The development of these tools and these skills represents a very great achievement, and one which we of the New Zealand delegation feel must not be jeopardized by anything else at all. I was interested to hear Mr. Hardman's remarks on these proposed short-term plans. I have listened with interest to various suggestions for our short-range programme, of items more directly related to peace and war. They stir the imagination and I shall listen eagerly to concrete details. But I hope that our enthusiasm for these new and exciting ideas will not reduce our effort to develop those solid skills without which our noblest dreams will remain just dreams. And when I hear each proposal, I shall ask myself: will it interfere with the development of the use of the fundamental skills which, together with our faith and our friendliness, still constitute the most valuable asset of Unesco? Now this may seem a rather timid and pedestrian point of view. I do not see it so. In these humble skills that are developing, in the growing body of men and women like ourselves, from all countries, who know and understand how most effectively to work together in the fields of education, science and culture, I see the beginnings of a new and exciting hope for the world.

[85] I remember, and the Chairman of the Board will certainly remember, how in the Paris Conference of 1946, a few of us played at the game of nominating the gifts that we would ask from some fairy godmother to this infant organization that we had just seen born. If we were to play that game again I should ask for this lusty four-year-old nothing more spectacular than two or three years of calmness, security and hard thinking, to learn to leave alone the things it cannot yet do, and to do still better the many things that it is already doing so well.

[86] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As it is now rather late, I think we had better suspend the meeting and resume it at 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XIV.	Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*continuation*): Speeches by delegates of Australia, China, Ceylon, France, Philippines and Burma	141
XV.	Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new Members	156

President: Mr. D. R. HARDMAN (United Kingdom),

later: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XIV. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*continuation*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — I call upon the delegate of Israel.

[2] Mr. S. GINOSSAR (Israel) — Mr. President, the delegate of Iraq has thought proper to bring before the Assembly a newspaper report of a frontier incident in which Arabs are alleged to have been the victims. Evidently every border incident has two sides and we obviously cannot verify the facts at such short notice. We could readily find a number of border incidents in which Jews were the victims. There is an Armistice Commission presided over by a representative of the United Nations and I submit that it would be wiser and fairer for a responsible person to await the Commission's verdict in all such cases before making public statements. The essential lesson to learn from these and similar incidents is the urgent need to replace the unstable equilibrium of an armistice with real and lasting peace, and the importance of convening immediately a peace conference, which Israel keeps offering to the Arab States.

[3] The PRESIDENT — The delegate of Australia has the floor.

[4] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have already had an opportunity of expressing my great pleasure at being in this city and the gratitude of the whole Conference as well, but I would like on behalf of my colleagues in the Australian delegation to add our words of joy in finding ourselves here in Florence at this time, and to add our greetings to the Italian Government and Italian people.

[5] This is the first opportunity which the Organization has had since the Conference of Beirut to take stock of the development of Unesco, because it will be recalled that the Conference in Paris last September was restricted, as far as possible, to the transaction of urgent, essential business, and did not afford so large an opportunity for a complete examination of the stage we have reached and the directions in which we are likely to move. From that point of view, the Australian Government and the Australian delegation consider it very important that we should examine carefully and with due reflection on this occasion the developments of the last couple of years and the particular problems confronting Unesco at the present time. Looking back over this period, the first thought that we have in our mind is to congratulate our Director-General upon the way in which he has directed the work of the Secretariat and inspired the activities of the whole Organization throughout this period. We are all impressed by the fact that the annual Report submitted to the Conference on this occasion is extremely encouraging because of its solemn record of achievement in so many different fields.

[6] We think that now, in 1950, it can truly be said that the Organization is beginning to find its way, to find the way that it should follow through the complexities of the post-war world. We find evidence of that in the four main points which seem to be before this Conference in Florence. Those four points are: first, that of concentrating the programme on a few important practical activities; second, the problem of reaching a firmer conclusion regarding the best methods of work

for the Organization. The third is the emphasis on the role of the Member States, which, I think, has already been stated more clearly and by more speakers, and been stated more firmly by our own Director-General on this occasion, than ever previously in discussions at Unesco. Finally, we have the fourth major problem of this Conference, the relation of our programme and our methods to the problem of world peace. The Australian delegation is convinced that in Unesco we are at last facing up to these four major problems. These problems have been with us from the very beginning, but it is only now that they are emerging as the four great problems of Unesco, the four great problems that we have to determine and for which we must find solutions as far as possible at the present Conference. These major problems, I say, are now emerging very clearly, but we feel that it is none too soon that they should emerge clearly. We have been for too long caught, as it were, within a vicious circle of programme preparation and discussion, and I think many of us have shared the feeling that it was not possible for the Organization to go on with conference after conference at which we debated at great length all the details of a complex and extensive programme. We did seem to have got ourselves into a sort of vicious circle in which there seemed to be no way out from this continual discussion of the details of a programme of work for our Secretariat.

[7] We have also struggled with the burden of the documentation to which reference has been made by some others who have already spoken. The stage has been reached in this continual elaboration and discussion of the programme in which the documentation produced was far beyond the capacities of any delegation to absorb, and we have been running the risk of holding annual conferences at which matter after matter would be decided by vote, when perhaps not more than two or three of those who voted had had the time and the energy to master the complexity of the subjects which are dealt with in the many documents put before us. We have been told that there has been danger of a breakdown in the Secretariat from the point of view of the pressure of work and the burden upon the health of its members. We have ourselves feared a situation in which the General Conference might become increasingly ineffectual just because of the physical impossibility of dealing in a serious way with the mass of material put before us. One of the difficulties is, of course, that the delegates who come to the Conference do not have the rest of the year to prepare for it. Most of us leave other occupations which also make great demands on our time and energy, and then we are thrown, sometimes at short notice, into a Unesco Conference with piles of documents which have arrived in the preceding fortnight and continue to arrive in the early days of the Conference, and it is extremely difficult to feel that we really are taking decisions on the basis of a careful study of all the problems involved. We have felt for some time that it was necessary to break out of this vicious circle, if the Organization, as an organization, was going to fulfil the purposes laid down for it when it was founded. But now, as I said, it seems to me that the problems on this occasion are being very clearly posed, very largely owing to the clarity and fervour of our Director-General, but also owing to a gradual realization by numerous delegations, that the Organization must find solutions to the great problems that are facing it and to which I referred a moment ago.

[8] The Organization is now four years old, and it was not perhaps surprising that an organization with so vast a purpose, one covering the whole field of education, science and culture, and bound to work for co-operation between the nations in these fields and to contribute to peace, should in its early years find some difficulty in having a clear conception of the direction in which it should go and even in deciding which were the main problems to which it should address itself. But now, after four years, the friends of this Organization in Australia, the Australian Government, the Australian Co-operating Bodies, are convinced that a time has come when our great need may well prove to be the need for stability, stability in our programme, stability in our Organization and even stability in the budgetary provisions of the Organization.

[9] Now, I propose to say just a little about the four problems that I mentioned and to give you some of the observations that have been made in Australia, in Government circles, in our national Co-operating Bodies and throughout the public, regarding these problems facing Unesco. First of all, the problem which we all agree is a very serious one indeed, that of concentrating our unduly diffuse programme upon a limited series of activities, the value of each of which must be clearly understood and recognized by the members of the Organization. In this connexion we have before this Conference resolutions which were adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, concerning the programmes of the Specialized Agencies. These resolutions have been made the subject of a special report by the Executive Board and at a later stage in the Conference it will be our duty to examine the views expressed by the United Nations and addressed by its General Assembly to all the Specialized Agencies. The general direction of those resolutions is to impress upon us the need at this time

for each of the Specialized Agencies—and that means for Unesco as well—to make sure that we are concentrating our efforts on those activities, preferably on a restricted number of activities, which will make the greatest contribution to the common objectives of the whole United Nations system at this time. The whole problem, of course, is one of choice, and if we are going to concentrate on a few great enterprises, there are many other enterprises that will just have to be pushed aside. That is one of the laws of life, that when emphasis is to be given to important matters, less important matters must take a second place. So far as we are concerned in Australia, we would give priority—and throughout the Conference this will be the policy that we shall follow—to projects designed to promote co-operation and mutual assistance in the development of education and science, particularly in the less developed countries.

[10] In the early stages of the post-war period, we welcomed the very great emphasis placed on the reconstruction of war-devastated areas. We are convinced that the main emphasis over the next few years must be upon the assistance of the stronger countries for the development of the educational systems and the scienfitic resources of the less developed countries, and for our part we especially hope that considerable attention and assistance will be given to the needs of the great neighbouring countries in South East Asia, in which Australia is taking a very great interest. If we are going to give emphasis to the practical work of building up and strengthening the less developed parts of the world, the inevitable consequence will be that some, perhaps many, of our more abstract studies, and some of our broader cultural activities, may have to be postponed and some of those that are at present being undertaken may have to be reduced in scope and even, for the time being, held over. That is the first observation I wish to make from the Australian point of view, following the discussions that have taken place in Australia about the work of Unesco. We would hope that, in considering the concentration of the programme, we should give special emphasis to the problem of assisting the development in a practical way of the countries which, for various reasons, are less advanced in their educational systems and in their scientific organization.

[11] The second problem is the problem of methods of work. And here we welcome the discussion which it is proposed to hold regarding a list of methods of work which has been drawn up by the Executive Board. Our Constitution envisaged that one of the main activities of Unesco would be to recommend to Member States international conventions and recommendations of a technical nature, which it was hoped would assist governments to develop their cultural relations with other countries and would assist Member States and the peoples of Member States to make progress within the fields of education, science and culture through international co-operation. We understand that to this Conference will be submitted draft rules of procedure to cover the procedure that should be applied in the future to the consideration of conventions and recommendations. All this is virtually a new subject, a new field of work to which no previous session of the General Conference has given any serious attention, and while we welcome the preparation which has been undertaken of a series of draft regulations to cover the procedures, we feel in Australia that there is a more urgent task still, which must be undertaken in the course of the Programme Commission's discussions of the methods of work of the Organization. That task is the following: we should ask ourselves what are the subjects, what are the matters which are ripe at the present time for some degree of international regulation in the fields of education, science and culture. If the answer is that there is none, well then, of course, there is no point in drawing up any conventions or series of recommendations. If the answer is that there are some, then we must be led on immediately to say which are the important ones. We have, it is true, considered once or twice proposals made by individual delegations for a convention or some recommendations on a particular subject, but no attempt has been made by the General Conference to survey the whole field and to make up our minds what are the subjects on which we, as an Organization, wish to attempt some degree of international regulation through the machinery of regulations and recommendations. And that question seems to us one of the important questions to which this Conference should address itself. We also welcome the studies that have been made of cultural agreements. We find there is a document submitted to the Conference which reviews the many cultural bilateral agreements which are in existence between different Member States. We have noted that some Member States have made a great deal of use of this form of international co-operation: others again have not, and we are inclined to the view that a careful study of the use that has been made of cultural agreements may point the way to others of us, and indicate a new form of co-operation that may well yield useful results.

[12] I also wish to make an observation, still under this general heading of the methods of work, regarding the use of expert committees. And here my remarks are of a somewhat critical

nature, based not on any failure to recognize the need which Unesco has for expert advice in various fields, but upon the experience which Australian experts have had in attending certain meetings called by Unesco. We feel that there is room for very great improvement in the use of this particular method of work by Unesco. All too often in the experience of Australian experts who have come to Paris, the meeting has been insufficiently prepared in advance and a great deal of their very short stay in Paris has been devoted to preliminary work which should have been done in advance by the Secretariat. Secondly, we know that the meetings of experts are kept to as short a period as possible in the interests of financial economy. But we have felt very often that it is false economy to bring an expert from the other side of the world at considerable expense, involving considerable personal fatigue, because travel across these immense distances, although it may be rapid, is still a fatigue to the human body and spirit. We feel that it has often been false economy to bring experts from distant countries for a meeting that lasted three or four days, or perhaps only a little longer, and that much better results would often be obtained if fewer meetings were held but if they were of sufficient duration to enable full advantage to be obtained from the views of the experts brought to them. I think that is a point in which there will be agreement among delegations from other distant countries, not always realized by people who are accustomed to go from one capital to another in the space of a few hours. It is not always realized just what is involved in bringing experts from the other side of the world to work on a particular problem. Furthermore, we have been seriously concerned by a tendency in some cases, after the experts have been brought from great distances and have worked together in Paris—as they thought, very well—by an apparent disregard of the views and findings that they have put down in their reports. In particular, we have been concerned at the lack of attention paid to the findings of some of the experts who have been brought together by the Department of Natural Sciences. I have been asked to refer particularly to the fact that a meeting held almost a year ago on scientific abstracts produced a report which has not yet, so far as we know, been made available, and that the course of programme activities following that report ran counter to the proposals to which the experts attached so much importance. I am asked also to say, in connexion with studies of the arid zone, that the proposals brought before the Conference at this time are entirely different from the line advocated by the meeting of experts in Paris, which gave very definite advice as to how this problem should be approached. No doubt, there will be an opportunity in the course of the Conference to discuss these and any other examples in more detail, and, no doubt, there will be explanations on various sides. But my general observation which I must make is this: that we cannot expect to build up that close relationship between the Secretariat and our Member States and our National Commissions through the use of experts, unless we utilize this method of calling expert committees in a way that yields good results and that strengthens the confidence and enthusiasm of our experts in our various countries in the actual work which is being carried on in Paris.

[13] In Australia also there has been some criticism of the amount of travel by Unesco's own experts. We have had visits to Australia of Unesco officials which have been a very great help in stimulating interest in the work of Unesco. We have also had visits where our people felt that all the information obtained could have been provided at negligible cost by the national Co-operating Bodies and that the sending of an official to Australia to collect information on the spot involved a waste of the financial resources of the Organization. These are all points to which attention must be given, and in our view it is our duty to draw attention to these weaknesses, because unless we have a frank exchange of views between our Member States and those concerned with the day-to-day work of the Organization, it will be difficult to remedy the weaknesses to which reference is made.

[14] The third major point to which I wish to refer is the problem of finding the proper role in all our work for Member States and the National Commissions and national Co-operating Bodies. The Constitution of Unesco speaks a great deal about the organization of co-operation among the nations, which, to our way of thinking, implies that the task of Unesco is very largely to encourage the flow of information, the movement of people as between Member States, and also to encourage Member States to work together. That is not the same thing as undertaking in some centralized secretariat a number of specific projects. We have felt in Australia that there has sometimes been a tendency to look upon the National Commissions as a mere auxiliary of the Secretariat. We have tried in our own country to make our national Co-operating Bodies centres of effective work in which they themselves co-operate with similar centres in other countries, and to find for our national Co-operating Bodies a field of work which certainly includes obtaining answers to questionnaires and helping the Secretariat, but which also includes the conduct of relations with groups in other countries who desire to co-operate

with us in the cultural field in Australia. I might just mention in passing the twenty or so Unesco fellows financed by the Australian Government who are at present studying in Australia, who have come from various countries, mostly from South East Asia, and the fact that we expect to welcome thirty more fellows, financed again by the Australian Government under the general auspices of Unesco, in the coming year.

[15] We feel that this problem of working out the type of activities which Member States can organize on their own soil, the type of co-operation that Member States can undertake with other Member States, is one of the prime problems of the Organization at this time. This new role of Member States, which, we think, is just coming into the limelight and to which more and more attention must be given, places new duties upon our Secretariat and undoubtedly affects the type of work which the Secretariat will be called upon to do. We welcome in Australia the remarks of our Director-General in his Report in relation to the future work of the Secretariat. The Director-General has said that this work in future should be confined in the main to documentation, the exchange of information, and enquiries, those activities being undertaken only as preparation for definite constructive action. And inevitably, as the role of the Member States in the work of Unesco develops and expands, the function and the duties of the Secretariat will be modified in the direction indicated by the Director-General.

[16] The fourth of the great problems facing this Conference is the relation of all our work to the problem of peace. And here I would merely say very briefly that we in Australia feel that Unesco will make its greatest contribution if it concentrates upon the problems that fall clearly within its own field. We know that education is a slow process, and ours is primarily an educational organization. Political issues should go in the main to the United Nations. We feel that the greatest contribution this Organization can make to the maintenance of peace is to work at the problem of securing the participation of as many Member States as possible in the gradual formation of those habits of mind which will assist us to maintain peace throughout the world. We would stress the duties of the Member States in this regard, and the hope that in the programme of Unesco we shall find them taking the leading part in certain of the activities to which attention has been drawn again and again. When we speak about education for international understanding, when we speak about teaching about the United Nations, and about educating the world regarding the Declaration of Human Rights, nothing very much can be done in any of those fields unless it is done by the Member States. We would not believe in Australia, that the best way of spreading throughout the world an understanding of the principles underlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was to increase greatly the part of Unesco's budget to be spent upon disseminating the Declaration. But we would say that the Declaration will never become a reality unless the Member States are prepared to devote time, attention and money to ensuring that teaching and understanding the Declaration of Human Rights comes to be part of the educational systems of their respective countries.

[17] Over the past four years I think we have found that the problem of organizing collaboration among the nations is perhaps more difficult than it appeared in 1945. We have come to realize perhaps more clearly than before the great difficulties in our way arising from the diversity of our different cultures, and sometimes I know our Secretariat has been discouraged, sometimes we have all been discouraged, by the difficulties arising from the fact that in different parts of the world the way of approach to cultural problems and educational matters and to international dealings is so different. But as we have realized the difficulties, I think we have come to realize just how much we gain by recognizing and insisting upon the maintenance of our diversity. I might, in this connexion, quote the words of the great modern philosopher, Whitehead, which seem to me to underlie all the work of Unesco:

> A diversification among human communities is essential for the provision of the incentive and material for the Odyssey of the human spirit. Other nations of different habits are not enemies, they are godsends. Men require of their neighbours something sufficiently akin to be understood; something sufficiently different to provoke attention, and something great enough to command admiration.

This diversity which appears to put obstacles in the way of organizing co-operation among the nations will remain at the same time one of our most precious possessions.

[18] But we have recognized also in the past four years that there are other difficulties in the way of collaboration between the nations. One of the greatest obstacles is the existence of great inequality in the wealth and power of the States members of this Organization. It is not altogether easy to organize co-operation between persons or groups that are of unequal strength and, although Unesco is required by the Constitution to respect the diversity of cultures, we must not be surprised if we are confronted by demands that we should work together to iron out some of the very great

inequalities between nations which are an outstanding feature of the world today. And it is from this point of view also that we feel that an increasing emphasis in the work of Unesco must be given to mutual assistance, in which the strong will aid the less strong and in which the wealthier nations will come to the aid, in the fields of education, science and culture, of the less wealthy nations, which have such terrible problems to overcome before they can afford the very minimum of education, science and culture for their peoples. Now with this thought in my mind, just shortly before I left Paris, as I was one day walking in the Ile de la Cité, I noticed the monument which was erected a considerable time ago to a Frenchman, Théophraste Renaudot, the founder of one of the earliest newspapers and also one of the founders of one of the earliest forms of social services, namely free medical consultations for poor people. My attention was drawn to this particular monument as one of the many monuments in Paris which had suffered during the occupation by the enemy, and as I looked at it and read the words that were written upon it, it seemed to me that here again was one of the many precursors of some of the main ideas of Unesco. On one side of this monument you read the words—I will give you the English version—:

Here in the rue de la Calandre, at the sign of the Great Cock, was the office of Théophraste Renaudot, where he founded the Gazette and instituted free medical consultations for the poor.

Then on two other sides you find two striking quotations from the words of Théophraste Renaudot. The one relates to his interest in the free flow of information, the other to his interest in helping the poor. In one we read:

I would only have one prayer to the princes and foreign governments, not to lose their time uselessly trying to prevent the passage across their frontiers of my newspapers, since that is a type of merchandise which we have never been able to stop moving around the world and which shares the nature of those torrents which grow stronger and broader whenever they are resisted.

It seemed to me that those are observations which certainly forecast our modern interest in the free flow of information. Then when you turn round and look at the other side of the monument you find Renaudot's words on the other subject:

It is necessary in every State that the wealthy come to the aid of the poor, because the harmony of the State comes to an end if one part is strengthened too much and the others are inevitably weakened.

The statue which stood on top of the monument to which I have been referring, disappeared during the war, and like many others in Paris, has never been found again, being made of bronze. But we in Unesco, it seems to me, are not only still bound to keep before our minds our ideals in promoting the free flow of ideas which will sweep across all frontiers, but we must give increasing emphasis in our work to the mutual aid and assistance by which the wealthier and more technically advanced countries can come to the aid of those who are labouring with very difficult problems.

[19] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of China.

[20] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, meeting in this city of Florence, so full of memories of men and events of the Renaissance, that wonderful flowering time of the human genius, can anyone be unmoved and not try to be a little better than his usual self, a little more generous, a little less mean? We see beauty, beauty everywhere. No wonder that the young Milton in the 17th century after visiting this place should have been moved to make that vow so that his very life itself would be a beautiful poem. To me it is always pleasant to give thanks where thanks are due. It is therefore with the greatest pleasure that, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, I thank the Italian Government for the warm hospitality they have accorded us. We love the climate, we love the place much more, and we love the Italian people most of all. As for you, Mr. Torres Bodet, the Director-General, may I be permitted to add my bouquet of praise to the many that you have already received. The flowers I offer you are few, but they are roses. They are the sincere tribute of my heart to one who has done so much for Unesco with the small means at his disposal.

[21] The record of work done during the last six months by Unesco must be a matter of sober satisfaction to all of us. Much of the credit must go to the Director-General and the Secretariat. It is they whose energy and inspiration have made possible the smooth running of the Unesco machine and the close and friendly co-operation of Member States, both among themselves and with headquarters. But, as has already been pointed out by other speakers, there is a tendency to make Unesco do too much. It is well to know one's limitations, for to know one's limitations means strength. It is much better, it seems to me, to limit our tasks to one or two things and do them well, rather than spread out, doing this and doing that, and end up by doing nothing at all. Unesco is still very young. It must learn to walk before it attempts to fly. What is important to

Unesco just now is that everything it undertakes must be one hundred per cent successful, for success breeds confidence. Without this confidence in its ability to accomplish what it has put its hand to, there is real danger that people may soon come to regard Unesco at best as a very expensive international club, and at worst as a tremendous hoax.

[22] The Chinese delegation has in past conferences of Unesco suggested the concentration of Unesco's efforts on mass education. I do so again. My delegation feels that this is one of the crying needs of Asia, South America and Africa. It cannot, of course, be done all at once. As a start, mass education may be first attempted by Unesco, say, in the Middle East or in one or two countries in South America. The reason why my delegation suggests the concentration of Unesco's efforts on mass education is that it wishes to see Unesco reach the masses, bringing light and knowledge where there is now darkness of the mind and superstition. Millions today lead brutish lives, grubbing for roots all day, with their eyes pinned to the ground and never once looking up at the stars and the heavens. We must open up their minds by mass education, so that they can attain to a vision of something better than mere stocks and stones.

[23] The Chinese delegation would also like to register its support of the United States proposals regarding Unesco activities in Japan and Germany. These two countries are too important culturally for mankind's intellectual and spiritual health to be excluded from playing their full part in helping to build a saner world for all of us.

[24] As I sit here day by day listening to the torrent of words that pour forth from the mouths of so many distinguished men and women from all over the world, I have often wondered what Dante, the greatest of Florentines, would have thought of some of them if he had been in this historic hall. Of two of them I am sure that he would unhesitatingly consign them to that circle in Inferno reserved for soulless men and women, without truth in their hearts, mere propagandists, repeating raucously their master's voice at the Kremlin. One of them Dante would certainly condemn to the flames in that circle meant for the sins of faithlessness and base ingratitude. As for twelve others, I really do not know what Dante would have done with them in his scheme of justice. They are too bad for Purgatory and not full-blooded enough in their badness to find a place in Inferno. Perhaps Dante, with sardonic scorn, would have thought it punishment enough for these twelve to be left alone to settle their own account with their conscience, if they have any.

[25] What has impressed my delegation and myself in the speeches of all delegates who have spoken so far is the yearning for peace they all share. They hope that Unesco, by promoting cultural understanding among the peoples of the world, will bring about the peace they so much desire. The Chinese people more than any have need of this peace. Being by nature pacific, all they want of life is to be allowed to work and live in peace and quiet. Soldiering and fighting they despise. But such is their misfortune that since 18 September 1931 right up to the present day, owing to direct and indirect aggression, at first by the Japanese and then by Russian imperialism, they have never been left alone to work out their own destiny. The lot now of most Chinese people in continental China is to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for their Russian masters, with Mao Tse-tung and company as their compradores and slave-drivers. The kind of peace Russian imperialism tries hard to impose upon the Chinese people through Mao Tse-tung is the peace of death. This sort of imperialistic peace is what Kremlin propaganda means when it shouts for peace at international gatherings. It is this imperialistic peace, made in Moscow, that Unesco must resist. In this sort of imperialistic peace, imposed by the Kremlin, art, science and letters will wither, because the imposition of this imperialistic peace of the Kremlin presupposes the closing of men's eyes and ears to the world as it is. They are made to hear and see only what the Kremlin wishes them to hear and see. Even music must be *à la Kremlin*, science made to dance the tune of Stalinism, and painting become but crude flattery of the occupants of the Kremlin in oils on canvas. This concept of peace, men and women who believe in the ideals of Unesco must utterly reject. The peace that Unesco should foster by bringing about genuine cultural understanding among the peoples of the world is a harmony which is dynamic, always aspiring and moving towards something better, but always harmonious. There should be harmony even in its discords of conflicting ideas.

[26] Two basic aims underlie the *raison d'être* of Unesco about which the Director-General talked to us so eloquently and movingly two days ago: to strive towards universality and to attempt to bring about the realization in practice of the Declaration of Human Rights. To strive towards universality, to include all the human family within one fold, this has been the dream of the ages. Is it not a common Chinese saying that within the four seas all men are brothers? How to bring this about? By force? By trickery ? To make the world one by force is the way of the old imperialism. To make the world one by force and lies and trickery is the way of the new imperialism of Moscow. Unesco utterly rejects it. The very concept of

science and culture rejects it. Science and culture can only exist and flourish in an atmosphere of truth and understanding and freedom. In any other atmosphere, only superstition, call it by what name you like, whether Stalinism or any other 'ism', will flourish.

[27] There are certain fundamental human rights which men must have before they can grow to their full stature, morally, intellectually and spiritually. This is why it is imperative that Unesco should insist that its Member States should respect—not only in word, but also in deed—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly at its plenary meeting on 10 December 1948. But we know only too well that there are Member States in Unesco whose very existence and being depends upon the denial of those Human Rights. What meaning has Unesco for them? How can Unesco co-operate with those Member States where the free flow of ideas and information is forbidden, where there is no freedom of intercourse and speech, where even their trusted officials cannot dine with foreign diplomats without special permission from the secret police?

[28] The Chairman of the Executive Board has aptly compared Unesco to a trireme, where all the Member States should pull together. The more rowers there are the better, so long as each does his best and all pull together. But suppose that some in the boat insist on rowing one way, and some another? What advantage will it be to have those in the boat who do not follow the captain's orders? Would it not be better for the smooth and speedy navigation of the boat, not to talk of its safety, to have fewer members of the crew, who can be depended upon to pull together, rather than too many, among whom may be two or three whose avowed object is to wreck the ship? Fellow colleagues, let us pull together in this ship of Unesco. The voyage is long and rough, but the ship's cargo is precious. It is nothing less than world peace. Let us not allow it to be shipwrecked. This world of ours has been too long a battlefield. Let us of Unesco work to help make it a real home for poor suffering humanity.

[29] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Ceylon.

[30] Mr. L. J. SENEVIRATNE (Ceylon) — Mr. President, Ceylon is represented at this Conference by a single delegate, and I feel I must make the reason clear. We have been a member of Unesco for only five months. Our National Commission has only just been formed and has barely begun to function. And, generally speaking, the affairs of Unesco in my country are in a rudimentary state. I am, therefore, here practically as an observer, to follow as closely as possible the transaction of business and to report to the Government what has to be done in order that Ceylon may collaborate effectively in the work of Unesco. I felt, however, that I must not leave this Conference without at least conveying at a full session, to your State in particular, Mr. President, for its generous hospitality, and to all Member States, the greetings of my Government, along with the fullest possible assurances of its faith in Unesco and of its deep desire to work with you whole heartedly to achieve your aims.

[31] In the belief, however, that the point of view of a newcomer might be of interest to older members, I venture to make a few further remarks. When I was in Paris during the last Conference, I enquired whether there was any pamphlet classifying the various techniques favoured by Unesco, with notes of the psychological or other bases for those techniques. I was told there was none. I suggest the preparation of such a book, as much confidence will be created in the activities of Unesco if all those techniques are proved really to lead to international understanding. Certainly, with regard to the one I examined in some detail, namely the collaboration of States in activities like fundamental education, on the basis that each State learns what it should do and then minds its own business, on that particular technique, I venture to declare myself rather a sceptic.

[32] I have also examined the programmes since 1945—somewhat hurriedly I admit—in search of new techniques, and I am sorry to say I could not spot any. This remark is not meant to indicate any dissatisfaction with the present programme, with regard to which I join the other States in congratulating the Executive Board and the Director-General. It is indeed a most impressive one and if fully carried out will represent an achievement of real merit. It discloses greater sureness in planning than those of earlier years; all of which points to the conclusion that the initial inevitable period of confusion is slowly passing away. But may I, at the same time, point out that the discovery of one new technique is worth far more to our cause at this moment than the addition of several new activities based upon the same old method of approach. It seems pertinent to ask oneself, what is the reason for this apparent absence of inspiration? The answer has been provided, almost in full, by the delegate of New Zealand. In his remarkable address, so convincing because so clearly felt, one saw almost a poetic version of the civil servant's lament the world over. It is the same old story, the drudgery of labour in a hard-worked administrative office while the first-class minds (and they are all first-class minds at Unesco, it appears) are protesting vigorously at being compelled to carry out tasks which they had

not set for themselves and, in certain cases, for objects in which they did not believe. Very probably, most of this superior staff had joined the administration at a somewhat late stage in life, in other words, they had not been broken in at an early age. The result, naturally, is frustration and a longing for a less trammelled life. If the person at the head should happen to be another worker accustomed to work in freedom, some kind of understanding is possible. But if he happens to be a civil servant, one must look out for squalls. One has only to see the form in which the Director-General receives his instructions in order to infer what his reactions must be. Here is a person, accustomed for a long time to give orders, a man of great imagination and boldness of thought, to whom the freedom of the spirit is something very real. We appoint him to a high office to which he is expected to devote all his time, and then we issue him detailed instructions as to how he should carry out his duties. Let me not be misunderstood. I think it is perfectly correct for the Conference or the Executive Board to tell him all this. But did he really expect it? I should not be at all surprised if his first reaction was similar to that of the first persons who were suddenly confronted with the Ten Commandments; only, this is a bit worse, for the Ten Commandments are only prohibitions and leave the individual perfect freedom to do as he pleases outside their range, whereas the Director-General is told in the resolutions precisely what he is to do and apparently has no discretion to do anything more. Under those conditions the creative spirit certainly cannot flower.

[33] Another possible reason for this absence of grace, as the mystic would put it, is the somewhat dispiriting character of our Constitution. The really operative and worthwhile basis for Unesco is the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind. But the thunder has been stolen, as the expression goes, by the fear of war. In fact, the most pregnant sentence in the whole Preamble is the oft-quoted one: "Since wars begin in the minds of men. . ." Now, I wish to ask, is the conception of "the moral and intellectual solidarity of mankind" so little compelling that it has to be bolstered up, so to say, by the fear of war? I am well aware that the text was drawn up under the shadow of the last war. I also grant that the possibility of another war will make us huddle closer together for some time longer. But fear of anything has never contributed to positive action, except, perhaps, running away. Some time or other, therefore, when the circumstances are favourable, it will be necessary to recast our Preamble so that emphasis is placed on our true objective and give it its rightful place as the source of our inspiration. In the meantime, we know that the measures we are taking in Unesco can only show long-term results and we therefore know that those measures cannot possibly avert a war if it is menacing us in the immediate present. If, as it now appears in the Preamble, the object of Unesco is to eliminate war, is it not likely that initiative will be choked by a sense of despair? That, I think, partly accounts for the absence of creative effort.

[34] It gives me satisfaction to note in this year's agenda a proposal to change the Constitution so that it may be more in keeping with our practical needs. During the last meeting of National Commissions, attention was drawn to certain clauses which appeared unsuitable in the light of the work that the Commissions are now called upon to do. It is hoped that the proposal made this year will help to make Member States overcome their natural prejudice against making changes in the Constitution, even when circumstances require them.

[35] I was very glad to observe in the address of the Director-General a hint that the advice that is now given to Member States in such full measure ought to be transformed into something more practical. We in Ceylon welcome such a change. To take education as an instance, advice may be very useful for countries that have no experience in educational expansion. Exchange of personnel may be very useful for countries of the same level of educational progress. But there are many States that fall midway between these two categories. Such countries have numbers of persons who have received higher education, but a fair proportion of their people have still to gain the advantages even of a sound elementary education. There are men in such countries who know what has to be done to remedy this, and merely to send them informative literature, when what they want is practical work for setting up schools, training teachers, etc., is merely to encumber them with help. What such governments now do for their countries is done under the spur of national patriotism, and no National Commission should ever be expected to do any more because of its connexion with Unesco. I appreciate that Unesco will be pleased with the results thus obtained, no matter what the impulse to action has been. But it is essential to keep clearly in mind that what appears in a National Commission's report as a record of progress may not truly be due to causes with which Unesco or the National Commission has had anything to do. In fact, what somethimes happens at Unesco proceedings may actually be to fan the flame of national sentiment and snuff out the faint flicker of international feeling. For to hear at a conference of National Commissions that one country has done so much, may create in another a certain heartburning that poverty had allowed it to achieve so little. For

mere advice, even eloquent advice, will never create enthusiasm for our cause. What can give body to the work of Unesco is true devotion to its cause, the development by every nation of a sense of personal responsibility for the good and the shortcomings of the others. The more this manifests itself in practical ways, the more will the work of Unesco assume reality in the eyes of mankind.

[36] Believing as I do that this role of direct service is the one that will bring Unesco closest to the hearts of my people, I would like to refer here to item 7.21 at page 54 of the Executive Board's proposals. It speaks of the allocation of assistance from a relief fund to "countries ravaged by war or natural calamity". The proposal is most commendable so far as it goes. But does it go far enough? It seems to me that reasons for assistance have been artificially circumscribed, that the most perfect generalization consistent with our Constitution has not been achieved. The proposal has not taken into account all the conditions that may affect countries or races in the course of their lives. I am not referring to Ceylon here, but it is easily conceivable that fifty years of cold, unthinking neglect can cause more damage to the moral and intellectual fibre of a country than five years of a sharp conflict or the effects of a sudden earthquake. I feel that the true issue has got somewhat overclouded here by things that seem more worthy because they are more spectacular. I therefore suggest to the Conference that the proposal be altered to cover all contingencies, if found reasonable by the Executive Board, and not restricted to war and sudden calamities only.

[37] For the purposes I have recounted above, the book *Study Abroad*, to which the Chairman of the Executive Board referred with approval, is a very valuable document, and we in Ceylon have taken the liberty of extracting from it all the information that may be useful to our students and of publishing it in printed form. But, from my particular stand point, I say this book is insufficient. The task is incomplete until some department of Unesco produces a book entitled, "Service Abroad". Just as we delegates have affirmed to one another here our faith in the aims of Unesco, there are many persons of like mind in all parts of the world; and quite a number of them, moved by this great humanistic aim, will readily volunteer for free service in countries overseas. Such a book will also be a fair guide as to the degree to which the appeal of international solidarity has touched the heart of mankind. Moved by a sense of religious duty, large numbers have in the past dedicated their lives to service in distant and remote regions. The aims of Unesco should be attractive to quite as large a number, and with international backing they can easily be assigned to places where the need of the world is greatest.

[38] I would like at this stage to refer in brief to the suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegation, that dependencies be allowed representation in Unesco. I am heartily in agreement with it and trust that no technical objections will prevent this being done. After all, it is those countries that need the assistance of Unesco most, and to plan for their benefit without hearing them does not seem to me either reasonable or democratic. May I remind the United Kingdom delegation that Ceylon sent a representative to the first meeting of Unesco prior to its becoming a Dominion. Perhaps that particular method is not forgotten. This, I think, would enable quick relief and effective assistance to be given to those backward countries of the world without whose early uplift to a state of literacy and intellectual curiosity the good intentions of Unesco have not the faintest chance of fruition.

[39] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of France.

[40] Mr. Yvon DELBOS (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on taking the floor on behalf of the French delegation my first duty is to pay tribute to its first head, Mr. Léon Blum. Death has carried away this great Frenchman and great international figure, who had the honour of addressing Unesco's constituent Conference in the name of France. In eloquent words, he expressed the French conception of culture and affirmed its universalist tradition. He also defined the fundamental role Unesco must play in the promotion of universal understanding, which he regarded as the indispensable condition of peace. For both these reasons, Léon Blum remains our guide.

[41] We are now meeting for the fifth time, and on this occasion Unesco is making a change. Henceforth, its Conference will be held in May instead of in November. I regard this as a happy symbol: November is cold and uninviting: May is radiant and the sun rises higher every day. May looks ahead and, in spite of human troubles, is a time of burgeoning hope. And, we are especially sensible of the charm of Heine's "lovely month of May" in this sunny land of Italy, this land of the Risorgimento, so strongly imbued with the great humanist tradition; in this city of Florence, whose wounds would not allow us to forget, even if we were tempted to do so, the tragic hours through which we lived not long ago, but where the Quattrocento and the Renaissance still bloom, the springtime of culture, Eternal Spring. At the same time that we are reminded of the gravity of

our mission, everything, both time and place, contributes to lift us above ourselves and to bring us not only the bounties of the world, but also its trust and its support.

[42] We have heard two great artisans of our Organization: the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General. They have given us the main outlines of a record of work already done and of a programme for the future. They have also given us their own testimony and explained to us their chief preoccupations. By his very personal and frank address, Sir John Maud, evoking his own experience, has revealed to us the workings of a mind permeated with Unesco's ideals. As for Mr. Torres Bodet, I speak for all my compatriots in expressing to him our friendship and gratitude. His desire for efficiency and his boldness of outlook show themselves in his vigorous efforts to compress the programme. His acts reflect not only an understanding of our time, but a keen appreciation of human values. Mr. Director, you have insisted that there shall be communion between Unesco and its Member States. You are right: our institution is not an organization over and above the nations which form part of it, but the union of these nations themselves. Its activities are their activities. To make this communion possible, each Member State must act on two planes: within its own frontiers, and within Unesco. Each Government must inculcate in its citizens an understanding of the common ideal, and make its own personal contribution here by freely explaining its fears and hopes.

[43] In this spirit, I shall tell you quite simply what France is doing. When, in spite of so much other destruction, it gives to school reconstruction the absolute priority which you have recommended; when, in the development of its popular culture, it offers adults, not cheap education, but the means of developing their personality and of participating in the joys of learning; when it extends these efforts in all fields of education to the whole of the French Union, it is certainly carrying out its own particular mission; but it is also helping to carry out Unesco's. The projects initiated by our international institution, such as children's communities and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, are enthusiastically supported in our country. In promoting them, our Government is powerfully assisted by the French National Commission, which is in continuous touch with the organs of Unesco and a constant source of inspiration to our delegation. Its role is indeed such as it was so accurately defined this morning by the head of the United Kingdom delegation.

[44] France considers that there is no graver danger to Unesco than the indifference of the peoples. We therefore seek to draw attention to its concrete achievements, to interest educators and particularly young people in the common task by the establishment of numerous Unesco Clubs throughout the country, and, lastly, to show by means of the press and radio how its activities reflect the preoccupations of a troubled world. I would now like to evoke its hopes and its fears. It has been said, and particularly by the Director-General, that the problems are more difficult today than five years ago, the dangers greater. It is to Unesco's credit that it wishes to cope with such situations. For that purpose, it is not enough to define the elements of international understanding; we must multiply the occasions for practising it. A happy example is afforded by the seminar which Unesco is shortly to hold in Montreal. It will consider geography as a means of international understanding. The nature of the soil and the climate form the inhabitant of each region, determine his physical characteristics, influence his language and, through the latter, his ideas. Here you have a manner of thinking, there a national or provincial peculiarity, an irreducible originality. But this very originality must contribute to union, for we must not seek a uniform type of man in the abstract. Instead of attempting to do so, or of setting ourselves up as a universal model, we must each understand differences which formerly would have irritated us, so as to appreciate the idiosyncrasies of others and find reasons for liking them because of these idiosyncrasies. The same wide prospects are opened up to us by the seminar to be held in Brussels in order to study the teaching of history and particularly textbooks, which the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation and certain governments, including France, had already attempted in 1937 to convert into instruments of peace; but Nazism preferred to teach war. The cause of peace is served by these meetings, these talks and these "symposia", at which citizens of all countries, men of all origins, circles and professions, learn to know one another, compare their experience and ideas, and at which, beyond differences, not only of thought, but also of modes of thought, they become aware of the underlying unity of the human mind.

[45] In addition to measures initiated by Unesco, I shall mention the quite recent creation of a "cultural identity card" by the five signatory powers of the Brussels Pact. This new *laissez-passer* will facilitate not only foreign travel, but also foreign visits as a whole, by teachers, students, writers, scientists and artists. It will also smooth their access to museums and libraries. That is a first step towards the free movement of persons. I shall also draw attention to a text which was prepared in Geneva and which will be submitted for your opinion. Its object is to exempt books,

educational films and printed music from customs duties. That is a step towards the free circulation of cultural material. In the fields of science and education, this freedom for persons and objects remains one of France's constant preoccupations. We have given proof of this at meetings limited to a specific group of nations, and we wish to give further proof through Unesco. The results achieved within a geographically limited area should serve as the model for bigger things. In a world in which distances have been annihilated, frontiers are too frequently closed, and the mind has too often to fight against difficulties created by fear. If Unesco is to remain true to its original mission, namely, international understanding, it must guard against regarding this part of its activities as dull and uninteresting and as already relegated to the past. In the present circumstances, it is more than ever necessary to omit nothing that may pump blood into the veins and arteries of all countries, so that the humanity of tomorrow may become, as Montaigne said, a "mixed humanity", and thus a brotherhood.

[46] Unesco's best remedy for the world's distress lies in effective action. Now the first condition of effective action is to select questions and to organize them in series. I consider, as the head of the United States delegation said yesterday, that Unesco should concentrate on certain important items of its programme. It cannot do everything. It should be the great organizer of cultural tasks which it entrusts to specialized bodies. It should ensure their co-ordination, like a peace-seeking and disinterested general staff. Whenever it contemplates action on its own, if it thinks, with Paul Valéry, that a "league of minds" conditions the League of Nations, it should follow the example of the great mystics. The latter always knew their temporal limitations, and that explains their greatness and the victories they won. An undertaking that ignores the exact means at its disposal is chimerical. Here, the establishment by Unesco of an annual programme distinct from the basic programme seems to me to be an important step towards methodical action. If Unesco chooses this course, the French delegation will give it the wholehearted support of France. France will spare no effort to assist anything likely to serve the cause of international understanding by illuminating minds, opening hearts and—mainly—by stimulating the will to action. For to desire peace is to seek to define and organize the work of peace. Peace is a problem of education, culture and science. There are illiterates of peace who must be instructed. There are ways of organizing peace that must be carefully examined. There are illusions and fallacies of peace that must be exposed and denounced. The war now threatening us, which would destroy civilization and perhaps humanity as well, is not a spectre to be exorcised by formulas, but a scourge to be fought by deeds. As Mr. Laugier, representative of the United Nations, so eloquently expressed it, that is the role of governments and of the United Nations on the political plane. Our role is to help the United Nations by our own particular means. We have to teach men that, as an essential condition of peace, all of us, and not only some of us, must be ready to subordinate everything to it. It is sacrilege to invoke peace simply to obtain other ends, whatever they may be. The first duty of the peacemaker is truth and sincerity. Invoking peace is not enough. To claim a monopoly of peace by systematically accusing others of ulterior motives and of bad faith is to make it impossible. Mistrust leads to war. War can be banished only if we play straigthforwardly with one another, that is to say, assume and carry out the same obligations.

[47] In our own field of mutual understanding, such loyalty is the first condition of success. The last war was precipitated because Hitler and his satellites, by means of their Fifth Column, exploited the peaceful sentiments of other peoples at the same time that they forbade such sentiments in their own country. They hoodwinked their coveted prey the better to devour it. They advocated disarmament to other countries while overarming themselves. Our task is therefore to carry out the same work for peace everywhere and to desire that pacificism shall never be a mere article for export and consequently a fatal soporific, but rather a stimulus to joint and powerful action. This common action does not depend solely on us who are gathered here. To bring about universal understanding, we must fill in gaps, very big gaps; between one part of the world and another communion too often means a sequence of monologues. But we shall not cease to urge it, despite the mistrust, the real or feigned misunderstandings, the material or moral barriers which are raised against truth and against peace. Although governments who have frontiers to protect, must unfortunately, in the face of hard facts, remain on the watch—a duty which Unesco must recognize—Unesco's mission is to launch across frontiers, without ulterior political motive, an appeal that will sooner or later be heard by all.

[48] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of the Philippines.

[49] Mr. Proceso SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) — For the fifth time, since the end of the war, representatives of nations all over the world come together in a conference to work out a formula

for contributing to peace through education, science and culture. Although speaking different languages, professing different creeds, and espousing different political ideals, we meet once more, impelled by an ardent desire to find a common ground in Unesco in order to achieve the goal of peace. I feel a sobering of the great enthusiasm that inspired our first meeting in Paris four years ago, a sobering which to my mind is a healthy sign of the maturing outlook that we are now taking in face of tensions produced by nationalistic rivalries and by the threat of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. If the fervour of our faith has been tempered by experience, we nevertheless are determined to carry on doggedly, knowing that mankind's margin of safety grows narrower as the forces of destruction grow more and more. In this predicament of humanity, we cannot, we must not, fail the world in this our fifth conference. I believe that the choice of this great city of Florence as the site of our conference is a felicitous one. It was here some six hundred years ago that man lifted himself from the darkness of the mediaeval past to become, no longer a slave to superstition and a helpless victim of ignorance, but a free man in a free society. Here in this city, men of genius, spurred on by the inspiration of the Renaissance, created works that are to remain wonders of the mind for ever and ever. As I look in admiration at the art treasures of our meeting halls and rooms, I cannot but be imbued by a strengthening faith in Unesco. If men of Florence some six hundred years ago could produce this spectacular flowering of the arts, then we, too, meeting in this ancient city, in this mid-half of the twenthieth century, can profit by its inspiration and acquire power to make Unesco yield the fruits of peace in the minds of men. To the Government and people of Italy, we of the Philippines add our voice to the symphony of praise expressed by many delegations. Such commendation is a well-deserved tribute to the tremendous effort that must have been exerted to make Florence not only an inspiring but also technically proficient site of this Conference. We appreciate its charming hospitality and wish that like its ancient painters, sculptors, and other devotees of beauty and culture in centuries past, who produced the majesty and splendour around us, we could likewise create here a state of peace that will endure. We of the Philippines, therefore, consider it a rare pleasure to be able to express our great admiration and appreciation of Italy, particularly her beautiful city of Florence. To all of you who have come as pilgrims seeking the holy grail of peace, we offer the cordial greetings of the Filipino people. We share with you the hopes that at the close of this conference we shall have become better "Unescans", more loyal friends, and more effective crusaders for peace.

[50] The Philippines delegation wishes to pay tribute to the Director-General, the Deputy Director-General and the Executive Board for the brilliant manner in which they have carried out the work outlined by the General Conference. Considering the limited financial resources at Unesco's disposal, it is a wonder how the achievements recounted in the Director-General's Report could have been brought about. There seems to be a prevailing opinion that Unesco is dispersing its resources over too many and varied activities. Yet, it is difficult to pick out the activities that should be eliminated in the meantime so as to permit greater concentration of effort on larger and more significant projects. In this regard, our delegation is in agreement with the position taken by the United States delegation. However, it is our feeling that in the choice of major projects the needs of Member countries of Unesco should be given priority over those of occupied countries.

[51] Two years ago a survey of the educational system of the Philippines was made by the Unesco Consultative Educational Mission. And now let me report to you what our country has done in collaboration with that mission, for which you made such generous provision at the Third Session of the General Conference. After the survey, what followed? Our delegation is especially happy to announce here that a number of the recommendations of that mission have already been implemented, and that other desirable proposals growing out of the mission's report are on the way to being carried out. As evidence of our Government's sincerity in this regard the President of the Philippines appointed as Vice-Chairman of our delegation our first and only woman senator, Mrs. Gerónima T. Pecson, who, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education, Congress of the Philippines, has been mainly responsible for the enactment of several progressive laws in line with Unesco's Constitution and educational programme of action. Among the forward steps taken in education are the opening of thousands of new elementary schools that have brought the blessings of education to every child of school age, the establishment of 1,000 libraries in five years beginning last year, the raising of the status of teachers by increasing their salaries, the organization of the first four-year normal college and the expansion of other teacher-training facilities and the strengthening of vocational schools through more generous financial support. Recently approved by the Philippine Senate is a new elementary education policy bill which would extend to seven years the present four years of free, compulsory education. All these are evi-

dences to show how Unesco can inspire and stimulate progress in a Member State.

[52] As one of the grateful beneficiaries of Unesco's technical assistance in education, we wish to emphasize that in any scheme of technical collaboration self-help must be the primary principle and technical assistance its corollary. It was on this basis that we solicited and accepted Unesco's technical assistance. As a modest contribution to such scheme of international cooperation, I take pleasure in presenting to Unesco a report which is the result of the self-help effort of Filipino educators, collaborating under the auspices of the Joint Congressional Committee on Education, the co-Chairman of which, for the Senate, was Mrs. Pecson. It is our conviction that technical assistance should be a two-way traffic, rendering help to the requesting country and giving back to the assisting countries, on the part of the country assisted, the products not only of the industries developed through technical collaboration, but also the products of its other resources and ingenuity. On this basis we announce our adherence to and full support of the technical assistance programme made available by Unesco. In this connexion we of the Philippines delegation wish to invite the attention of this Conference to the necessity and desirability of continued assistance in Asia and the Far East. It is in this region of the world, we believe, that Unesco can perhaps render such assistance as will have a direct impact upon half the entire population of the earth.

[53] On the problem of implementing the great principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our delegation supports the proposal to include economic, social and cultural rights in the Covenant or Covenants to be adopted. Doubtless, political rights are of transcendental significance, but political idealism of the loftiest sort will be meaningless if it does not ensure the economic, social and cultural rights of man. To peoples of the world who live in perpetual famine, for example, political and civil rights lose their soul-stirring significance. To millions of people whose minds work helplessly in the blackout of illiteracy, freedom of the press is a mockery. We, therefore, strongly urge that Unesco collaborate actively with the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, in accordance with the latter's recent resolution, in the preparation of draft texts of articles covering economic, social and cultural rights for inclusion in the proposed Covenant or Covenants on Human Rights. This will be a collaboration greatly to be desired. Also in this connexion we are wholeheartedly in accord with the appeal for non-discrimination expressed on the first day of the Conference by the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. No solidarity of spirit can exist where any discrimination of any sort is allowed to thrive. This great Organization can succeed in its role of being the conscience of mankind only when it vigorously maintains the principle of non-discrimination among the peoples of the world. Our delegation favours, therefore, and will give full support to any project of Unesco which will promote this ideal.

[54] On the subject of annual conferences, there is a feeling that we of Unesco are meeting too frequently by having a conference every year. Since most of our objectives are long-range, dealing as we are with changes that by their nature take time to bring about, it would seem desirable that we consider the idea of holding a biennial conference instead. For this purpose we support the proposal of the delegation of the United States of America. Should this proposal be accepted by the Conference, we would also favour the prolongation of the term of the members of the Executive Board from three years to four. Furthermore, in line with a developing tradition of holding the Conference in different regions, it would now appear logical that the next Conference be held somewhere in East Asia or in the Western Pacific. A considerable part of the technical assistance programme of the world is being carried out in those regions. The holding of a Conference in any one of them by Unesco will focus greater attention upon the problems and aspirations of those regions and upon their potential contributions to the advancement of world peace.

[55] One more point and I shall conclude. The Philippine delegation believes that Unesco's programme of action embraces activities which require the full participation of women. We are, therefore, in favour of according to women an increasingly greater share in Unesco's leadership. The genius and talents of women should not be confined to the home or to the local community, however significant these areas of influence may be. In this precarious peace of today, we believe more than ever that women should have an appropriate place in the parliament of nations. The blending of their genius with the traditionally accepted genius of men should bring about improvement in the formula we are seeking for universal peace. It is our hope, therefore, that Unesco will find increasing opportunities for the participation of women in its programme and that it will take the lead in this movement among the United Nations and its various Specialized Agencies. This will be a noble reply to the resolution recently adopted by the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, asking that the higher offices of these international organizations be opened also to qualified women the

world over. With these thoughts, to which the Philippine delegation earnestly invites your attention, I close this brief statement, trusting that Unesco will continue to forge ahead even in a divided world, in its crusading mission of strengthening in the minds of all men the world over the defences of peace to which we are all dedicated.

[56] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Burma.

[57] Dr. Htin AUNG (Burma) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all the delegation of the Union of Burma wishes to express its gratitude for the kindness and hospitality shown to it by the Government and people of Italy, by the Mayor and people of Florence. One of the distinguished delegates who spoke before me said that our visit to this beautiful city should make the delegates become more generous and less mean. I am sure that other delegates, including the other members of my delegation, have become more generous, but so far as I am concerned, I regret to say that I have become more mean because for the last one or two hours I have been thinking out a way of hoarding up this beautiful city of Florence together with the statues and pictures, together with the handsome men and beautiful women, into a small bundle so that I could take it home with me in my suitcase when I go back at the end of the Conference.

[58] The delegation of the Union of Burma has studied the report of the Director-General with great interest, and with great admiration also, because as a document it is a testament of faith not only in Unesco but in the power and achievement of the human mind. The Director-General's Report is indeed a work of art, but, like all works of art, it is not quite perfect. We have listened with interest to the speeches made by the other delegations and we have been impressed by the tone of sincerity and by the sense of gladness that we can hear in their speeches; and although the speeches have contained a lot of criticism, in their heart of hearts I am sure that all these critics admire the Report, because we scold only those people whom we love and criticize only those things which we admire. And in this spirit of criticism our delegation would like to offer a criticism of the Report.

[59] We were very disappointed because South-East Asia, which is a distinct region from the point of view of politics, from the point of view of society, and from that of culture, has not been given adequate recognition in the Director-General's Report. The term South-East Asia emerged into popular use only towards the end of the second world war. But since prehistoric times the peninsula of Indo-China, which contains the valleys of great rivers, the Irrawaddy, the Salween, the Menam and the Mekong, and the peninsula of Malaya, and those festoons of islands which we now call the United States of Indonesia, have always been distinct regions from the point of view of culture and of achievement. Bordered on the east by China and on the west by India, and influenced by the civilizations of these two countries, the peoples of South-East Asia have been able to preserve a civilization which is distinctively their own and also a special pattern of culture. In the nineteenth century this region of South-East Asia fell under foreign rule and suffered both from that foreign rule and from foreign cultures. But recently it has emerged into freedom again, and as a patient who has just recovered from a long sickness needs very careful nursing, this region also needs a carefully thought out programme of education and reconstruction. Realizing this pressing need, the Government of the Union of Burma has put forward a very ambitious project of fundamental education and entered into a contract with Unesco for the visit to our country of an educational mission which will advise the Government, especially on fundamental education. In spite of all this the section of the Report dealing with education, social science, litterature and culture pays very little attention to this region of South-East Asia. To cite examples off-hand. The Report mentions with enthusiasm the project for publishing certain books dealing with the way of life in fifteen different countries, but this list of countries does not contain a single country from South-East Asia. It also mentions with enthusiasm a project to study racial tensions in America, Europe, Africa, India and Japan, but there is no mention of a project to study racial tensions in the Indo-Chinese peninsula, which has always been a melting pot of races and cultures and which has been in past history the scene sometimes of great racial harmony under religious unity and sometimes of great religious conflicts. And the Report also mentions with enthusiasm a projected study of native languages of America, but it mentions no projected study of the hundreds of languages of those fast disappearing tribes which live in the hilly regions of Burma and Thailand.

[60] With one aspect of the Report my delegation has been greatly impressed, namely the emphasis laid on the future work of the National Commissions and of the Member States. The tendency now is for both the Unesco Secretariat and for the Governments of the Member States to pay more attention and to put more reliance on the National Commissions and to delegate their

powers and their duties to those National Commissions. Under the present system of organization a Unesco Conference assumes a solely political character. Although we belong to learned societies or learned institutions, we come here not as representatives of learned institutions but as representatives of the Governments of Member States. That is why the delegation of the Union of Burma can well appreciate the desire of the delegate of Yugoslavia for a cultural conference, and the delegation of the Union of Burma fully supports his proposal that a cultural conference, not a solely political conference, but a purely cultural conference, should be called as soon as possible. However, if the National Commissions play their part very well in the next four or five years, the present Conference of Unesco, which is merely a meeting of the representatives of the Member States, should evolve into a meeting of representatives of National Commissions from the Member States. The change will be significant because then a Unesco Conference will be a purely learned Conference and not only a semi-political and semi-learned Conference, and when this change has taken place, we delegates will come here as intellectuals and not disguised as politicians, and we shall come here as lambs pure and simple and not wearing the clothing of wolves. We shall be able to tread the straight and narrow path to scholarship without looking either to the left or to the right, and we shall no longer tremble as to what the tax-payer might say and what the man in the street might think. And when that change has taken place, there shall be no more of this whispering in the corridors and canvassing for votes. Above all, we shall then take the meetings of this Conference seriously and we shall come to the meetings of the Conference punctually at the appointed hour and not one hour late as we have been doing. And we shall sit and listen politely when a delegate is speaking instead of strolling about in the hall or moving into groups having friendly chats. And the lamp of learning that is lit by Unesco shall then burn pure and bright, not red which is the colour of anger, nor green which is the colour of suspicion. Nor shall this light ever grow dim as it does sometimes at present.

XV. Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new Members.

[61] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We shall now interrupt this discussion, to which several other speakers will be contributing, in order to pass to another subject, namely, item 13 of our Agenda: "Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board concerning the admission of new Members." I would remind delegates that it is a question of the admission of the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and that, in accordance with Rule 81 of the Rules of Procedure, a two-thirds majority vote is needed. I call on the Chairman of the Executive Board to present his report on this matter.

[62] Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Executive Board — This is one of the most pleasant privileges which falls to a Chairman of the Executive Board, to propose that we increase our membership from fifty-six Member States to fifty-nine. I will not delay you with reciting the relevant parts of the Constitution, because in the spirit of the last speaker I have no doubt that all of you will have read the documents which have been circulated, 5C/7, I, II and III, and the Appendices thereto, and therefore I need only remind you that the Republic of Korea applied for membership of Unesco on 5 July 1949, the Republic of the United States of Indonesia on 5 January 1950, and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan on 7 January 1950. Each of those States, as it so happens, is not a member of the United Nations, and therefore the procedure which we have followed in accordance with the Constitution has been in the first place to refer their application to the United Nations. In each case, the Economic and Social Council has, in its wisdom, seen no objection to Unesco's admitting any of those three applicants to membership, and as each of the Governments has not only applied for membership, but has stated its willingness to abide by the terms of the Constitution, the Executive Board had no difficulty in unanimously recommending to the General Conference that each of those States should be admitted to membership. I, therefore, on behalf of the Board, wish to move the three resolutions which are set out at the end of each of the three papers to which I referred, and beg to move that in each case the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, be admitted to membership of Unesco.

[63] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] You have heard the proposals by the Chairman of the Executive Board. Does anyone wish to speak? I call on Dr. Walker, delegate of Australia.

[64] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — I have very much pleasure in supporting the proposal of the Executive Board for the admission of

our three new Member States. It is, I think, one of the greatest tributes to the work of our Director-General over the past couple of years since he has been in office to record the way in which the membership of this Organization has steadily increased, and I know we all rejoice at the thought that our membership today will be raised to fifty-nine Member States. I would like, on behalf of the Australian delegation, to welcome all three of the new Members which will be admitted, and I would like to extend a special welcome on behalf of the Australian Government and Australian people to one of those countries which is one of our closest neighbours, namely Indonesia. We shall be particularly happy to see them among us as Members in this great enterprise.

[65] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of the Netherlands.

[66] Dr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) — In consequence of the many centuries of relations that exist between the Netherlands and Indonesia, it is a great pleasure to me to recommend especially the admission of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

[67] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Iraq.

[68] Dr. Mohamed Fadhel JAMALI (Iraq) — I wish to join in the pleasure of welcoming the three new States. We are glad to have with us the sister Arab State, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as well as the young, virile States of Indonesia and Korea. It is not the fault of Jordan that it is not a Member of the United Nations. I hope she will soon be a Member of the United Nations, as well as Korea and Indonesia. It is the veto that has stopped that, and I wish again to emphasize our welcome to them in this Organization.

[69] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of the Philippines.

[70] Mr. Proceso SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) — The Philippine delegation wishes to associate itself with the motion to admit these three new States as members of Unesco. We are neighbours of two of them, and I want to tell you how happy we are to have these two neighbours of ours, Korea and Indonesia, among us, collaborating with us in seeking the goal of peace.

[71] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Burma.

[72] Dr. Htin AUNG (Burma) — I would like to request that these three resolutions be taken separately. I hasten to assure the Conference that the delegation of Burma does not wish to oppose any of these three resolutions. As a fellow State in South-East Asia, we specially welcome Indonesia as a member. In the case of Transjordan also we support the application, but in the case of South Korea, the delegation of Burma wishes to remain neutral.

[73] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Yugoslavia.

[74] Professor Radivoj UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) — [*Translation from the French*] The Yugoslav delegation cannot consider the Government of South Korea as a legal Government, since it was formed under conditions that did not permit at least a part of the Korean people to express its will freely, that is to say, under the conditions of an occupied country. Moreover, this Government, since its formation, has shown itself little disposed to advance the interests of the Korean people. On the contrary, it has constantly supported the views of circles which consider that the Korean people is not capable of governing itself nor of developing its own culture. Considering that the present Government of South Korea is not the true representative of the sovereign will of the people, even in that part of the country over which it claims authority, the Yugoslav delegation will vote against the admission of South Korea as a member of Unesco, for it believes that its admission would compromise and complicate the work of our Organization. The Yugoslav delegation is not opposed to the admission of the other two countries in question. For this reason we ask for a separate vote to be taken in each case.

[75] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of India.

[76] Dr. R. C. MAJUMDAR (India) — The Indian delegation has great pleasure in welcoming as new Members the three States whose admission has been recommended by the Executive Board. India has special relations with at least two of them, Indonesia and Korea, and it gives India great pleasure to welcome these two States, with whom our relations in the past have been most cordial and intimate; we hope that their addition to Unesco will increase its strength and increase the importance of the Organization as a whole. We also welcome Jordan as an additional State.

[77] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of China.

[78] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — The Chinese delegation warmly welcomes the Republic of Korea as a Member State of Unesco. I am surprised at what the delegate of Yugoslavia has just said. The Government of the Republic of Korea truly represents the Korean people because it was freely elected under a free election. There is more freedom in Korea, I assure you all, than in any of the puppet States. The Chinese delegation has therefore great pleasure in welcoming warmly and sincerely the Republic of Korea as a Member State of Unesco. As regards the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, my delegation also has very great pleasure in warmly and sincerely welcoming that State as a member of Unesco. But as regards Indonesia, I am sorry to say that my delegation will be opposed to its being a Member of Unesco for reasons well known to all of you. During the last few years my Government were second to none in doing everything they could to help and foster the freedom and independence of Indonesia, which always had a helping hand from us. But you all know what has happened recently. Indonesia, through its Ambassador in Washington, has made a statement that she intends to recognize the right of the Peking Communist Government to send representatives to the United Nations. Because of this, my delegation will oppose the inclusion of Indonesia in Unesco.

[79] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Pakistan.

[80] Dr. Mahmoud HASAN (Pakistan) — On behalf of the Government and people of Pakistan, I have very great pleasure in supporting the motions that have been moved by the Chairman of the Executive Board. We in Pakistan have very intimate relations with two of these countries, Indonesia and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, with which we have very deep cultural ties, and I have no doubt that their inclusion in this family of nations, who sit here for the sake of furthering peace in the world, will be a very great help to us all. On behalf of my Government, I also welcome the Republic of Korea and I am certain that whatever may be the feelings, I may say the individual and personal feelings, of individual members against one another, I am sure that all of us should welcome with very great pleasure these three new Members who, I am certain, will carry further in very important parts of the world, the great message of Unesco for the furtherance of peace, harmony and co-operation in the world.

[81] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Ladies and gentlemen, as no one else has asked to speak, we shall now put the matter to the vote. As the Chairman of the Executive Board has already announced, we shall vote separately on the three admissions.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[82] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The result of the voting is as follows:

KOREA:

For: 27
Against: 1
Abstentions: 4

INDONESIA:

For: 34
Against: 1
Abstentions: 0

HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF THE JORDAN:

For: 33
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

I therefore proclaim the admission of Korea, Indonesia and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as Members of Unesco and bid them a cordial welcome. I now call on the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

[83] Mr. Edmond KOCH (Jordan) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, a few months ago Dr. Raadi, representative of Unesco, arrived at Hamman. If I remember rightly, his mission was to establish contact with the authorities in order to induce the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan to collaborate with Unesco's big programme. As the result of these talks, the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan did not hesitate to apply for membership. Any other course would have been surprising; a country where Christianity was born and in which Islamism developed, would have shirked its duty, if it had not joined your Organization. Gentlemen, the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan has today been authorized to participate in your work. While associating myself with the delegate of Iraq concerning the Palestinian refugees whose plight is due to a political fact, responsibility for which rests upon the United Nations, I beg you not to lose sight of the plans which you have outlined with a view to their instruction. Gentlemen, on behalf of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, I thank you for having admitted us to your Organization. I assure you that we shall carry out the tasks incumbent on us to the full extent of our powers.

[84] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the*

French] I now call upon the delegate of Indonesia.

[85] Dr. Abu HANIFAH (Indonesia) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, honourable delegates, as an Indonesian I am proud to witness the fact that a few moments ago the country which I represent, *Republik Indonesia Serikat*, or the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, was accepted as a Member of Unesco. We have eagerly been hoping for this moment, and therefore on behalf of the Indonesian Government, I express here our gratitude to this assembly. Our ambassador in London has already been instructed to sign the Constitution of Unesco. I wish to emphasize that this is not a mere formality, but that we are firmly resolved, not only to co-operate fully with Unesco, but also to further its aims and ideals as proclaimed in its Constitution.

[86] We are grateful for the interest which Unesco has taken in our country and for the gifts which have been sent to us. It is not only for these valuable gifts, which have been a substantial contribution to our work of reconstruction, that we are grateful, but also, and even more so, for the spirit of friendship and interest in which they have been forwarded to us.

[87] Indonesia, a country in South-East Asia, has a population of about 75 millions. The Indonesians are well known to be a religious people. About 90 per cent of the population are Moslems, about 2 million Protestants, one and a half million Roman Catholics and the rest have faith in religions such as Buddhism, and so on. Though the population profess several religions, there is peace among them all and there has never been dissension aroused by religious differences. Therefore it is not surprising that the Indonesian State is based on five principles which are harmoniously blended into one idea and which also form the basis of our culture and education. The five principles are: first, faith in God Almighty; second, social justice; third, humanity; fourth, national consciousness; fifth, democracy. The Indonesians are convinced that these five principles constitute a good foundation for friendship, good neighbourliness, co-operation and peace with all countries and people the whole world over.

[88] Preliminary steps have already been taken to establish a National Unesco Commission for Indonesia to propagate Unesco's aims and to further the brotherhood of all people on earth. We realize that freedom means a continual struggle, and that the road which lies ahead may be rough and difficult. But in our hearts we carry faith and we have the indomitable will to succeed. Therefore, whatever difficulties may arise, we know that our zeal will enable us to surmount them. A great tradition supports us. You may all have heard of the famous Buddhist University existing in the eleventh century in the Kingdom of Sriwijaya in Palembang on Sumatra, in Indonesia. Also, the proud remains of the temples and sanctuaries of Java, erected in the times when the famous empires of the Calendras and Majapait flourished, are a testimony to the ability of our people and to the high religious and cultural level which they had attained already centuries ago. But a tradition, however proud, is not sufficient if there is not the impetus to carry us on to an even better future. At this very moment we have a university already, of which we are proud, and where our future leaders are trained and educated. The numbers of our primary and secondary schools are rapidly increasing, and it is only lack of sufficient personnel that hampers the elimination of illiteracy within a few years. We are working very hard now on our national programme of education and culture, but we also know that we are making progress in every way. At this moment, already 48 per cent of our population is literate; and our A-B-C campaign is proceeding so satisfactorily that we feel confident that within ten or fifteen years from now the last vestiges of illiteracy will be eliminated. By 48 per cent I mean 48 per cent of the persons over six years of age; and, by literate I mean that they can read, whether in Latin, Arabic, Javanese, Buginese, Balinese, or any other characters in use in Indonesia.

[89] So we enter the ranks of Unesco, enthusiastic and confident, perhaps over-enthusiastic, but not over-confident, for we fully realize that many things remain to be done. It is very clear, however, that, as a young nation fighting on behalf of humanity and progress, we may be expected also to be very critical of this world after the second great war. Indonesia certainly will do her utmost to promote all that is worthy in Unesco, more especially as an instrument of peace, but we also want to make it clear that we will try to prevent it from becoming an instrument used only for purposes which are not to the advantage of peace and good understanding in the world. But it is especially for technical reasons that we intend to co-operate closely with Unesco, in order to have the advice and aid of its experts. At the same time we will always be willing to give Unesco all the information and all the help it wants for the correct and successful implementation of its work. May I thank all of you who are willing to recognize us as your fellow delegates, especially those from our neighbour States in South East Asia, Australia, Burma, India, Pakistan and others. I do not want to take up too much of your time, but let me again, on behalf of my country and my people, express my

sincere gratitude and reiterate the promise of full and intense co-operation from our side.

[90] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Korea.

[91] Mr. Jin Hang GONG (Korea) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to every delegate who has voted for our country. Our country will collaborate with all your Member States in furtherance of the great ideal of Unesco.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

NINTH PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 26 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XVI.	Discussion of the Director-General's Report on the activities of the Organization from 1 September 1949 to 1 May 1950 (*conclusion*): Speeches by delegates of Austria, Thailand, Monaco, Union of South Africa and Ecuador	160
XVII.	Reply by the Director-General	168
XVIII.	Proposal for the admission of Associate Members to Unesco	174

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XVI. Discussion of the Director-General's Report (*conclusion*).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We shall resume the discussion of the Director-General's Report. I call on the delegate of Austria.

[2] Dr. Hermann ZEISSL (Austria) — Mr. President, fellow-delegates, ladies and gentlemen, at the beginning of my speech I must confess that I cannot wholly suppress a feeling of doubt and embarrassment. This is the third day of an extensive debate, and hecatombs of speakers—if I may use this classic term with all due respect to my colleagues—have fired all kinds of inspired and convincing arguments at you. After these admirable and eloquent speeches, what can possibly be left for me to say? How, for instance, could I improve upon the glowing tribute which has rightly been paid on behalf of all of us to this country, and to this city and to its overwhelming hospitality? Nevertheless, our delegation feels from the bottom of its heart that the intimate neighbourhood and friendship which links our two peoples needs expression. Perhaps some of you remember the famous passage in the *Gloria* when Mass is sung, the passage which has inspired many great composers, where thanks are given to God for all his glory. Let me say to our Italian friends, on behalf of our delegation, nay, on behalf of the Austrian people: Thank you, thank you for the glory that is Italy, thank you for the glory that is Florence. No people whose life-blood is imbued with the great Christian universalistic and humanistic tradition of the West, can and will ever forget the glorious contribution made to it from this peninsula and in this city. The fair face of Italy has become more dear to us because of the scars which have been inflicted on it, and this feeling goes deeper with us because we are also in this respect fellow-sufferers.

[3] While this debate, while the General Conference is on, our sympathy goes out more than usually to the Director-General and his excellent team of international civil servants. What an ordeal of days and nights of work before, during and after a General Conference! And what a job! While they are supposed to concentrate on a few projects, they are, on the other hand, supposed to cover the five continents and the seven seas. While they are supposed to make both ends meet

as tightly as possible, they are supposed to convert the world, where there are some very unrepentant sinners, through fundamental and elementary education, through secondary and higher education, through the promotion of science and the humanities, through cultural activities, through research and adult education, through mass media and what not. Well, after all, they have not made too bad a job of it, and we all know that, guided by the Executive Board and the General Conference, they will be making a still better one in future.

[4] When the Austrian Federal Minister of Education opened the first meeting of the Austrian National Commission for Unesco a few weeks ago, he recalled in the speech he delivered on this occasion that now, more than five years after the end of the war and after the liberation from the Nazis' yoke, our full sovereignties, which they had suppressed, have not yet been granted to us and that we are still prevented from taking the seat due to us in the family of the United Nations; and he pointed out with emphasis that Unesco was the first of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations where we had been admitted with full equality of rights. At least, so we thought up to now. An Austrian representative, who has the privilege to talk to a world-wide audience of such distinction as yours, representing the governments of 56, or since yesterday, of 59 States, would fail in his duty if he did not use the opportunity to raise his voice and to appeal to the conscience of the world and of those who hold the fate of the world in their mighty hands to do their utmost so that full freedom and sovereignty be given back to a people which has no reason whatsoever to be ashamed of its contribution to the common cultural heritage of the world and which has within its borders, through the work of centuries, built up some of the outstanding seats of science, of learning and of the arts. I should like to say how grateful we are to Unesco headquarters for the intimate contacts which have been developed during the last year through repeated visits of distinguished members of the Secretariat. Those visits gave the opportunity of a most helpful exchange of opinions and of projects in the field of adult education, of reconstruction, of science in its dissemination and popularization. I also should like to express our pleasure and satisfaction at being able to welcome a Unesco Seminar on Adult Education in our midst this summer. We hope that it will be attended by experts from as many of the States represented here as possible, and we ask you to be assured that we shall do our best to make them feel at home with us and to contribute to the full success of this very broad experiment in the field of education. May I further draw your attention to the pilot project suggested in our resolution contained in document 5C/21 and ask for your sympathetic examination of this proposal, which would, it seems to us, be a very useful step in the direction of certain aims which Unesco has so much at heart.

[5] Whoever listened with some attention to the debate could not help feeling that there was, and is, some malaise in the air, and we are in duty bound to do the necessary heart-searching in order to find its deeper roots. Is it really only concentration that we need? This word has been bandied about very much during this debate and I am almost afraid of its becoming a slogan. Concentration is all right. It is of the greatest importance to concentrate your striking forces at the critical points, in peace as well as in war. We have got to plan reasonably, to cut out everything which threatens to exceed our financial power and the capacity of our apparatus. But we have to find out where to concentrate. We have to thrash that out here and now. We have to find out the right directions in which to concentrate, to clear our minds regarding the principles which have to underlie our decisions regarding concentration. This needs singleness and clearness of purpose.

[6] According to our Constitution we have to promote peace through education, science and culture. This is only an indirect approach to that problem of winning the peace, which, as we all know, is a matter of life and death. We have to awaken and foster the capacity for clear, and above all, critical thinking. We have to spread the knowledge which is necessary to decide the great questions of social and collective life. We have to create an atmosphere of international cooperation in the field of education, science and culture and to make the fruits of such collaboration so dear to the people that they will refuse to risk them in war. We have to implant an ethical outlook and a moral outlook, the respect for the *Droits de l'Homme*, the love for peace, so that everybody will condemn war out of hand. All this, as I said, is an indirect approach and the fruits of such endeavour do not ripen in one year. There is, of course, also a direct approach, the approach straight away to the masses, through mass media; but I often wonder whether this direct approach, necessarily urgent as it is, should be the duty of the same agency as the one to which the indirect approach is entrusted. This direct approach is a question of propaganda, a decent, efficient and sincere propaganda—I repeat sincere propaganda—but none the less mass propaganda, and I wonder whether the mentality and the methods of those whose task it is to lead such

propaganda campaigns can and should be the same as those in whose hands the indirect approach is laid. This of course does not mean that the mass media should not be used by the indirect approach as well. Let us be careful, when we start concentrating our efforts, not to neglect those sides of our activities which are the *raison d'être* of our Organization.

[7] We should like to give the fullest support to the plan suggested by the delegation of the United States of America to hold General Conferences every second year only. The financial burden of these conferences is so great, the time, the working powers of those concerned with the preparation and of those attending are so heavily taxed that it would be a great relief if the American lead could be followed. Besides, as I said before, the plans of indirect approach do not mature so fast; they need their time and one year is not enough.

[8] Much has been said and much is hoped of the activities of the National Commissions. I should like to give a warning not to overtax the capacity, not to overrate the possibilities of these bodies. We know that big empires are ruled by committees, but such possibilities seem to be a question of historical tradition, national character and social structure. If I think of my country—and the same applies to many other countries—I have to say that on such Commissions, if they are expected to be representative, there must be sitting, and will be sitting, mostly men who have, each of them, the burden of a very heavy other full-time job on their shoulders. We therefore cannot expect them to become a truly executive body. They will not be able to do much more than liaison and co-ordinating work. On the other hand, the Ministries in such countries which have to master extraordinary historical and political situations are responsible for the rebuilding and reconstruction of their country, though short of personnel and financial resources themselves. These burdens are often so difficult and heavy that no blame can be laid on these countries if they can give only very limited financial support to the National Commissions and cannot satisfy sufficiently the additional claims coming their way in the international field. This is a very serious problem and the suggestion of our honourable colleague from Egypt to accredit Unesco functionaries to Member States in order to help the Ministry concerned to wrestle with Unesco problems, seems in my eyes worthy to be looked into very carefully.

[9] Our colleague and friend from Yugoslavia has expressed anxiety regarding what he called "war psychosis" and its consequences. I can assure him that in my country, though it is certainly in the front line of the cold war, and if, God forbid, hot war should ever break out, might easily lie in the presumptive front line of that war as well, there is no psychosis, no hysteria whatsoever. Everybody goes about his work as if there were no intrinsic threats in the world situation. Let me conclude these few remarks upon this optimistic note. Let us all do our work in the field of education, science and culture with optimism, faith and confidence. Let us do our duty to our utmost, so as to justify optimism as far as we are concerned, and we can be confident that it will be justified.

[10] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Thailand.

[11] Luang Svastisarn SASTRABUDDHI (Thailand) — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Thailand delegation, I wish to thank the Italian Government for the kind and generous hospitality they have extended to us.

[12] Mention is made in the Director-General's Report of an educational mission sent by Unesco to Thailand, and I should like to make a short statement on this subject. Early in 1949 sir John Sargent went on a consultative educational mission to Thailand. I believe it was the first of its kind sent by Unesco. The mission came very soon after Thailand became a Member State. In 1950 Unesco followed up the first mission by another to study and make further proposals and recommendations. I am glad to say our Government has accepted the proposal that Unesco should send technical advisers to study and draw up more concrete and practical plans. The initial outcome of the missions is that we are now considering a scheme for the prolongation of free compulsory education and the popularization of vocational education. The former, which is one of the recommendations of the mission, will be in the trend of the educational system at present in use, which needs only modification and extension; the latter, that is, the popularization of vocational education, will need a good deal of guiding and supplementing.

[13] I take this occasion to recall part of the history of education in Thailand. About seventy years back we called upon the West to modernize the education of the counrry. Men were recruited from the West to lay the foundation of the educational system, and this system, in a more or less modified form, is still in use. Men were also sent abroad to study so that they might come back to carry on the work. Such was the main outline of the programme and it has done much to promote the education of the country. Progress was slow, it must be admitted. There were times when things were not as they

should be. With budget setbacks, schools were closed, and some were destroyed during the war. With the coming of Unesco it seems a somewhat similar occurrence is taking place, like history repeating itself, in that a mission is being sent about this time to lay a more international basis of education, science and culture. It is my belief that a programme for the exchange of information and exchange of persons in the form of fellowships, technical advisers and technical assistance for certain less privileged countries will prove useful and beneficial.

[14] In passing, I note with anxiety that we are mixing politics with education, science and culture. Politics are merely passing phases in the life of man, whereas education, science and culture are the permanent heritage in the evolution of mankind. We have to choose that which we are going to pass on to posterity and not that which will become but dust and askes with the passage of time. In an international organization for peace and understanding, if it is to be successful, there should be no barrier to bar those who care to join. Let them all come and form one family of nations.

[15] In conclusion, I take this opportunity to thank Unesco and the Director-General for the interest taken in Thailand, and on behalf of my colleagues I can assure you of close co-operation.

[16] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Monaco.

[17] Mr. Jacques RUEFF (Monaco) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, ladies and gentlemen, may I first of all associate my delegation with the thanks offered by previous speakers to the Italian Government for its splendid hospitality. Renan said that Florence and Athens were the two cities which have done most for the minds of men. Let us hope that the effective results from our discussions for which we pray will add to Florence's fame. It is a great privilege to speak in a hall made glorious by so much art and beauty. Perhaps it was of deliberate intent that the Italian Government staged our discussions among incomparable frescoes illustrating methods of settling conflicts not based directly on international understanding. At least they have the merit of reminding us that there are problems which recur repeatedly because they are never solved and of giving us yet further reason to seek a remedy in our deliberations.

[18] To my great regret I was prevented by unavoidable prior commitments from hearing Sir John MAUD's address; however, I have read it with care, as I have the report of the Director-General. May I first pay tribute to the scrupulous fairness of the report and more particularly to the intellectual honesty which shines through it. Mr. Torres Bodet has not sought to hide from us his anxieties, which indeed are shared by all those taking part in these discussions. There is a wide difference between administering an institution in being that has its traditions and pursues an appointed course, and controlling an undertaking which has to cut its pathway through virgin forest. Unesco seeks to scale the peaks, but like the climber whose own ice-axe must cut the steps by which he mounts, Unesco is searching for a route which it must pioneer itself. I feel that this is the essential—possibly indeed the sole—task confronting this General Conference, namely, seeking criteria for the determination of what is and what is not Unesco's business. Government has been defined as selection and—even more important—rejection. The question which must be answered by those in charge of Unesco is what they can and should retain and what they should reject.

[19] I may say that I have had this problem constantly before my eyes, in a capacity other than that in which I now address you, as President of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. The Council is now more than two years old and owes its existence to you. Its life is already vigorous; its Standing Committee has met three times and throughout each of those meetings I have been continually at grips with the problem, implicit in every page of the Director-General's Report, of whether the tasks suggested to us are or are not our business. And the question whether our existence represents a step forward, or whether it would make any difference or things would be either better or worse if we did not exist, is only the same question of what is or is not Unesco's proper sphere in another form. It may perhaps help a little if I contribute to this discussion—not teaching, for we are still beginners—but the first fruits of experience, of the trial and error which have led us to a preliminary and temporary definition of our task. Initially we were faced with problems of the simplest nature—what might be called the most rudimentary and material form of intellectual co-operation. Despite their simplicity it cannot be said that even these problems are always easy to resolve. Many years ago I had an old teacher of whom I was very fond—he is dead now, but some of you may have known him—Mr. Colson. He was a liberal of the old school without over-much sympathy for the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, newly founded after the first war. I remember his saying one day: "Certainly, intellectual co-operation is very valuable, but I had always believed that the means

for it was perfected some centuries ago by a man called Gutenberg and that there had not been many improvements since". However, in the light of experience it looks as though Gutenberg either had not found the final answer to the question or had answered it too well. May I recall to you the Arab poem quoted to us yesterday by the Egyptian delegate about the scholar snowed under by the documents descending on him. Of course, the delegate was tactful enough to talk about an Arab scholar rather than almost any delegate to the Conference of Unesco. However, that is what happens to all too many scholars as regards their own special subject.

[20] The first problem we had to deal with was that of bibliographies, and here undoubtedly the trouble lies in excess and not its opposite. Gutenberg has solved the problem too successfully. Every one of us has inflicted on him monthly not one but five, six or seven competing bibliographies, all giving roughly the same information but not in the same order and serving only to cause dissipation of effort with no positive gain to culture. We therefore began by trying to reduce to reasonable proportions the numbers of bibliographies in the various fields with which we were concerned. We set up a commission of editors of bibliographies for each discipline and set limits to the numbers of existing publications.

[21] Similarly, we have attempted to avoid duplication of work by congresses, to introduce a measure of order, to establish contact between congresses in related fields and to secure that they are held in the same place, to secure maximum effectiveness. We have further sought to establish reviews, to keep track of the position in each discipline, while Unesco's assistance has enabled us to revive the dormant review *Erasmus*, now a general review of humanistic studies designed to give a coherent picture of this department of knowledge as a whole. We have done our part towards instigating meetings on library and museum technique. However, all these are purely material concerns—they are, so to speak, no more than minor refinements of Gutenberg's invention, and, as I think was said either by the Director-General or the Chairman of the Executive Board, it is not thus that the heart-cry of the peoples can be answered nor their confidence in Unesco repaid.

[22] Leaving material things aside, a thing at once brought home to us by the very diversity of a Council whose member organizations are concerned with subjects as various as Philosophy, History, Linguistics and Classical Studies, was the damage done by specialization. It is an unavoidable consequence of the intellectual progress made by man, but as Bergson put it with great truth:

> Science has enlarged man's physical capacities beyond all measure, but within the giant frame the soul is still, as it always was, too small to fill it and too weak to govern it.

The contrast between the limited intellectual capacity of the seeker and the extent of the field before him constitutes the great drama of contemporary culture, and it is the central problem of that drama which we have done our little best to tackle with the means at our disposal by seeking to build or to enlarge the bridges between the several disciplines of humanistic studies. For one thing, we have systematically developed the method of symposia in an endeavour, by bringing together the representatives of different disciplines to discuss specific questions, to widen the expert's field notwithstanding the limits set by the expansion of knowledge. For instance, we have arranged for symposia on specific subjects between historians and scientists and between philosophers and scientists; here we owed much to the aid of ICSU and of the new Council of Medical Sciences, of whose co-operation I cannot speak too highly; I should also like to stress the extent of Unesco's efforts for the avoidance of watertight compartments. You probably recall the story—by Anatole France I think—of the scientist who was taking someone round a museum. The visitor questioned him about a small animal he noticed, and the scientist replied: "Oh, that's not one of my cases". I have been able to see for myself how keenly those within Unesco were concerned to take away the glass and let in fresh air, and through the help of the Council of Scientific Unions, the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies and the Council of Medical Sciences, we have been able, within the limits set by our resources, to arrange a number of symposia for the exploration of questions of concern to different and generally unrelated disciplines. We shall continue in this course and I feel myself it is one of the most important of our activities.

[23] Nevertheless, even this is no answer to the cry of the people nor to the trust they may have placed in Unesco. This brings me to a field much less well defined and far more difficult, in which we are still in the experimental stage and are rather in need of counsel from Unesco than able to teach it anything. Our feeling was that there were certain fields in which it might be profitable to effect systematic and objective exploration of subjects of concern to governments for one reason or another. In my view we should not forget that we, here, are the assembled representatives of governments. It would nevertheless be a great

mistake to think that an institution such as ours can carry out research direct. The main element in research is the man who does it, and a body such as ours can ease his task by material aid in the widest sense—as in fact we have sought to do along the lines I have described; but, believe me, any attempt to go further than that or to usurp the research worker's place would involve a serious risk of paralysing their endeavours. On the other hand, we do feel that as representatives of governments we are competent to express and formulate the problems confronting those governments. I realize that such problems are already examined from many angles and at many levels; I hope, however, that I shall not shock any statesmen present if I suggest that in fact they are discussed in an atmosphere which, to say the least of it, is not distinguished by objectivity. Leibnitz pointed out that if our passions and immediate interests were as much thwarted by geometry as by politics we should be little less ready to dispute the former's than the latter's teachings and defy its laws despite all the proofs of Euclid and Archimedes. We had wondered whether it would not or might not prove of value to discuss problems nearly relating to the activities of governments from a standpoint other than our usual one; in the event it was you yourselves, the General Conference of Unesco, who asked us to do so when, at Beirut, you referred to our Council a vital problem of outstanding difficulty, that of the techniques and methods of Fascism and Nazism. Faced with this "present" of yours, we discovered that it set us the most formidable problems imaginable and in the early stages there were two schools of thought in the Council. The first favoured a fact-finding procedure, i.e., an investigation of great importance but concerned only with facts and seeking to do no more than to make available to future historians a kind of catalogue of the techniques and methods used by Fascism and Nazism. However, since we are, if I may say so, a comprehensive institution, including philosophers, sociologists and historians, another school of thought arose which wished to go to the root of the matter and determine the main lines of the evolutionary process which had given rise to the phenomena in question and by which ideological concepts had been transformed into political dogma. In the end the latter school prevailed. In due course we shall publish a report in three parts, the first two examining respectively the chain of thought by which the ideology became the Nazi and Fascist dogmas, and the historical circumstances under which the transformation became possible, while the final part will give an outline of the actual techniques and methods themselves.

[24] Gentlemen, we are of opinion that the course on which we have decided is dangerous, indeed as dangerous as it could well be. The programme we have set ourselves plants us squarely in the thick of the worst difficulties, and we are as thoroughly committed as it is possible to be. I want to make it clear that it was for this very reason that we chose this approach. We did so because we feel it our duty as the Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies and as Unesco's instrument to get to the root of the problems submitted to us and to define and discuss all their implications despite the risks involved. I do not know if we shall succeed. The difficulties are immense. Some of them are purely material, such as the choice of men to do the work, more particularly since, as you realize, the question as regards such committees is not always what men one wants but what men are available. Hence, this undertaking of ours is beset by a major difficulty, that of securing from the public and from the scientists who can contribute to the work the degree of trust which will induce them to put forth the effort we want from them. Nevertheless, the work is under way. I say again that I do not know if it will succeed; of that you will be the judges. The reports I spoke of should be completed at the end of 1950 and the work as a whole may be regarded as a surveying trip along a path on which we think Unesco might venture and thereby, perhaps, best respond to those aspirations of the peoples of which the Director-General spoke. There are many other similar problems. The question of Fascism and Nazism is only one tiny facet of the problems confronting all who ponder on the philosophy of government.

[25] Gentlemen, there is constant talk of peace both in our Constitution and in every report we produce. May I venture to suggest—with the delegate of Egypt—that we talk about it too much: no single report lacks its paragraph on peace. Napoleon used to say that no purpose was served by discussing anything while one was actually doing it. I think myself that it is dangerous to talk about it when one has not yet accomplished it. The problem of peace will not be resolved by mere reference to it in reports not otherwise concerned with it. There is a technique of social pacification.

[26] The same is true of the question of liberty: to set the peoples free, it is not enough to make freedom an article in a constitution; a system must be applied in practice which makes freedom possible; in other words, there is a technique of freedom. I agree that Unesco would run a serious risk by committing itself through its technical organs and the Councils I have mentioned, to an

enquiry into the technique of freedom. But gentlemen, do you not think—it is a question you cannot avoid—do you not think that it is our duty not to dodge the task? Do you not think that, if we really wish to justify the trust the peoples at present repose in our Organization, we must tackle the real problems, the basic problems, of which it can be said that, if they are not resolved, all our generation's efforts will have failed? I think myself that, as long as we confine ourselves to improving the methods of which I was speaking just now, Gutenberg's method, to running congresses and subsidizing reviews, we shall be merely scratching at the surface of our real task; our concern is with the major problems and, if we cannot solve them, it will mean that the task laid on us is impossible of accomplishment.

[27] Gentlemen, that is the note on which I want to end. Yesterday our Egyptian colleague bade us not to yield to the gloomy lure of pessimism. I doubt if any of us is in danger of doing so. Of course, the Director-General might be so tempted if he paid too much attention to the criticisms mixed with the adjurations addressed to him. He is reproached by some for having done too much and by others for not doing enough. Yet I have noticed that in many of the speeches accusing him of having done too much he was urged to do still more and to add considerably to the Organization's liabilities. If he needed reassurance, I can give it to him in Dante's words:

The man whom the Ghibellines called Guelf and the Guelphs called Ghibelline has the truth in him.

Mr. Director-General, in this debate the Guelphs have repeatedly called you a Ghibelline and the Ghibellines have called you a Guelph, and so I am sure that the truth is in you.

[28] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of South Africa.

[29] Dr. D. B. BOSMAN (Union of South Africa) — Mr. President, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity, and before I go on to deal with the subject specifically before us, to pay a tribute to our hosts, the Italian Government, the City Council of Florence and particularly the Italian National Commission for Unesco, for the magnificent arrangements which have been made for the Fifth Session of the General Conference in this city of Florence, which is an object lesson of what the creative genius of man can achieve through the centuries and, at the same time, a reminder of the wanton destruction that a few weeks of man's war-like activity may work. If the results of this Conference depended only on the arrangements and the surroundings in which it is taking place, its complete success would already be assured. And we should have our gracious hosts to thank for that.

[30] The South African delegation has studied with great interest the report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization, and welcomes this opportunity of associating itself with the tributes which have been paid to the Director-General on the efficiency and zeal with which he and his staff have carried out the programme entrusted to them by the last session of the General Conference. We are gratified to note that commendable steps have been taken to curb further increases in the budget, following on the desire, widely expressed at the last Conference, that the Organization's activities should be reassessed and consolidated. The Director-General has rightly stated, however, that such stabilization as has been attained is more apparent than real, although scarcely any new projects were added to the programme. This is partly due, he aptly points out, to the fact that "the same resolution every year necessitates work on a wider scale simply because of the impetus acquired". It is important that we should bear this mind, for it shows that, if concentration is to be achieved, it must be not only in respect of new projects but also in respect of winding up existing programmes. It is clear from the statements of previous speakers that there is a widespread recognition of the necessity for further consolidation and simplification of the programme, and in view of the experience of the past year the South African delegation cannot but associate itself with this view.

[31] The Director-General's report shows how, in spite of attempts at simplification, it has been necessary to increase the Secretariat by 13 per cent to the position where, even if the common services are deducted, payments to personnel amount to five-eighths of the over-all budget. This is not a healthy state of affairs. But we cannot blame the Director-General therefor. He and other speakers have stressed the extremely heavy burden being borne by the Secretariat. The obvious conclusion is that we, the General Conference, have entrusted the Director-General with duties without according him resources commensurate with what is necessary for the execution of those duties. This state of affairs only we, the General Conference, and not the Director-General, can remedy. It is our business to find the remedy. Either we must find the means for an expanding programme or we must simplify the programme. This is a difficult decision, for we are all agreed, I am sure, that the opportunities of action for the purpose of advancing, through education and scientific and cultural relations, the objective of international

peace and the common welfare of mankind, are practically unlimited. On the other hand, we must face the fact that what is limited are the financial means for providing for the exercise of those opportunities, bearing in mind the numerous other commitments of Member States in the wide field of present-day international co-operation. It is appropriate, therefore, that the Director-General has stated that we should seriously take stock of our resources and our responsibilities. I think it will be agreed that however wide may be our responsibilities, the action which we take to meet those responsibilities must be governed by our resources. This is but simple common sense. These resources are dependent upon contributions from Member States, and the difficulty which some Governments are experiencing in meeting their obligations in this regard is strikingly evident in the extent of arrear contributions. The position is aggravated by the urgent need for increased action on a national basis. Much emphasis has been placed on this by the Director-General, the Chairman of the Executive Board, and many delegates. We in South Africa are acutely aware, from experience, of the large governmental expenditure necessary for effective action in this sphere. It is clearly necessary to strike a proper balance between international and national expenditure. However enthusiastic supporters of the ideals of Unesco we may be, we are all agreed that it is the primary duty of a State to provide for the fundamental education of its members, both juvenile and adult. It is therefore understandable that Member States insist on a close scrutiny of the purposes to, and manner in which, their contributions to international organizations are applied. The South African delegation considers, therefore, that it is essential that the General Conference determine its resources by fixing a realistic over-all budget which is within the means of Member States, bearing in mind their other responsibilities. Only when the resources have been so determined can the Organization decide how best to cut its suit according to its cloth. Two lines of action will be necessary:

[32] In the first place, we shall have to avail ourselves of every opportunity of avoiding any administrative or overhead expenditure which is not absolutely essential. In a budget in which administrative expenses account for such a large proportion of total expenditure I am not without hope that considerable savings can be made. We already have before us the welcome proposal for biennial instead of annual sessions. Further savings should be possible on items such as travelling expenses of officials, printing, and many others enumerated by previous speakers, notably the delegates of Denmark, Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States of America.

[33] In the second place, we can further simplify and concentrate the programme. For this the General Conference must assume primary responsibility. The Director-General will execute the programme as laid down by us, and it is we who must curb ourselves and not allow our enthusiasm to overwhelm our realism and good judgment. The Executive Board could greatly assist by allocating the priorities to be applied to the projects submitted to the General Conference. If we find that certain matters are being postponed in deference to others of higher priority, we must remind ourselves of the possibility that, if Unesco's programme is extended over a field too wide in relation to its resources, the sum total of its efforts may well be inappreciable in the final reckoning for peace or war. If Unesco is to make an effective contribution towards world peace, it is surely preferable that, if its programme must necessarily be limited, it should be concentrated on the matters of more immediate importance, and not on projects of which the final effect may be so far in the future that it may easily be upset by other more important developments which cannot be foreseen at present. We feel convinced that our able and energetic Director-General will still find in this more circumscribed field of activities ample scope for his driving power and his genius for organization, and that Unesco will reap more immediate and not less important results from such a policy of concentration and intensification of its efforts.

[34] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the last speaker on the list, the representative of Ecuador.

Dr. Rafael ALVARADO (Ecuador) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, delegates, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of Ecuador I wish to express our deepest thanks to the Italian Government and to the municipality of Florence for enabling the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco to take place in this wondrous shrine of art, hallowed by history, the admiration of the world.

[35] In the tiny land of Ecuador lying at earth's midmost point, there dwells a people thirsty for culture. It must be that which is the source of the deep faith which all Ecuadoreans feel in Unesco's work. That this is true can be proved by a few concrete examples. Ecuador has contrived to maintain continued, regular and adequate contact with Unesco. It is a joy to me to boast on this occasion that we have several times received Unesco's thanks for the care and promptness

with which its letters have been dealt with and its enquiries and suggestions handled. For instance, through the care of the Ecuadorean Government, Ecuador was the first country to accept Unesco's suggestion for the commemoration of the Declaration of Human Rights. Nevertheless, despite the solid, cordial and earnest contact maintained so far by Ecuador with Unesco, it is my country's intention to draw the bonds yet closer. The Ecuadorean Government has promulgated a decree enlarging the Unesco National Commission so that its work may be more intensive and more effective throughout the country. The Ecuadorean National Commission is supported by all the cultural institutions of Ecuador, among the most important of which I may mention the Ministry of Education, the Ecuadorean House of Culture, the Universities and all the country's literary, scientific and artistic institutions. It is thus for this reason that our cultural programmes maintain their conformity with Unesco's proposals and suggestions. On occasion we have even anticipated the programmes suggested by Unesco, for instance in celebrating the centenaries of great men later honoured with enthusiasm throughout the world. Last year we carried out programmes co-ordinated with those of Unesco to honour the anniversaries of Goethe and Chopin, and this year we have in hand worthy tributes to Bach and Balzac. As regards the Declaration of Human Rights, Ecuador has decided to institute annual programmes and competitions on subjects related to the Declaration. In the present year there will be series of lectures and literary and scientific competitions on subjects whose titles alone will indicate the importance which Ecuador ascribes to the Declaration of Human Rights. The subjects are the following: The Declaration of Human Rights and the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador; the Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations; and, lastly, a comprehensive study of the historical and juridical bases of the Declaration of Human Rights, with outlines of the chief stages in its evolution.

[36] And now I should like to express, in the name of Ecuador and of her delegation to this Conference, the gratitude we feel for Unesco's action in connexion with the grievous disaster suffered by my country towards the end of last year, in the earthquake of whose appalling effects the whole world knows. Ecuador received encouragement and generous help from all the peoples of the earth and more particularly from the sister nations of America. Unesco gave us help and encouragement by appealing to all governments and all organizations for help for Ecuador and further, by a recent decision, has set aside a considerable sum to aid the victims of the disaster. In conveying the thanks thus due I wish to inform this meeting, and more particularly the Executive Board of Unesco, that it is Ecuador's intention to build a school which will be the first to bear the name Unesco.

[37] Finally, Ecuador, this small, culture-loving country, whose faith in Unesco I want to make plain to this meeting, has merited encouragement and gratitude for what it has done, but wants to do much more. Ecuador is convinced that, if Unesco's work receives, as it should, the support of all governments and all cultural institutions, the Organization will attain to complete success in its allotted task. Ecuador believes profoundly that with universal support for Unesco's work we shall gain the glorious goal prescribed in the first lines of Unesco's Constitution, of constructing the defences of peace in the minds of men.

[38] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] That completes the list of those down to speak. I now call on the Director-General to reply.

XVII. Reply by the Director-General.

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, before I read my reply, I should like to point out to the meeting that we have among us one who is a true symbol of our great hopes as regards education and peace. I refer to Mrs. Maria Montessori, who is taking part in the General Conference for the first time. *(Applause).*

This applause, Mrs. Montessori, speaks for itself and conveys to you the full measure of our admiration and our respect.

[40] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the discussion which has taken place as a result of the presentation of my report by the Chairman of the Executive Board has been the occasion for a frank and useful exchange of views. I thank delegates warmly for the words of praise which they have been so good as to address to me. I am proud to receive them, but I also receive them in all humility; for it is really to the Secretariat as a whole that they are due. The devotion with which all my colleagues have served the Organization during an exceptionally difficult period has been a matter of the liveliest satisfaction to me. It is only just that, after having borne the burden and heat of the day, they should now receive honourable mention. But, while I am grateful to delegates for their congratulations, I am no less grateful to them for the criticism they have openly expressed. Both congratulations and criticism encourage us to persevere in one direction or

another, and to improve our work; both congratulations and criticism bear witness to the interest shown in our Organization.

[41] This exchange of views would, to tell the truth, have been more thorough if it could have been based on consideration of reports sent in by all the Member States. In that way we should have been better able to discover the reasons for certain short-comings, as also for certain successes achieved. Much of the information that has not been forthcoming has been withheld by Member States who have not yet set up their National Commissions, have not yet reported on their own activities on behalf of Unesco, yet have voted resolutions, for the excessive number of which they criticize us, and have asked for reports, with which today they complain that they are being overwhelmed.

[42] A strong current of opinion has emerged in favour of altering the periods at which sessions of the General Conference are held. I do not wish to pre-judge your decision, but I think we should leave the door open for a possible future exchange of views such as that which in these last few days has proved so essential. I am not, in principle, opposed to the idea of biennial conferences; on the contrary. But this suggestion should be considered in the light of two prime considerations. Does it not, in the first place, involve another amendment to our Constitution, involving a change in the term of office, and perhaps even the structure, of the present Executive Board? In the second place, how are we to avoid its causing a dangerous loss of contact between the Member States and the Secretariat? The disadvantages of biennial sessions might conceivably be lessened if fuller annual reports were supplied by Member States, and by all of them; such reports would become more necessary than ever if the decision in favour of biennial conferences was taken.

[43] I do not, moreover, believe that this need for contact could be fully met if biennial sessions of the Conference were to alternate with similar sessions of National Commissions. Except in a few cases, the existing National Commissions still lack the resources in men, money and material that would enable them to fulfil a really effective function; they have not yet acquired the necessary experience. While I am the first to acknowledge the value of the work done at the Conference they have held during these last few days, I do not think it would be unfair to say that this meeting has shown that they still have much to do if they are to carry out the mission for which they are designed. It might, on the other hand, be possible to have, not world conferences, but special meetings of National Commissions, grouped according to regions or community of interest in one given problem or another.

[44] It has been suggested that each Member State should have accredited to it a representative of Unesco, whose duty it would be to ensure more positive liaison between the Governments, the National Commissions and the Secretariat. Last year I brought a proposal of this nature before the Conference; but the idea has had to be abandoned. It would have had several advantages, but there were difficulties from a budgetary point of view. In view of the high qualities required of the officials who would have had to occupy these important posts, the office expenses and the necessary amount of travel involved, some $1,000,000 would have been required. Such a cost was sufficient to rule out the whole proposal. Another way of making up for the loss of contact with Member States and of an annual exchange of views would be for the Director-General and some of his main collaborators to pay a visit to certain areas of the world. Such a visit would have to be carefully organized in advance and would have to last long enough for the problems of each area visited to be studied profitably. In this way contact would be preserved with the facts upon which our joint effort must be brought to bear; they would emerge more clearly, and would accordingly be better dealt with. I am here simply putting forward suggestions, on the assumption that the principle of biennial sessions is approved. What I say should not be taken to mean that the Secretariat is opposed to that course; it is merely designed to emphasize the need for maintaining regular and frequent exchanges of views between Member States, since this alone can ensure that our work is adapted to the actual conditions existing throughout the world.

[45] What, in fact, do the criticisms that we have heard amount to, if not to a charge of lack of realism or effectiveness? To clarify the matter, I will make a distinction between two types of criticism—that levelled against the Secretariat and that levelled against the Organization itself. The first type of criticism is, I think, the less serious, in that it is easier to take the necessary action to meet it.

[46] I am no more satisfied than are our critics with the position as regards publications. Fresh measures are now being considered with a view to reducing their number, improving their quality and increasing their distribution. The information circulated about Unesco is also not what it should be. Our appeal to the National Commissions, which we repeat, to help us make our work better known does not, of course, absolve us from the task of improving the methods of the Secretariat. It is for the Heads of Departments them-

selves to see that their work is properly presented to the public. When they have been relieved of the obligation to draft a surfeit of reports at very short notice, they will be able to keep in closer contact with the Public Information Division; and when our services have thus been better co-ordinated, I expect a clear improvement as regards press communiqués, articles, and material for broadcasting.

[47] We have also been criticized for excessive administrative expenditure. I entirely agree with our critics that this expenditure should be reduced to a minimum. But a study of this problem, in which I have engaged ever since I took up my post, has convinced me that it is very difficult to bring this expenditure below its present level. We have arrived at the point with which economists are familiar, where a reduction in the programme would not result in a reduction in general expenditure but, on the contrary, an increase in programme work would mean that a smaller proportion of our expenditure was employed for general purposes. The structure of the Organization itself, as defined by the Constitution, and the work and procedure as laid down by the General Conference do not permit us to reduce any further the size of an administrative apparatus whose unwieldiness it is easier to criticize than to remedy. You may be assured, gentlemen, that I shall not relax my efforts to reduce, so far as I can, this part of our expenditure, which it is not perhaps quite accurate merely to describe as "unproductive".

[48] As regards the excessive amount of reports and paperwork, I may perhaps be allowed to observe that, before making this a matter of reproach to the Secretariat, which is the first to suffer from it, each delegation might ask itself whether it is not, through its own votes, responsible for it.

[49] I further agree with our critics when they deplore the lack of a balanced geographical distribution in the staff of the Secretariat. In view of the short time which was available to us for the carrying out of a heavy and complex task, I was reluctant to run the risk of disorganizing the Secretariat during these last eighteen months by making radical changes in the geographical complexion of the staff. The problem is, in fact, only a part of the larger problem of recruitment as a whole, and as long ago as last year I told you of my difficulties in recruiting, for our work, persons of a high quality from all our Member States. I have described my difficulties again this year; I can only repeat that the problem will remain insoluble so long as Member States and National Commissions refrain from making the effort we have asked them to make in connexion with the selection of our collaborators and with the guarantee, to be given them by their own countries, that their careers in those countries shall not be prejudiced in any way by the fact that they have devoted their time to working for an international organization. Moreover, do not the remarks we have heard on this subject amount to contradictory demands? We have, for instance, been asked to show more understanding as regards regional problems, to see that Unesco's "world outlook" adapts itself to special conditions that have been determined by history and geography. I could wish for nothing better. I have said, on many occasions, that the united world at which we are aiming does not in the least imply a "uniform" world. When Unesco's Liaison Office for the Western Hemisphere was opened at Havana, I said, in a message, that "there is no place in our company for that kind of regionalism which would put fresh obstacles in the path of mutual understanding. Even culturally, such regionalism—masking intolerance of its neighbours—would surely only reinforce the political and economic barriers behind which one section of mankind seeks to isolate itself in time and space from the rest. Unesco, which is a force for human unity, could never endorse any narrow regionalism of that kind. But this spirit must not be confused with those elements which give to every people its individual character and its own original and inalienable cultural personality. In our efforts to achieve unity throughout the world we should fall into grievous error if we failed to take into account the originality of individual cultures and the affinities linking the cultures of particular groups of peoples. Unesco does not seek to impose an arbitrary and, in the end, deadening unity, but tries rather to lead men of every race and clime to mutual understanding, and to awake in them that current of sympathy and consciousness of their moral and intellectual kinship which underlies all their differences and which is acknowledged by even the most widely dissimilar cultures. Hence the difficulty, but hence too the greatness of Unesco's task". You will see therefore, gentlemen, that I have already gone some way along the road that you now so rightly indicate. We still, however, have to recruit enough of the right kind of specialists to deal with all the various individual problems that arise. Yet how can I do this if, in the first place, the Member States do not supply me with first-class candidates and, in the second place, I am severely limited as to the number of staff that I can recruit?

[50] As you see, gentlemen, no individual question can be solved if it is not related to the generality of the problems raised. And the solution of these problems as a whole depends on effective

and increasing co-operation from all our Member States.

[51] I now come to the criticisms levelled against the Organization. What, in fact, are these criticisms, if not criticisms of the Member States themselves? For we are all agreed that Unesco is not merely the Secretariat; it is the 56 Member States as a whole, united in a process of organized co-operation. All the distinguished persons who have spoken before me have emphasized the need for making our combined action more effective, and none could subscribe more heartily than I do to this demand. What they have said in general points to two very clear ways in which greater effectiveness might be brought about: the concentration of our programme, and the unification of our resources. It would, no doubt, be easy for me to point out here that when our programme is criticized for being too diffuse and obscure, what is really being criticized is the work of previous sessions of the General Conference, which prepared and voted that programme; so that, when making this criticism, many of the delegates, who have now for several years taken part in Unesco's work, are, in fact, criticizing themselves! But no matter. The main thing is now to agree and to resolve to correct the situation. So far as the effort at "concentration" that you demand is concerned, this is an effort that we decided to make as long as eighteen months ago, and we have already begun to carry out our resolve. The report now under discussion represents the execution of a programme inherited from previous sessions whose work, as is normal in the early years of an organization, was directed not towards concentration but towards expansion. I had already attempted, with the wise guidance of the Executive Board, to correct the impossible situation created by a super-abundance of projects, by laying down an order of priority. The Fourth Session of the General Conference did not proceed beyond this point and left it to the present Florence Session to re-think the programme of Unesco with a view to a concentration of effort. The matter therefore, gentlemen, now lies with you.

[52] In considering, however, the draft programme submitted to you by the Executive Board it would be well to pay due regard to the conditions governing our work, and to its essential features. This a particularly true with regard to the organization and development of intellectual co-operation between the nations, which is our primary objective, since it is the pre-requisite for any really practical work. This involves the provision of various services which cannot be delayed or reduced without grave disadvantages. Most of the projects themselves are such that a year is not sufficient to complete them. The improvement of school textbooks in the interest of international understanding, the preparation of international conventions on copyright or the free circulation of educational, scientific and cultural materials, and the development of a fundamental education pilot project, all require patient work, which will, we hope, produce far-reaching and lasting results. If we adopted a special project each year, as one delegate has suggested, we should not be released from the obligations we have contracted by embarking on the execution of projects from which no concrete results can be expected within a year. We must not forget that there are many tasks in our own field of activity which we have already set aside, and most of those we have undertaken can bear fruit only after long years of toil. The concentration of our programme should not commit us to gradual renunciation, nor cause us to sacrifice for immediate and spectacular results tasks which are difficult and slow to bear their fruit but which will lay a far surer foundation for the structure of peace we are endeavouring to build.

[53] Speakers also seemed to be agreed on the second means of making our Organization more efficient—the careful marshalling and integration of all our resources. I fully endorse all you have said, both with regard to your criticisms of the past and your recommendations for the future. So far as the Secretariat is concerned, I shall try to bring about the utmost possible integration by linking yet more closely—if need be, by new machinery—the work of our various branches of activity and of our different services. But I am convinced that the integration in question is not a matter of concern to the Secretariat alone. This integration which we all admit is a pressing necessity also means, above all, that all the Member States must be prepared, feeling themselves to be truly members of Unesco and acting in that spirit, to co-operate still more closely with one another within the Organization. It means that they must not rest content with passing resolutions and approving the budget, but must carry out those resolutions and pay their quota of the budget more readily than some of them have done in the past.

[54] Will the collaboration afforded by National Commissions be sufficient in this respect, valuable though it already is and capable though it be of further development? Most of them, as I have said, still suffer from inexperience, inadequate resources and, in the words of one delegate, some "blind spots". The special or regional meetings I have suggested would probably give them an opportunity of taking a more active part in the furthering of our work—more active because they would be concerned with more immediate and

practical matters—particularly if it were possible to link these meetings with the continuing activities of regional offices, like the one which has already begun to operate so successfully at Havana. Here again, however, an inter-governmental organization such as ours must appeal, first and foremost, to governments. The real and effective integration for which you are asking on their behalf depends primarily upon those governments themselves, so that you, gentlemen, who report their requirements, also control the means we need to satisfy them. What profit would there be in stating so accurately how our work can be made more efficient, if you failed to draw the practical conclusions which follow? If these frank discussions, in which the desire for greater efficiency has so often been expressed, were not to lead to decisions calculated to secure increased participation in our work by Member States, in both the material and the moral sphere, they might perhaps do our Organization more harm than good in the eyes of the peoples who are watching us. It is not enough to diagnose the ills from which we suffer: remedies must be found for them.

[55] In the material sphere, may I make some comments on the budget, since financial questions have already been mentioned by several speakers. Whether we will or no, the statements made in this hall, however eloquent and encouraging they may be in themselves, will be largely judged by the decisions taken on this point. A methodical revision of the draft programme submitted to you with the object of securing greater concentration combined with the "streamlining" of our methods and procedure may, of course, help to release certain sums from our proposed budget estimates. These sums may be employed either to carry further certain activities, or to enable us to embark on the study of some major projects for submission to the next session of the General Conference, or even to carry out immediately certain types of work which are directly related to the needs of the present-day world. I need not tell you how very ready the whole Secretariat is, as I am, to help you in adjusting the programme and budget in the interest of greater system and realism. But let me tell you frankly, that, so far as I can judge at this stage, no substantial reductions can be secured by such adjustments without dangerously compromising the continuity and very effectiveness of our activities. Believe me, there is a point below which we cannot sink without imperilling the future and even the existence of a young organization which is developing naturally; and the level at which our resources stand is so low that a very few reductions would bring us to that point.

[56] Now, as you know, you will have to consider, besides the budget, how the requisite sums are to be obtained. You are already aware that the budget you pass will not, in all probability, be supplied entirely from the contributions of Member States. It follows that a minimum budget would really mean that our actual resources were below the minimum and, if that were so, I am convinced that you would deal Unesco a blow from which it would take several years to recover; and you would do this, by a cruel contradiction, at the very moment when you mean to set the Organization on the path of achievement and when it is in fact in a position to set forth on that path with profit. Lastly, as I have already said but feel it necessary to reiterate, the moral support of Member States is quite as necessary to us as their material support. Without either we could only rust in idleness.

[57] After Mr. Laugier's stirring appeal on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the words of so many delegates, whose measured terms have not concealed their anxiety, it seems to me that the General Conference must have realized the responsibilities we bear in the present state of the world. Let us now consider what strength we have. Unesco consists of 59 Member States, some of which are to be found in every continent, representing every school of thought, and united in their consideration for the dignity of the individual and their care for international peace. This session of the General Conference is exceptionally important. It is considering the problem of the aims of our Organization and trying so to co-ordinate the programme that it shall be more directly related to those aims; the Conference is investigating Unesco's methods, with the object of increasing their speed and efficiency. Even more, the Organization must assess the extent to which it can play an effective part in the present condition of the world, deciding not only what it can do to secure peace for tomorrow but what it can do for peace today. I have been glad to see how readily the Executive Board's appeal on this point has been heard and how seriously it has been considered. Several delegations have responded to it. Although they are not unanimously agreed upon the solutions to be suggested, they are all, or nearly all, inspired by the same desire to fulfil the great obligations imposed upon them by the Constitution, under which Unesco is, by definition, not a mere office of intellectual co-operation but an organization for the defence of peace. Various speakers have advised us to bring prudence to our task. But what is the nature of that task? Until the Constitution of London is amended or until its Preamble becomes a dead letter we are required

explicitly to serve peace without weakness or reserve.

[58] During this general discussion the hope has several times been repeated that Unesco will not get mixed up in politics. That should of course be the rule for the Secretariat. A political Secretariat in Unesco is inconceivable. But the General Conference is an assembly of delegates of governments and as such necessarily has political authority and a political character. That being so, it is hard to see why the political authority so much in evidence in dealing with certain specific cases should suddenly become perilous when it is sought to use it to strengthen the foundations of the United Nations' work for peace which is our essential task and the reason for our existence. Our Constitution makes no distinction between peace tomorrow and peace today. Of course the political centre *par excellence* of the United Nations' system is Lake Success; but Unesco is not a cloister utterly withdrawn from that system.

[59] Several policies have been suggested for the Organization, among which the General Conference will have to decide. May I say that, in my opinion, these policies are not mutually exclusive, but, on the other hand, do not seem calculated to complement one another. If we take a more active part in the present we are likely to win the sympathy and assistance of all the men and women concerned with the present drama of the world, and that sympathy and assistance must necessarily be of help in directing our programme towards the accomplishment of the basic practical tasks on which the groundwork of tomorrow's peace depends. As several speakers have emphasized, Unesco's field of activity offers definite opportunities of assisting the United Nations not inconsiderably in their work for peace concerned with current problems. Specific proposals for this purpose have been put forward, and I must pay tribute to the constructive attitude in which they have been advanced. As many delegates have pointed out, the arms Unesco wields in this struggle for peace are those of truth and tolerance. They are strong and honourable arms, so that we need not fear the strife in which they will be tried. In my opinion it is Unesco's mission, now more than ever, to conduct an unceasing crusade for truth and tolerance. We cannot stand aside. We are living in an era in which an ivory tower is a tomb. Personally, it causes me no anxiety to see Unesco entering the arena of current affairs. Only—I must repeat once more— there would be no point in laying down a militant policy for the Organization unless the same militant spirit were to inspire the national policy of each one of the Member States. We cannot conceive of a Unesco policy of peace apart from that followed by the Member States themselves. Here again, ladies and gentlemen, you have to make the necessary decisions.

[60] Years ago, when I first visited Florence, I slowly climbed up the road which leads to the Piazzale Michelangelo, as many of you have probably done. When I reached the top, I looked for some likeness of the artist. There was none. The incomparable silhouette of the great sculptor's David stood out against a clear blue sky; in the distance, the countryside rose to the horizon in a succession of light and shade, like the stanzas of a well-constructed poem. Down in the valley lay the city. What was the significance of Michelangelo's absence from this place commemorating his renown? But was it right to speak of his absence? No man can ever be absent from places where his memory is perpetuated by his works. The immortality of the greatest creative artists lies in the fact that their survival does not depend on their material presence, even in the form of a statue. When Unesco has really accomplished the task assigned by history, it is unlikely that any promenade will bear the name of the Organization to commemorate it in the same way as the sculptor of Moses. But, in the minds of all free men and women, there will be a free force for ever exalting the ideal of brotherhood, justice and peace which we now serve with humble devotion. We ourselves shall probably not live to see that day. But that does not matter. Promises are gages. Those who believe in their duty keep their eyes fixed on the future. The time for talking is past; the hour for decision has struck. We have said what had to be said and you, gentlemen, have said it very well. We now have to do what there is to be done.

[61] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Ladies and gentlemen, this addition by the Director-General to his masterly report will, I think, be of the utmost value to the Commissions now to continue their work. They will show us the lines along which we must direct our efforts. It is therefore in your name that I again thank the Director-General for his powerful contribution to our work. May I borrow the allegory with which he closed his address to recall to you another matter: in St. Paul's Cathedral in London you will find a very small memorial to Sir Christopher Wren, the genius who built the whole. Below it, there is inscribed a single phrase: "*Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice*" (for this man's monument, cast your eyes around you). It is my earnest hope that Unesco's work may be

of such a sort as to constitute a living memorial to what its Director-General has done.

XVIII. Proposal for the admission of Associate Members to Unesco.

[62] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The General Committee of the Conference this morning considered the request from the United Kingdom delegation for the addition of a supplementary item to the agenda for the session, namely, a proposal for the admission to the Unesco of Associate Members. In this connexion the Committee recommends that the General Conference:

(a) Add this question to the agenda and refer it to the Procedure Committee, without discussion in plenary meeting at this stage;

(b) Recommend the reference of the question to the Procedure Committee for preliminary study;

(c) Request the Procedure Committee to prepare regulations for the application of the provisions of Article XIII of the Constitution.

I must accordingly ask the General Conference whether it accepts the suggestions of the General Committee. For the first matter, namely, inclusion of the question in the agenda, a two-thirds majority is required under paragraph 1 of Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, as this is a new question.

Will anyone second the motion for the addition to the agenda of the General Conference of the following question: Proposal for the admission of associate members to Unesco? It is seconded by India and Pakistan. The vote will now be taken.

(The vote was taken.)

[63] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] The proposal is accepted by twenty-eight votes to one, with two abstentions. The question will accordingly be referred to the Procedure Committee.

[64] The General Committee has also considered the proposal submitted by the delegation of Yugoslavia, which seeks to add the names of Descartes and Giordano Bruno to the list of great men to whom the General Conference will pay tribute this year, on the occasion of the third centenary of the death of Descartes and the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that of Giordano Bruno. The Italian Government and National Commission having been given the task of arranging a series of lectures in honour of those to whom Unesco is to pay tribute, the General Committee has decided to ask the President of the Italian National Commission if arrangements can be made in sufficient time for the addition of two lectures in honour of Descartes and Giordano Bruno. Further, the Committee is asking the Executive Board, when it discusses the organization of work for the next session, to examine the whole question of tributes to those who have distinguished themselves in education, science and culture.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

TENTH PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

CONTENTS

	Page
XIX. Discussion of the Second Report of the Credentials Committee	175

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XIX. Discussion of the Second Report of the Credentials Committee.

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] On today's agenda is the second report of the Credentials Committee, which has been distributed in both working languages in document 5C/CRE/1, I call upon H.E. Mr. Désy who will present the report to you.

[2] Mr. Jean DÉSY (Canada) [*Translation from the French*].

The Credentials Committee met on Thursday, 25 May at 9.45 a.m. and on Monday, 29 May at 4 p.m. It examined the credentials of the delegations of the following Member States: Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Greece, and found that they conformed to the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure. Consequently, it recommends that these delegations be admitted to the General Conference with the right to vote.

[3] The Committee also examined the credentials of the observer appointed by Chile. It admitted the observers appointed by the Allied High Commission in Germany.

[4] The Credentials Committee considered the credentials of the Chinese delegation and the objections to these credentials raised by the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The credentials in question are issued by the same authority which, in the past, has more than once issued the credentials of Chinese delegations to previous sessions of the General Conference. They are, moreover, in the same form as those previously submitted and accepted as entirely valid. However, by the date at which the credentials of the present Chinese delegation were issued, the situation in China had undergone a radical change. The authority by which these credentials were issued is no longer situated on the Chinese mainland but on one of its island possessions. On the other hand, another authority has been established at Peking and has been recognized as the regular government of the country by a number of States which are Members of the Organization. This authority has addressed to the Director-General, for transmission to the General Conference a communication in which it states that it is "the only legal government representing the Chinese people"; and a formal resolution that the Chinese delegation whose credentials have been referred to the Committee be excluded from taking part in the General Conference has been proposed by the delegations of two Member States.

[5] The problem which the Committee thus had to consider was whether the authorities by which the credentials in question were issued were fully competent to issue credentials in due form. The Committee felt that the question was extremely delicate. It was the subject of a very thorough discussion, in the course of which different points of view were expressed. Some members of the Gommittee pointed out that membership of Unesco entailed duties to the Organization as well as to the people of the country concerned, duties which they considered the authority that had issued the credentials to which objection had been raised was no longer in a position to fulfil. In these circumstances, the participation of a Chinese nationalist delegation in the work of the Conference could not promote the aims of the Organization; on the contrary, it might have the effect of paralysing its activities and causing Unesco to become an organization not fully representative of all parts of the world. It was further remarked that there was a Chinese member of the Executive Board, who might represent Chinese culture within the Organization, even though no Chinese delegation would be taking part in the work of the Conference. Other members of the Committee pointed out that certain countries recognize the government which has issued the credentials in question as the regular Government of China, while certain other countries recognize a different authority. In their opinion, it is not for the General Conference of Unesco to deal with questions concerning the recognition of governments. Unesco is a Specialized Agency of the United Nations and its activities should remain essentially technical. The authority which issued the credentials of the Chinese delegation is that at present represented on the various organs of the United Nations. In these circumstances, the members expressing these views considered that it would be wiser for Unesco to refrain from taking any step which might conflict with the situation at present existing in the United Nations. Bearing that situation in mind, the Committee should propose that the General Conference recognize the validity of the credentials submitted for its consideration. Other members contested this conclusion,

stating that the Committee was fully competent to decide immediately on the exclusion of the delegation whose credentials had been challenged. A formal proposal to this effect was presented by the representative of Yugoslavia, was voted upon and was rejected.

[6] In spite of the different views set forth, the committee unanimously agreed that it was essential that the great Chinese people be represented on the Organization. The majority of the Committee held that the General Conference should not at present, with regard to the problem of determining which government should exercise membership rights, take any decision which would conflict with the situation at present existing in the various bodies of the United Nations. The Committee indeed considered that one aim common to the various United Nations Organizations is to secur co-ordination in international relations, and that any variation in the action taken by the different organs of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies with regard to the problem under consederation could only have unfortunate results contrary to the aims in view.

[7] Within the limits of its terms of reference the Committee decided to recommend to the General Conference that, having regard to the foregoing considerations, the credentials of the Chinese delegation be accepted and that this delegation be admitted in the present circumstances to take part in the work of the current session. The Committee reached this decision by a majority of 6 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Voted in favour: Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, Lebanon, United States of America.

Voted against: India, Yugoslavia.

Abstained: United Kingdom.

[8] The Committee also considered it to be highly desirable that the United Nations should establish guiding principles to be followed so that uniform action may be taken by their various organs and by the Specialized Agencies (irrespective of their composition), whenever the question arises of determining —in cases where two or more authorities claim to be the regular government of a country—which of these authorities should exercice membership rights and fulfil the corresponding obligations. The Committee was of the opinion that this question should be submitted for immediate attention to the United Nations, so that it may be possible to reach a uniform and expeditious settlement of the serious difficulties the present situation of China has caused to the various United Nations organizations.

[9] The Committee therefore decided to submit for the approval of the General Conference the following draft resolution:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO,

CONSIDERING that the United Nations as well as the various Specialized Agencies are called upon, in cases where two or more authorities each claim to be the only regular government of a Member State, to determine which of them shall exercice the rights and fulfil the obligations of membership on behalf of the country in question;

CONSIDERING that this problem has arisen in a particularly urgent and serious form because of the present situation in China;

AND CONSIDERING that it is highly desirable that, in order to solve this problem, the United Nations should lay down guiding principles which would allow the various organs of the United Nations and of the Specialized Agencies, irrespective of differences in the composition on these bodies, to adopt a uniform policy.

EXPRESSES the wish:

1. that the United Nations adopt general criteria by which it may be possible to reach a uniform and practical settlement of the problem of the representation on the various organs and organizations of the United Nations of countries of which two or more authorities claim to be the only regular government;
2. that this question be considered as soon as possible, in view of the serious difficulties to which the present situation in China is giving rise;

INSTRUCTS the Director-General to communicate the present resolution, together with a copy of the Report of the Credentials Committee, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for transmission to the competent bodies of the United Nations.

[10] The Committee reached its decision on the foregoing draft resolution by a majority of 8 votes to 1 vote.

Voted in favour: Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Voted against: Yugoslavia.

[11] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] You have just heard the second report of the Credentials Committee. Before dealing with the controversial question of the Chinese representation, I propose that we vote on the first part of the text, which should not in my opinion give rise to any objection, that is to say on the ratification of the credentials of the delegations of the following Member States: Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Greece. The Committee recommends you to approve them. Does anyone wish to offer any comments? As there are no comments, we shall now take a vote.

(A vote was taken on the proposal, which was unanimously approved.)

[12] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The delegates of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, India and China have asked to speak on the proposals concerning Burma and Hungary. I call upon the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

[13] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the Czechoslovak delegation had the honour, at the first meeting of this Conference, to present the first draft resolution. That resolution was short, simple and final. It is only today, a week after the official opening of the

Conference, that we are able to take a decision on a report from the Credentials Committee. Considering that there was no reason for postponing the final decision until today, the Czechoslovak delegation protested to the President of the Conference and takes this opportunity to repeat its very strong protest in plenary assembly.

[14] We cannot agree that the Credentials Committee's report will result in a just and sound solution. The Committee's draft resolution is simply another manifestation of those complexes of doubt which prevent mature men from being aware of their own maturity and of their grave responsibility to this body whose aims are education, culture, science and peace. The reversal of world equilibrium brought about by the Chinese people's conquest of their liberty, invited you to take a logical and political decision. Nothing in the Constitution or in the Conference's Rules of Procedure prevents you from taking such a decision. To recoil in the face of undeniable facts is an admission of an organic weakness in the character of this Organization, one which would be later reflected in the results of this Conference's work. But the Czechoslovak delegation, and public opinion in Italy, in Europe and the whole world expects that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization will, in accordance with the spirit of its Constitution, carry out its mission for education, science, culture and peace by a rational application of its principles. Even as things are, the presence here of the Kuomintang group is a constant source of trouble. Any decision in their favour and any tardy decision would be of very serious significance for this Organization; it would be of even greater import than the regrettable fact that there are in this Assembly men who prefer to see around the table in Unesco representatives of a group whose impotence and corruption have become notorious, and were indeed revealed by the American State Department itself, rather than the representatives of the workers of the popular democracies that stretch from Prague to Shanghai.

[15] As for the Yugoslav proposal which seals only the fate of the Kuomintang group during the present Conference, it is not a final solution. The Czechoslovak delegation regards it as a new attempt by the Yugoslav delegation to weaken and divide the common front of the delegations who are opposed to the majority proposal of the Credentials Committee. This attitude on the part of Yugoslavia, so gallantly supported yesterday by the United States delegation, has no surprise for us.

[16] Neither of the two proposals, majority or minority, seems to us to be adequate. The Czechoslovak delegation is unable to vote for either; it will vote for its own resolution and will abstain from voting on, or will vote against, the Credentials Committee's recommendations. I ask you, Mr. President, to take a vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which is wider in its terms than the others and has been published and distributed among the documents of the session; but I take the liberty of reading it out once again:

The Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco has decided to exclude the Kuomintang group from membership of Unesco.

Seconded by the Hungarian delegation, I now ask you to take a vote by roll-call in accordance with Rule 84, paragraph 2.

[17] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Yugoslavia.

[18] Mr. Vladislav RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, the Yugoslav delegation considers that the Credentials Committee's draft resolution is far from satisfactory and is contrary to Unesco's fundamental aims, namely to work for constructive co-operation between all peoples in the fields of education, science and culture. The presence of the Kuomintang delegation at Unesco, far from creating favourable conditions, is an obstacle to co-operation with the largest nation on earth. The support which the majority in the Credentials Committee has in fact given to the Kuomintang delegation cannot fail to aggravate the questions in suspense that affect relations between countries, and is also an injustice to a people which, after a century of struggle, has at last won its freedom. This act constitutes, when all is said and done, a moral reinforcement for those who have lost the support of their people and who are at present up in arms against it. Can Unesco take such a step today without destroying the hope of realizing its aims?

[19] Today, as in the past, it is difficult to find at Unesco meetings a speaker who has not emphasized how necessary it is for the Organization to seek every opportunity for developing cultural co-operation between all peoples and to promote the exchange of their different cultural ideas and values with a view to better understanding and the defence of peace. In this sense, the question arises as to what would be the political and practical significance of support given to the Kuomintang delegation. If we are sincere when we speak of co-operation, if we wish to collaborate with the great Chinese people who represent an original brand of civilization, we have no need of the Kuomintang delegation, which no longer represents the Chinese people. We consider that the cause of peace cannot be defended without the co-operation of the People's Republic of China.

Moreover, what are the prospects before us if we support the Kuomintang group?

[20] Certain delegations have recommended that we should wait until the question is decided by the United Nations. The Yugoslav delegation prefers to put the question in another way. It considers that Unesco should be the first organ of the United Nations to resolve this problem, for that would concord most nearly with the character and aims of Unesco. In doing so, Unesco would be making its contribution to the settlement of the question at the United Nations. Moreover, Unesco would not be the first to take such a step, since a similar decision was quite recently adopted by the Universal Postal Union, which refused the Kuomintang delegate the right to represent China in that organization. The Yugoslav delegation considers this a very important question of principle. We must know whether Unesco, when making its decisions, will remain faithful to a policy of peace, of co-operation among peoples and of respect for the sovereign will of peoples on the basis of their right of self-determination, or whether, on the contrary, through excessive adherence to formality in certain matters will disregard those principles. Lastly, Yugoslavia has particular reason for laying stress on the importance of this question. It is not so long since she was in a similar position to that now occupied by the People's Republic of China, for she has experienced the grave injustice caused by methods directed to the barren aim of maintaining a past that was doomed, by the revolt of its peoples and the laws of history, to disappear.

[21] In view of the foregoing explanations and adhering to the point of view which we expounded in the Credentials Committee, I again declare that the Yugoslav delegation is resolutely opposed to the presence of the Kuomintang delegation at Unesco. It is in this sense that our draft resolution has been drawn up. It seems clear to me that the ideas which I have just expressed are summed up in our draft resolution which is therefore in no way a half measure.

[22] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The delegate of India will address the Conference.

[23] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) — The position today is that indicated by Rule 24:

> Any representative to whose admission a Member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Conference has given its decision.

Now, the Credentials Committee has reported. That report is before us, and the General Conference has to give its decision. I should like to put the resolution thus:

> Having taken note of the communication from the People's Government of China and the resolutions proposed by Czechoslovakia and Hungary and the report of the Credentials Committee, the General Conference decides that the credentials of the delegates of the Nationalist Government of China be not accepted.

That would be the right way to proceed on the basis of this Rule 24.

[24] We and the Chinese people have been close neighbours, with cultural and commercial relations for over 2,000 years. Never was there a disagreement or tension between us which had to be resolved by resort to violence or coercion. It is our hope and ambition to maintain the same friendly relations between our two peoples. I agree that Unesco is an Organization representative of different cultures. If the great Chinese culture is not represented, to that extent the effectiveness of this Organization will certainly be diminished. But I would ask you, fellow delegates, to look at the very first sentence of our Constitution. It says: "The Governments of the States parties to this Constitution on behalf of their peoples declare . . ." In other words, the Governments speak in the name of the peoples of their respective countries; they are not speaking in their own name. The opening sentence of our Constitution states the well-known democratic theory of the sovereignty of the people, the fact that governments are merely the mouth-piece, the voice, so to say, of the sovereign people. This is not merely common sense; it is also diplomatic practice. Whenever a government has established its authority over a large extent of territory, nations deal with that government. The question is not whether we like or dislike the government which is now functioning in China. The question is whether the Chinese people have chosen that government, have decided to be governed by it or not. I do not think there are two opinions on this matter. Neutral observers, French, English, American, who have been functioning in China, have testified to the fact that the new government is rooted in the affection of the people, commands the respect and good will of the people, and is therefore to be regarded as the expression of the general will of the Chinese community itself. The other day I had the opportunity of addressing this General Conference and I pointed out that if we are not winning in this cold war it is due to the fact that we are not reckoning with the first principles of democracy. We are supporting governments which are not popular, not representative of the people, but are reactionary in their character. Our stand is undemocratic in so far as we support a government which has lost its hold

on the Chinese people. Thus we are widening the gulf, so to say, between ourselves and the vast millions of Chinese peoples.

[25] We are told, why should we not adopt the example of the United Nations? Well, the United Nations has come to a standstill, it is disabled from functioning. It is taking every step possible for the purpose of making itself efficient, and efforts are being made to get the People's Government of China included in the Security Council and in the United Nations. Either that happens or the United Nations itself will fade away. We are in a mess there. Is it necessary for us to repeat it here? My friends, the leader of the Yugoslav delegation referred to the fact that an international organization—a United Nations organization—has excluded members of the Nationalist Government; it has not only excluded them, but seated the members of the People's Government of China, so we cannot say that all international organizations are waiting to know what the United Nations is going to decide. Is it not possible for us sometimes to be forestallers? Is it always necessary for us to be camp-followers? Cannot we, in this international organization which brings together intellectuals, who are prepared to look at these questions with integrity and impartiality, give the lead to the United Nations if we are satisfied with the righteousness of our cause? When it suits us, we claim that we are the conscience of the United Nations. When it does not suit us, we hand over our conscience to the United Nations. I have always had considerable respect for the British type of mind. The British have great political sagacity. The way in which they have dealt with the question of India is an illustration. It is usual to say that while the German mind works according to a theory or a pattern, whereas the Asian mind leaves things to their wild growth, the British mind distrusts theory, accepts facts and adjusts itself to the situation as it grows. A garden is symbolic of the German mind, it is worked out according to a geometrical pattern, but wild growth, forest life, is symbolic of us in Asia. But the British take a little of the garden and a little of the forest and make a beautiful park out of it. Mr. Hardman, as leader of the British delegation, will accept that it is the spirit of compromise, of adjustment to facts, of flexibility of mind and no doctrinairism, which has made the British nation famous for its political sense. Now what have the British done? They have withdrawn recognition from the Nationalist Government of China and accorded recognition to the People's Government of China. Can we not follow them in this particular matter? If we talk of law, of formality, that we invited them and they have come here in response to our invitation, they are still the legal government, etc., we will become the victims of theory. I would remind this Conference of the famous principle, "The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life." Are we prepared to sacrifice the interests of the millions of people who are the custodians and representatives of the Chinese culture for the sake of a diminishing few in Formosa? Is that the way in which we are going to look at this problem in this Conference? We agree that the present Nationalist Government cannot carry out the obligations imposed upon it by the Unesco organization. They cannot set up National Co-operating Bodies, they cannot get hold of university men, artists, savants, etc., to carry the message of Unesco to the peoples of China. They have no touch with the cultural institutions of the country. Are we going to widen the gulf between this Organization and the people of China? Or is it our intention to close this gap and be in a position to welcome the representatives of China, as they are bound to be welcomed if they choose to come?

[26] We all know, it does not require a prophet to declare, that before many months are out the new China will be in the Security Council and in the United Nations. They will remember that they put up a protest and their protest was unheeded by this great Organization. They may feel that we have no sympathy for them, that we are becoming merely an arm in this ideological conflict. If we wish to welcome them, we must abstain today from accepting the credentials of the delegates of the Nationalist Government of China. It is argued that if we do not recognize these gentlemen now there will be no representation of the great Chinese culture. I should like to say that Confucius does not belong to the People's Republic nor Mencius to the Kuomintang Government. They are above these battles. They are above these political differences. They are representatives of the universal Chinese culture, of which we are all great admirers. There is a Chinese member of the Executive Board of Unesco who is a representative of Chinese culure, and who has that native, innate courtesy which has not been spoiled by passing political passions. He will be available for us if we have to raise any questions concerning China.

[27] It seems to me that it is a critical time for the world, and for this Organization, and the decision we take today will have very far-reaching consequences. The decision we take is a critical one. It is not one to be taken lightheartedly. There are already Member States of the United Nations who are not Members of this Organization. If by any deed or misdeed we perform today we discourage China from entering this Organization, it will be reduced in scope, resources and effectiveness. I therefore appeal to you as intellectuals, not

as nationals of this or that country, but as intellectuals, to take note of the obvious facts which are staring us in the face, accept the position which has developed and welcome the new China, and to prepare for that welcome by abstaining from accepting the credentials of the delegates of Nationalist China.

[28] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of China.

[29] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — We have just now heard a panegyric on Great Britain. Britain was truly great when she knew how to compromise, but not at the expense of principles. Would you consider Munich, when Britain compromised at the expense of her principles? Would you praise Britain for that?

[30] I would like now to pass on to a few observations on the Credentials Committee's report now before you. The question of whether or not the credentials of the members of the Chinese delegation are in order is a very simple one. Let us not allow ourselves to deviate into irrelevancies when considering the Credentials Committee's report. Most of us here know very well that it is in the interest of certain Member States of Unesco to distort the issue. Many of us also know too well the method used by such States to bring about confusion in our minds when there should be none. These methods have been repeated thirty times since January of this year in all the United Nations bodies and agencies. The thirtieth instance, let me remind my fellow colleagues, occurred only a few days ago. It was followed by the usual walk-out. Now, what in essence do a few of the delegations want you to do in regard to my delegation? To get my delegation out of Unesco! Yes! But there is something else they want. They want all of us who believe in the principles of Unesco and of the United Nations Charter to sacrifice those principles. They hope that by inducing us to sacrifice those high principles, in this Fifth Conference of Unesco, it will be so much easier for them to beget in all of us a mood of surrender to all their wishes later on. For it is surrender and not compromise. It is a second Munich they want. Let us be clear about this. The U.S.S.R. and the States behind the Iron Curtain have regrettably walked out of thirty United Nations bodies and agencies. Some of these withdrawals have taken place even before the Chinese question had ever been debated in the United Nations. Do not forget that. The United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, has recently returned from a mission of trying to stop these withdrawals. It is the fervent hope of the Chinese delegation that his attempts to bring back the U.S.S.R., and those who have followed her example, into the fold of the United Nations bodies and agencies, may not be at the expense of the principles of the United Nations Charter. We hope for that. The only kind of peace which is worthwhile is the peace based upon real co-operation within the framework of the United Nations Charter. Let us not forget that too, when threatened by walk-outs in the present Unesco Conference.

[31] What are the facts? You must remember them when making up your minds on the report of the Credentials Committee before you. They are three: under the terms of Article II, paragraph 1, of the Unesco Constitution, membership of the United Nations carries with it the right to membership of Unesco. Up to the present my Government is the only acknowledged authority in my country recognized by the United Nations. You have been asked by a minority in the Credentials Committee and also in this Conference to contravene the spirit of the Unesco Constitution by refusing my Government the clear right it possesses. Secondly, the United Nations and its bodies and agencies have thirty times given a categorical "No" to thirty repeated demands by the U.S.S.R. and States behind the Iron Curtain to unseat the representatives of the only lawful government of my country. I ask you, is Unesco going to be the only exception, by giving the wrong answer to political blackmail? Thirdly, my Government has a case against the U.S.S.R. for indirect aggression against China, and this case is still pending in the United Nations. The puppet government at Peking is the fruit of that indirect Russian aggression. While the matter is still under investigation by the Interim Committee of the United Nations, surely it is the duty of all loyal members of the United Nations in Unesco to refrain from prejudicing the issue by siding with the fruit of Russian aggression, which is the puppet government at Peking, against the only government recognized by the United Nations, which has sent the members of my delegation to this Conference.

[32] The Chinese delegation has no appeal to make. In reaching your decision on the report of the Credentials Committee, it only asks you to be true to your conscience and to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Unesco Constitution. It has been said by holy writ: "Without vision the people perish." Be true to your vision and what is right and just when you cast your votes.

[33] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Burma.

[34] Dr. Htin AUNG (Burma) — The great objection that the Burmese delegation has against the report before us is that it shows a certain timidity which is worthy of a sweet girl of sixteen,

but unworthy of a conference of intellectuals. During the whole of last week, the delegates to the Conference, while discussing the Director-General's Report, have been giving lip service to scholarship, to intellectual achievements, to science, education, culture, beauty and truth. But now, only one week later, or if we take the last day of the discussion, only two or three days later, when we are asked to come to a definite decision on a certain point, we shift our burden to the United Nations. Up to now, nobody has ever said that this Conference and Unesco are merely the followers of the United Nations; but now we are asked to accept the theory that we have to abide by the decision of the United Nations.

[35] The delegate of India has already appealed to you as intellectuals and, although we represent a very small country with only 17 million people, the Burmese delegation will again appeal to you as intellectuals. On previous occasions when I have addressed this Conference, I have always insisted that we should raise Unesco conferences out of the sphere of politics into the higher sphere of intellectual truth, and again I insist on that. I appeal to you not to shut your eyes to truth. Truth may be as glaring as the sun but please do not put on your glare glasses. Try to face truth, because as intellectuals, scientists, scholars, our duty is to face truth however much we may dislike this truth. And as intellectuals, we should have the courage of our convictions. Again I appeal to you to vote according to your convictions. I repeat it again, the Burmese delegation will take pride in the fact that we are going to vote according to our convictions, because we have the courage to face the truth.

[36] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Hungary.

[37] Mrs. Boris FAI (Hungary) — [*Translation from the French*] Ladies and gentlemen, the Hungarian delegation has already expressed its firm opinion concerning the representation of China. We believe we have clearly explained why the presence of the Kuomintang at the Unesco Conference is an absurdity. We have also expressed our firm determination to co-operate with this Organization, whose duty it is to work for the achievement of tasks regarded as vital, namely, to strengthen peace, to ensure mutual understanding among the peoples and to raise the cultural level of the masses. The Government of the People's Republic of Hungary has already recorded considerable success in the accomplishment of tasks, the final aim of which is the creation of a new human race. Allow me to say that Socialist Man, man really free from all oppression, is the true master of the laws of social evolution and of nature. It is because we take these duties seriously that we have raised in such explicit terms the problem of China's representation in our Organization. We consider that the presence of this group representing no one detracts very seriously from the authority of this meeting and the weight that should be attached to its decisions, and that it compels us to refuse to take part in this Conference. We had hoped that the Credentials Committee would, like ourselves, take a serious view of these matters and would find a solution commensurate with the gravity of the question and the importance of our Conference which referred the problem to it. We must say, with our customary frankness in both speech and conduct, that we are extremely surprised and greatly disappointed at the Credentials Committee's report. The Hungarian delegation does not mince its words. It does not take cover behind paragraphs and formulae. We are anxious to work with you and with all honest men for peace and progress. Patiently we awaited the Committee's decision. We feel that in this way we have afforded yet further proof of our good will and have resolutely followed, without swerving to right or left, our general policy, which has for its objective good understanding among men and the consolidation of any and every body that works therefor. We must say that we waited not merely in order to give proof of our good will but also because we had justifiable hopes of a decision that we could accept. Never was a question so clear, never was one upheld by such irrefutable arguments. Unhappily, the Committee's proposals force us to suppose that it was prompted in its work by considerations that are completely divorced from good sense and science and have no connexion with truth and peace.

[38] What argument could be adduced in support of the Credentials Committee's report? That the solution must be referred to the United Nations? Why? Is not Unesco an autonomous body with power freely to decide on the admission or ejection of its members? And when we have to decide not upon an expulsion but who is the representative of a particular people, why can we not decide it here? Why restrict our freedom of decision? Have we not been called the conscience of the United Nations? Is not this Conference a meeting of the *élite* of science and culture from every nation? Is it not our sacred duty to seek truth and proclaim it, without fear, undismayed by the powers of darkness which are always endeavouring to stifle truth? Why do you shrink from assuming responsibilities that are worthy of yourselves? Why do you recoil from this duty? Why not have the courage to look truth in the face? The truth is that we are dealing with a

people which, by firmness of purpose and unparalleled sacrifices, has succeeded in obtaining a government that is unwelcome to certain others. Can that be a serious reason for adopting an attitude such as yours?

[39] There are in Unesco and in this very room delegations for whom we have no special liking, and we are sure that we too do not attract their warmest sympathy. Nevertheless, we try to speak a common language in the service of common aims. Unesco makes a great effort to prevent the withdrawal of any other country from its membership. And yet, we are not now dealing with just any country. We are dealing with a nation of four hundred and seventy-five millions, which after struggling for thirty years has shaken off the yoke of political and economic oppression and is now at last in a position to achieve the very aims of Unesco. Let those among you who are scientists look at the matter from the scientific angle. And you, the geographers, can you deny the geographical existence of proletarian China, of its immense territory, wider far than Europe? Can you, the historians, gainsay the reality of this great metamorphosis that has taken place in the Far East these last few years? We refuse to believe that the historians, with their vast knowledge of the past, have been so sorely stricken with blindness when they look at the present or near future and cannot see that the time is near when all governments will be constrained officially to recognize the facts of history. You, the scientists, cannot set yourselves up against the march of progress, for you know best of all that there is no turning back. We have spoken of the geographers and historians. But what will be the position of those whose concern is with ethics? It will be very difficult for them to regard the delegates of Kuomintang, unfortunately still present in this room, as the representatives of the Chinese people. They are the men whom the Press of North America itself, nay, the White Book of the United States Government, has described as rotten. Let us, finally, look at the position from the practical standpoint. Can the Kuomintang contribute to our Organization's work? Has it any practical results to impart to us? Having no contact with the cultural institutions of China, has it the slightest means of giving effect to the decisions of this assembly? Is it the Kuomintang or the Government of Mao Tse-tung that deals in fact with the Chinese people's educational and cultural problems? Compare the enormous job being done by the People's Government of China to eradicate illiteracy, train a corps of specialists in cultural subjects, teachers, scientists, artists, to build schools and universities, to foster the practice and dissemination of art and culture among the great masses of the people—compare all that with what the Kuomintang is doing. No one, we feel certain, can adduce valid arguments in rebuttal of ours. We believe that, if the Credentials Committee's report were approved, you would find yourselves in a very difficult situation. You can deny truth, you can fight it, but you cannot kill it. Victory will go to truth and its champions. Those who resist it will incur the censure of science and of history, maybe of their own people. There are, of course, men who still fail to see the truth in its full stature, because the powers of darkness that are opposed to progress will stop at nothing to prevent their doing so. But surely, for us, members of the organization for education, science and culture, it is our primary duty to fight these powers, to bring light to those who still see but dimly, to hold the torch aloft and proclaim the truth aloud.

[40] To conclude, the Hungarian delegation is in complete agreement with the Czechoslovak proposal and asks every delegation to support it with its vote. I beg you once more to think well before you vote. It is not just any vote on any subject. The general feeling of co-operation and mutual understanding, the reputation of Unesco, the high ideals on which our programme is founded, all these are in the balance. We propose therefore that each delegate assume his full responsibility. We support the Czechoslovak delegation and ask for a vote by roll-call.

[41] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As there are no more speakers on my list, we will now proceed to vote. But first I should like to read you a telegram which the Director-General has received from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom Government:

Constitution of Unesco signed today May 27th by Indonesian Ambassador in London who deposited instrument of acceptance. Therefore acceptance took effect May 27th. E. Bevin.

Indonesia will accordingly participate in the vote we are about to take. I shall therefore begin by putting to the vote the most radical of the proposals, that which is farthest from the Credentials Committee's proposal, that is to say, the Czechoslovak motion. A vote by roll-call has been requested for this motion, which I will now read. We will then call the roll. The motion before the Conference is:

The Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco has decided to exclude the Kuomintang group from membership of Unesco.

The vote was taken by roll-call:

Voted in favour: Burma, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India.

Voted against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iraq, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstained: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Denmark, Indonesia, Israel, Netherlands, Pakistan, Persia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Absent: Bolivia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

[42] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] Here is the result of the voting: in favour of the motion: 4; against: 30; abstained: 13; absent: 10. The Czechoslovak motion is therefore rejected by 30 votes to 4.

The Hungarian delegate will address the Conference.

[43] Dr. Gabór TOLNAI (Hungary) — [*Translation from the Italian*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, after the decision which the Unesco General Conference has taken on the question of the Kuomintang, the Hungarian delegation has not much to say. The discussions which have taken place on this matter recall to my mind a well-known story. Since the delegates to this Conference are no longer very young, they will certainly be as familiar with it as myself. No doubt the Danish delegate knows it better than any of us, since the author of the story is a great Danish writer, Hans Andersen. It is the story of a king who walked the street without clothes. The tale says that the weavers who should have made the garment worked without looms and without the raw material. The delegates at the Unesco Conference have worked in the same way; they have discussed the question of the Kuomintang as though Free China did not exist. They too, like the weavers in Andersen's story, declare that they have made a garment. We delegates of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian Republics declare that "the king has no clothes". We go even further and declare that the day is not far distant when all men will say the same thing.

[44] In the meantime, we request the President to have the following declaration included verbatim in this record:

The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic is completely opposed to the decision of the Conference to postpone the solution of the problem concerning the representation of China, and to admit to the Fifth Session the representatives of the Kuomintang. It considers that this decision flows from the fact that Unesco has examined the question with insufficient seriousness, an act which weakens Unesco's authority and does grave injury to the spirit of international collaboration which alone will permit the Organization to realize its high aims. For this reason, the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic is compelled to refuse to take part in the work of the present Conference.

[45] The Hungarian delegation ventures to remind the General Committee of the Conference that a proposal concerning the support to be given to the magnificent Movement of the Defenders of Peace, which is rapidly spreading throughout the world, was presented by the Czechoslovak delegation. The Hungarian delegation declares that, notwithstanding the absence of both delegations of the People's Republics, this proposal should constitute the target of the present Conference's work. Otherwise this Conference will have betrayed a second time its very *raison d'être.*

[46] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Czechoslovakia.

[47] Mr. Adolf HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the Fifth Session of Unesco's General Conference has had to deal with two main problems touching the fundamental basis of the Organization, its mission and its *raison d'être.* It is not illogical to hold that the first problem, that of China, forms, in a way, part and parcel of the other, that of peace. The first has been resolved in a manner which threatens to jeopardize the scientific spirit of our Conference. And yet my journalist friends from across the Atlantic and from Great Britain assured me that numerous bets had been laid in the lobbies that Unesco in Florence would win fame by being the first United Nations organization to exclude the representatives of the Kuomintang from its membership. Unfortunately, my friends of the Press, carried away by their optimism, a very commendable optimism, have lost their bet, and Unesco's delegates have failed to score a point in the first round. They arrived here in Florence from all parts of the world, bringing with them their peoples' fear of war and desire for peace. Only the Kuomintang group, whose survival is due solely to those who are preparing an atomic war, this group of reactionary adventurers buoys itself up with the hope that a new war would restore to them that which does not belong to them.

[48] The nobility of each nation's character can

be measured today by its resistance to war and its endeavour to react against war's dangers. We all know that those who desire world peace and who set themselves up against all activities that make for war, form the overwhelming majority. And it is precisely the Chinese People's Republic which has quite recently swelled this majority with its hundreds of millions of citizens. All men who by honest work gain a living for their family, and all women who give life to children, expect Unesco at its present meeting to take up a definite position and join with them in the active defence of peace. Peace will not be gained by carefully thought-out delays, nor by shirking responsibility, nor through the back door of the United Nations, nor by simply remaining silent, nor by seeking skilful compromises on questions which, like that of China, affect the fundamental problem, that of peace. It is futile to hope that peace will be safeguarded: we must fight in its defence. The Czechoslovak people, who see their security in the friendship and loyal alliance of the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, is wedded to its daily work, the reconstruction of its country, the achievement of the five-year plan and the establishment of a Socialist State for the sake of our common welfare, as affording the sole economic and political guarantee of the happiness of future generations. That is our contribution to peace. And we are not the only people in the world who need peace in order to carry out our humble task for humanity, we in this little country of ours, in the heart of Europe.

[49] Unesco, encircled by this desire for peace, surrounded by this atmosphere of peace, which is innate in the Italian countryside and people, has a duty towards civilization, modern science and contemporary world culture, the duty of voicing its opinion on all matters affecting the maintenance of peace and security, which is the sole basis of all science, education and culture. Unesco's General Conference, at its Fifth Session in Florence, has taken a decision which I would not dare to describe in over-precise terms: the term "politics" has nothing very much in common with "politeness". We have not come together in order to pay one another compliments. It is the Czechoslovak people which will pass judgment on the attitude that Unesco's General Conference has taken towards these problems of the first importance. It is the history of the future which is beginning even now to draw conclusions. It is not for me to tell you that I am not satisfied with your decision; it is for your peoples to appraise your contribution to peace and your efforts for mutual assistance among the nations. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that, as the solution adopted is not a final one, it cannot participate in the work of the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco in Florence. It believes that only a final decision to exclude the Kuomintang group from all organs of Unesco as well as from its membership would be in accordance with geographical and political realities and with Unesco's supreme task of constructing the defences of peace in the minds of men.

[50] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We shall now take a vote on the second motion. In content it is very similar to, almost identical with, that on which you have just voted:

The General Conference,

Considering the communication received from the Government of the People's Republic of China, the only legal representative of the Chinese people, resolves not to recognize as valid the credentials of the Kuomintang delegation and not to allow that delegation to take part in the work of the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

The vote was taken by roll-call:

Voted in favour: Burma, Denmark, India, Yugoslavia.

Voted against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iraq, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstained: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Ceylon, Indonesia, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Persia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

Absent: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

[51] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The result of the voting is as follows: for: 4; against: 29; abstained: 13; absent: 11. The proposal is therefore rejected by 29 votes to 4.

[52] We will now proceed to the vote on the second part of the Credential Committee's proposal. You have just heard their report and I need not read it again. In any case, its conclusions are as follows:

. . . the Committee decided to recommend to the General Conference that, having regard to the foregoing considerations, the credentials of the Chinese delegation be accepted and that this delegation be admitted in the present circumstances to take part in the work of the current session.

There is also the following recommendation: the Committee expresses the wish:

1. That the United Nations adopt general criteria by which it may be possible to reach a uniform and practical settlement of the problem of the representation on the various organs and organizations of the United Nations of countries of which two or more authorities claim to be the only regular government;

2. That this question be considered as soon as possible, in view of the serious difficulties to which the present situation in China is giving rise;

Instructs the Director-General to communicate the present resolution, together with a copy of the report of the Credentials Committee, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for transmission to the competent bodies of the United Nations.

In accordance with the usual procedure, the vote on the recommendation will precede the vote on the report.

[53] Dr. Htin AUNG (Burma) — May I request that a roll-call be taken?

[54] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] I will put to the vote the Committee's proposal concerning the admission of China. This is point 11 of the report. A vote by roll-call has been requested. Is this request seconded? It is seconded by the delegate of Norway.

The vote was taken by roll-call:

Voted in favour: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Voted against: Burma, Denmark, Yugoslavia.

Abstained: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Ceylon, Indonesia, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Persia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

Absent: Bolivia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Czechoslovakia, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

[55] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] The result of the voting is as follows : for: 30; against: 3; abstained: 13; absent: 11. Consequently the proposal is *adopted* by 30 votes to 3.

[56] We now pass to the vote on the recommendation which was made by the Committee itself and which was read out previously. Nobody wishes a vote by roll-call?

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[57] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] The result is as follows: for: 31; against: 5; abstained: 5. The proposal is therefore *adopted* by 31 votes to 5.

The Chinese delegate had asked to speak.

[58] Mr. WEN YUAN-NING (China) — Our delegation would like to make a reservation as regards the preamble of the Credentials Committee's report. The reservation takes the form of a declaration consisting of observations on the preamble. We request the Conference to forward our declaration along with the report of the Credentials Committee to the United Nations and its Agencies.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

ELEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 11.55 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XX.	Discussion of the Third Report of the Credentials Committee	186
XXI.	Discussion of the Report of the Procedure Committee	186
XXII.	Election of six members of the Executive Board	187
XXIII.	Decision of the place of meeting of the Sixth Session of the General Conference	189

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XX. Discussion of the Third Report of the Credentials Committee.

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The first item on the agenda is the report of the Chairman of the Credentials Committee. Will the Chairman of that Committee please come to the rostrum?

[2] Mr. Jean DÉSY (Canada) — [*Translation from the French*].

Mr. President, the Credentials Committee met on Wednesday, 14 June at 10.30 a.m. It examined the credentials of the delegations of the following Member States: Indonesia, Monaco, Sweden, Turkey, and found that they conformed to the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The Committee therefore recommends that these delegations be admitted to the Conference with full voting rights.

[3] The Committee also considered a telegram from the President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Syria, appointing Mr. Wajdi-Mallat as Syria's representative to attend the meetings of the General Conference at which members of the Executive Board are to be elected. After discussion, the Committee felt that the telegram in question constituted valid provisional credentials, and recommends that the General Conference authorize the representative of Syria to attend its meetings for the purposes assigned.

[4] The Committee further recommends that the General Conference request the Director-General to draw the attention of Member States to the need for sending in their delegates' credentials at the time and in the form specified in the Rules of Procedure.

[5] Lastly, the credentials presented by the delegates of the Republic of Korea and the Kingdom of Hashemite Jordan may be provisionnally accepted, and the delegates of these two Member States may be allowed to take their seats and to vote.

[6] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Does the Conference approve the report of the Chairman of the Credentials Committee? If there are no comments, it is *adopted*.

[7] I have to report a telegram which I have just received from London:

Constitution of Unesco signed June 14 on behalf of Jordan and Korea and respective instruments of acceptance deposited. Acceptance by these two countries therefore takes effect June 14. (*Signed*) Ernest Bevin.

This means that the representatives of Korea and Jordan are now entitled to sit at our meetings. I should like to welcome the new members of the Conference. I call upon the Rapporteur of the Procedure Committee.

XXI. Discussion of the Report of the Procedure Committee.

[8] Mr. Nils THEDIN (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Procedure Committee — I have the honour to present the first part of the Procedure Committee's Report [document 5C/PRO/8 (II)]:

I. The Procedure Committee first considered the draft amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution. At its Fourth Session, the General Conference had instructed the Director-General to communicate this draft amendment to the Governments of Member States; this was done by a circular letter [CL/310], dated 24 November 1949. The Committee took note that the draft amendment had been duly communicated to Member States more than six months in advance, in accordance with the provisions of Article XIII of the Constitution. The Committee also noted that the amendment in question involved no fundamental alterations in the aims of the Organization and no fresh obligations for the Member States.

In consequence, the Committee resolved to recommend that this amendment be approved by the Fifth Session of the General Conference and, to this end, submits the following draft resolution:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

HAVING NOTED resolutions 40.2 and 40.23 adopted at its Fourth Session;

CONSIDERING that, in accordance with Article XIII, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, the Director-General duly communicated to the Governments of Member States the draft amendment to Article V, paragraph 3, of the Constitution more than six months before the opening of the present session,

CONSIDERING that this draft amendment does not involve any fundamental alterations in the aims of the Organization or new obligations for the Member States;

DECIDES that paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution shall be replaced by the following text:

The elected members of the Executive Board shall serve from the close of the session of the General Conference at which they are elected until the close of the third ordinary session of the General Conference following that election. They shall be immediately eligible for a second term, but shall not serve consecutively for more than two terms. At the first election, eighteen members shall be elected, of whom one-third shall retire at the end of the first year and one-third at the end of the second year, the order of retirement being determined immediately after the election by the drawing of lots. Thereafter six members shall be elected each year.

II. The Procedure Committee next considered the amendments to Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of Procedure, made necessary by the amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution.

In order to harmonize these texts with the proposed wording of Article V of the Constitution, the words "for a term of three years" in Rule 95 and the words "of three years" in Rule 96 should be deleted. It would also be necessary to replace the words "immediately on his election" and "on the day of the election of a member for the subsequent term" by "at the close of the session at which he is elected" and "at the close of the third ordinary session following that election", respectively.

The Committee therefore resolved to recommend that these amendments be adopted by the Fifth Session of the General Conference and, to that end, submits the following draft resolution:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

HAVING REGARD TO the amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution, just adopted, and

CONSIDERING that, as a result of the adoption of this amendment, amendments are also necessary in Rules 95, 96 and 97 of its Rules of Procedure,

RESOLVES that Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of Procedure be rescinded and replaced by the following provisions:

Rule 95. Each year, during its ordinary session, the General Conference shall elect by secret ballot six members of the Executive Board.

Rule 96. On the expiration of their first term of office, the retiring members of the Executive Board shall be eligible for immediate re-election for a second term of office. On the expiration of the second successive term of office, they shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

Rule 97. The term of office of each member shall begin at the close of the session at which he is elected and shall end at the close of the third ordinary session following that election.

[9] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I have to thank the Rapporteur for his excellent report. Does anyone wish to speak? If not, the report is *approved*.

XXII. Election of six members of the Executive Board.

[10] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We now come to the third item of the agenda: the report of the Nominations Committee and the election of six members of the Executive Board. The Secretary of the Conference will read out Article V of the Constitution and the relevant Rules of Procedure: Rules 30, 87, 89, 95, 96 and 97, amended to conform with the revised version of Article V of the Constitution, and which have just been adopted by the Conference.

(The Secretary read out Article V of the Constitution and the relevant Rules of Procedure.)

[11] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] In accordance with the Rules of Procedure which have just been read, we shall begin by hearing the report of the Nominations Committee and the observations of delegations on it. I would remind you that only delegates nominated, before the ballot, either by the Nominations Committee or by two delegations may stand for election. Will Mrs. Brunauer, of the United States delegation, and U Mya Sein, of the Burmese delegation, kindly act as tellers? I call upon the Chairman of the Nominations Committee to present his report to the General Conference.

[12] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) Chairman of the Nominations Committee — Mr. President, with your permission, before I proceed to my duty of presenting the Nominations Committee's report, I would ask you to allow me to say just a word in an entirely different capacity, so as to take advantage of the large number of persons present on this occasion; that is, to remind you that we have been engaged in this Conference, following a decision by the General

Committee, in making a collection among members of the delegations, Secretariat and others who are following our work, in aid of Italian Child Victims of the War. This was being undertaken as a mark of appreciation of the most generous hospitality that we have enjoyed in Italy and in Florence. I would draw your attention to the fact that we have already received contributions amounting to 657,000 Lire, $41 and £3 sterling. This mixture of contributions represents partly what delegates have in their pockets and partly what they are able to give. This appeal has been very much helped by certain ladies, mostly wives of members of delegations and of members of the Secretariat, who have assisted me by meeting each day in the ante-room here on the landing, and accepting the contributions from members of the Conference; and I would like to express my very sincere thanks for the assistance they have given us, because, although the Comptroller's Office is open to receive contributions, it is much more agreeable to hand over the contribution to one of the charming ladies who has waited at the entrance to this hall. We are not collecting today, but we are going to have one last day of this appeal tomorrow and I would ask those of you who, owing to the pressure of business in the Conference, have not had an opportunity of making your contributions, to take advantage of the arrangements tomorrow, so that when we close the appeal tomorrow evening, we shall have, I hope, a considerably larger sum than the 657,000 lire already contributed. I would also be very grateful if a few other ladies in addition to those who have already helped would get in touch with me during the course of the day so that we could make arrangements for somebody to be sitting at the tables outside throughout the day tomorrow. Please tell any of your friends who are not here today that this appeal is open until the close of business tomorrow and it will then be closed, so that the money can be handed over. Thank you for allowing me to introduce something which was not on the agenda, but which I know is very close to all our hearts.

[13] I will now turn to the initial reason why I am speaking from the platform at this moment. It is my duty as Chairman of the Nominations Committee to submit a report on the meeting of the Committee which was held yesterday, 14 June, to consider nominations for the seats on the Executive Board. None of the six retiring members of the Board is eligible for re-election, four members having already completed two consecutive terms of office, and two members not being members of delegations at the present session of the Conference. The Committee then considered various candidates and the report on the Committee's meeting, together with the record of the votes, is contained in today's Journal (No. 19) and need not therefore be read in detail.

[14] Following the consultations between the members of the Nominations Committee, the latter decided to propose to the Conference the following names, which are submitted in alphabetical order:

General Sir RONALD ADAM, member of the United Kingdom delegation;

Dr. RAFAEL BERNAL JIMÉNEZ, member of the Colombian delegation;

Dr. ANTONIO CASTRO LEAL, member of the Mexican delegation;

Mgr. JEAN MAROUN, member of the delegation of Lebanon;

Senator GERÓNIMA PECSON, member of the delegation of the Philippines; and

Professor JEAN PIAGET, member of the delegation of Switzerland.

On behalf of the Nominations Committee, I have the honour to submit these names to the General Conference.

[15] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I have to thank Dr. Walker for his report. In the meantime another nomination has been put forward, that of Dr. Mahmoud Hasan, of Pakistan, who is proposed by the delegations of Burma and Turkey. The delegate of Persia has asked to speak.

[16] Mr. Ali Asghar HEKMAT (Persia) — I had the honour yesterday to nominate three of our colleagues and I want to propose them again. One was Sir Ronald Adam of the British delegation, a gentleman well-known to all of us; the second was Mgr. Maroun, a great scholar from the Middle East, and the third was Dr. Mahmoud Hasan. On behalf of Dr. Mahmoud Hasan I want emphatically to say that it is in the greater interest of Unesco itself thas his name—and the name of Pakistan, of which country he is the delegate—be accepted for membership of the Executive Board. Pakistan occupies a very important strategic position. It is a growing State. It is the fifth largest State in the world, with a population of eighty millions. It is divided into two parts; the earstern part adjoins the countries of the Far East, and the western has physical, cultural and linguistic ties and affinities with the countries of the Middle East. The inclusion of this great country in the Executive Board of Unesco would be of great advantage and help to the Board in its difficult and complicated task of implementing the general policy and programme of Unesco. Dr. Mahmoud Hasan is well-known to most of the delegates to Unesco. He is a dis-

tinguished scholar. For more than twenty-seven years he has served education in his own country and abroad, and he is still in the service of education as Educational Adviser to the Government of Pakistan and head of the Ministry of Education. He takes very great interest in the work of Unesco and is very enthusiastic in organizing the work of the National Commission in his own country. He is a broadminded and cultured gentleman and has an extensive knowledge of several languages and literatures.

[17] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We shall now take the vote. I need not remind you that only candidates nominated by delegations at the present session may be elected. No other nominations can be accepted. This is the list of names proposed by the General Committee: Mrs. Gerónima Pecson, Sir Ronald Adam, Dr. Antonio Castro Leal, Professor Jean Piaget, Dr. Rafael Bernal Jiménez, Mgr. Maroun. In addition, Dr. Hasan has been nominated by two delegations—Burma and Turkey—and supported by Persia. The vote will be taken by secret ballot. In counting the votes, no notice will be taken of votes cast for delegates who have not been nominated. In accordance with the procedure adopted by the General Conference at its previous sessions, less than six names may be placed on voting papers. Voting papers bearing no names will, however, be considered as abstentions, and papers bearing more than six names will be declared invalid. Delegates are therefore asked to write no more than six names on their voting papers, the names being those of the candidates for whom they wish to vote. I would remind you that the voting papers must not be signed. The names of countries will be called out in French alphabetical order, beginning with Luxembourg. Will you please bring your voting papers to the box? The tellers are asked to supervise the deposit of voting papers, and to count the votes.

The vote was taken by secret ballot.

[18] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] While the votes are being counted, we may go on to the next item on the agenda, which is the seat of the Sixth Session [document 5C/9]. I call upon the Chairman of the Executive Board, who has to report on this matter.

XXIII. Decision on the place of meeting of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[19] Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom) Chairman of the Executive Board — The document which I have the honour to present to you is 5C/9 and concerns, on the recommendation of the Executive Board, the place of the meeting of the next Unesco Conference, that is to say the Conference of 1951. The recommendation is contained on the last page, that is to say, page 3 of the English text, and it is quite brief, namely, that we should agree that our next Conference should be held in Paris, at the headquarters of Unesco, and should be a short business session. I should like to say very briefly that the Executive Board, in presenting this proposal, does so with some confidence, because it had the advice resulting from the lengthy discussions which took place at our Conference's Third Session at Beirut. At that session there was a fairly clear indication of the Conference's view that we should have in alternate years a short business Conference in Paris and only in the other alternate year a Conference such as the one which we are holding here in Florence. That view was based on the experience which the Organization had acquired up to that date and which, in the Board's opinion, has been supported by our experience since then, namely, that it is in the interest of Unesco and our work that we should not ask the Secretariat and the Director-General every year to interrupt their work in helping to execute our programme for the purpose of a big General Conference such as we are holding here, but that we should do that only every alternate year.

[20] There has been at this Conference some discussion of a basic novelty whereby the Constitution would be amended and we should have no Conference in alternate years. Let none of us be in any doubt that that proposal is not before us at this moment, but the fact that it should have been brought forward and discussed, supports, I think, the view that, while we have our present Constitution, we would do well to follow the advice of the Beirut Conference and accept the proposal now made by the Board, namely that, next year, in 1951, we should not seek to have this big type of General Conference which involves the movement from the headquarters of the Secretariat of a large number of staff, but should content ourselves with what we tried to have last year in 1949. The Board feels very strongly that we should redouble our efforts to make the Conference in 1951 a genuinely short, business-like Conference and should not find ourselves engaged in so many basic and fundamental discussions as we did, in fact, at the Conference last year in Paris when we were trying to have only a short business Conference. And so, in this Report, we have set out our reasons which I will not further underline. But I would ask you to approve the decision set out on page 3, remembering that we are bound to have a Con-

ference in 1951 whatever the views of any of us might be about eventually changing our Constitution, and it is simply therefore on that question of where the 1951 Conference should be that we have now to take a decision.

[21] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I have to thank the Chairman of the Executive Board for his lucid report. Has anyone any comments to make? As no one has asked to speak, the report is *approved*. The question is therefore settled for 1951.

[22] With regard to 1952, the head of the Uruguayan delegation has informed the Director-General, in a letter dated 5 June 1950, that the Government of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay would invite the General Conference of Unesco to hold its Seventh Session in Montevideo, the capital of the Republic. Uruguay promises to offer Unesco all the necessary material facilities and the customary privileges, and to transmit all the required information about local resources, in accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure.

[23] In a letter dated 14 June 1950, the head of the Indian delegation has provisionally invited the General Conference to hold its Seventh Session in India in 1952 or, if the Conference adopts the suggestion that biennial sessions should be held, in 1953. The head of the Indian delegation adds that his delegation has been unable to consult his Government on the matter, which explains why the invitation is provisional for the time being. He says that the Government and people of India would be grateful if the General Conference were able to hold its Seventh Session in that country. Unesco's aims have aroused great interest among the Indian people, and that interest would be still further increased if the General Conference were to hold a session in India.

[24] Under the terms of Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Director-General is required to inform the General Conference of these invitations. When the Governments of Uruguay and India have supplied the necessary details about the local resources, the Executive Board will consider the invitations issued by these two Governments from every point of view, with special reference to their budgetary implications, and will report on the subject to the General Conference at its Sixth Session. I think I am expressing the general feeling of the Conference in thanking both these Governments for their proposals.

[25] I now have the honour to inform the Conference of the result of the election of members of the Executive Board: votes cast: 53; majority required: 27. This majority was obtained by:

Dr. Antonio Castro Leal . .	47 votes;
Sir Ronald Adam	46 votes;
Professor Piaget	45 votes;
Mrs. Pecson	43 votes;
Monseigneur Maroun . . .	39 votes;
Dr. Bernal Jiménez	38 votes.

Dr. Hasan received 25 votes.

I therefore declare the following elected: Dr. Castro Leal, Sir Ronald Adam, Professor Piaget, Mrs. Pecson, Mgr. Maroun and Dr. Jiménez. I am sure I speak for all of you in expressing the warmest gratitude to the outgoing members of the Board, who have made such a distinguished contribution to our work, and in welcoming the new members, who, I hope, will have an easier task than their predecessors. I call upon the delegate of Yugoslavia.

[26] Professor Milan BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) — [*Translation from the French*] Ladies and gentlemen, the Yugoslav delegation feels compelled to make a statement to the General Conference about the result of the election of the members of the Executive Board. As we see, the result means that the only place hitherto occupied by a national of one of the Eastern European countries has gone. Article V.A.2 of the Constitution specifies that, in electing members of the Executive Board, the General Conference "shall also have regard to the diversity of cultures and a balanced geographical distribution". The result of the election of the members of the Executive Board at the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco shows that the Conference has not observed the express provisions of the Constitution. The Yugoslav delegation has taken note of that fact and feels that it must necessarily cause grave injury to Unesco and to the spirit of friendship and understanding between the peoples. My delegation asks that this statement be included in the record of this plenary meeting.

[27] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Are there any other comments? If not, I declare the meeting closed.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

TWELFTH PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 5 p.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XXIV.	Tributes to Avicenna, J. S. Bach, Balzac, Confucius and Muratori	191
XXV.	Statement by the Director-General	197

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XXIV. Tributes to Avicenna, J. S. Bach, Balzac, Confucius and Muratori.

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The meeting is open. We shall first consider the item of the agenda relating to the commemoration of centenaries. The delegates of Persia, Israel and Egypt have signified their desire to speak. I call on the delegate of Persia.

[2] Mr. Ali Asghar HEKMAT (Persia) — Mr. President, dear colleagues, we are gathered here tonight to render homage to five great men. It is, indeed, a very agreeable duty, since these leaders of human civilization, who lived in the four corners of the world, have accomplished by their deeds and works the same task that Unesco, following in their path, means to accomplish. One of the best results achieved by our Organization is the fact that fifty-nine nations of the world have given up their narrow national outlook and have, in this meeting, chosen these great men of different nationalities as citizens of the world. This is indeed strong proof of the point that the human mind is in search of human unity. For the same reason the Persian delegation has the honour to salute the memory of these great men and to thank the Fifth Session of the Conference for organizing this commemoration. If the aim of our Organization is to strengthen the spiritual ties between the different nations and to fortify the foundations of peace in the world by intellectual understanding, the same noble ambition moved these great men in olden times. Confucius, with his laws and morals, Avicenna with his philosophy and medicine, Bach with his musical compositions, Balzac with his great novels, Muratori with his works on history, all of them have created the same ties and have been likewise advocates of peace and brotherhood. We are, therefore, paying tribute to our pioneers.

[3] Since most of my colleagues know the life and work of these great men better than myself, I will limit my contribution to a few words on Avicenna. The philosophical school and medical system of Avicenna were a link connecting the East with Hellenistic philosophy and medicine and, after him, they reflected back again from the East to the West, where his masterpieces continued to rank among the classics taught in the great universities up to the seventeenth century. Where could be found a greater factor for drawing the East closer to the West?

[4] A thousand years ago Avicenna put the corner-stone of his lofty philosophy at the foot of the Elburz Mountains, and it was much higher and stronger than the mountains themselves. What are the Elburz but a dense body always rooted to the same place, while the refined philosophy of Avicenna was a spiritual essence spreading from its birthplace to the whole world. No doubt the Middle Eastern countries owe a lot to this great man because through him they got to know each other better. Not only the Middle Eastern countries, however, but the whole of mankind has been enriched by his work.

[5] In Avicenna's *Treatise on the Ascension of the Prophet*, which I happen to have with me here, there is a beautiful passage which, with your permission, I am going to quote, as it alludes to the great men who accepted his teachings and can be rightly applied to this gathering of learned men from different nations. It may be translated thus:

> And any word uttered by someone, even a noble one, if not accepted by the High Assembly, will not acquire refinement and savour; because its acceptance gives the world a soul, and a body without a soul is without value. And not every word uttered would be accepted by that Assembly, but only that which is pure and without blemish in its meaning and in its sound, so that it can be heard by the Assembly because its ears are celestial and no gross matter can reach them. Words must be spiritual in order to reach that high summit.

[6] As you may know, Mr. President, the Persian nation is about to glorify this great philosopher and has taken several measures to celebrate his millennium. We are erecting a monument on his tomb in Hamadan, a mausoleum in the architectural style of the tenth century. We are publishing some fourteen of the studies he wrote in Persian. We are issuing five series of commemorative postage stamps, from 1947 to 1951. But the most important of all these initiatives is the organization of an international congress in Teheran to which many scholars and learned men of different countries will be invited in order that they may contribute by their research work to our knowledge of this great thinker. The purpose of the Persian nation is not so much to glorify the nationality of this great man, but rather to express our appreciation of him in whose thoughts and words we have already found the best means of arriving at a good understanding with other nations. I hope that many of you who are commemorating him tonight will join us in our commemoration in Persia in the near future. May "service to science" and "honour to savants" be the motto of Unesco!

[7] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegates of Israel and Egypt to speak on the same subject. I will ask them to make their speeches short as there are several tributes to pay before we come to the main object of this meeting. The delegate of Israel will speak first.

[8] Dr. Pinhas KOHN (Israel) — Mr. President, I have much pleasure in associating myself, on behalf of the delegation of Israel, with the tribute which has just been paid by the representative of Persia to one of the giants of mediaeval science and philosophy.

[9] Avicenna's fame as a codifier of medicine, as a commentator of Aristotle and as a philosopher of wide and original range was outstanding throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. He brought to bear a mind of great originality and a rare capacity for systematic treatment upon the problems of logic, physics, mathematics, metaphysics and medicine. His *Canon of Medicine* was a standard textbook in the European universities until the middle of the seventeenth century. It was translated into Hebrew and then into Latin and it is recorded that in some universities of Europe students of medicine were required to know Hebrew in order to be able to study Avicenna's basic treatise. Among the earliest Hebrew prints in the Library of the University of Jerusalem there is the Hebrew translation of Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine*.

[10] No less profound was Avicenna's influence in the sphere of philosophical thought. His *Book of Theorems* was one of the classics of mediaeval philosophy. He became known as the Aristotle of the East and his powers of codification put him indeed in the same category as his great Hellenic prototype. Avicenna received the Aristotelian heritage from the Nestorian Christians, but it was in the form in which he presented and commented upon the works of Aristotle that he influenced all subsequent philosophical development of Arab, Jewish and Christian thinkers in the Middle Ages and during the era of the Renaissance. But Avicenna was far more than a codifier and a commentator of Aristotelian thought. He added to it a rich contribution of his own. His system of logic covers the whole range of philosophic thought. In metaphysics he was influenced in significant measure by Neo-Platonic ideas, which he sought to bring into accord with the basic teachings of his great Hellenic predecessor.

[11] The influence of Avicenna was long felt in every sphere of mediaeval literature. Here, in the city of Dante, attention may be drawn to the fact that the cosmogenic system of the *Divina Comedia* embodies a conception of the universe which is based on the philosophic system developed by Avicenna and his Arabic and Jewish successors, and which was accepted at that time throughout Europe as absolute truth.

[12] I should like to refer here in particular to the close ties that connected Avicenna with the great Hebrew philosophers of his age. He was himself influenced by the work of a great Jewish philosopher who preceded him, Isaac Israeli of Kairouan, known to the scholastics as Isaac Judaeus. In turn, Avicenna's writings exercised a profound influence on Jewish philosophers and scientists. It was pre-eminently through the works of the Jewish scholars and translators who lived and worked in Spain, Italy and Southern France, that Avicenna's ideas reached Christian Europe. Solomon Ibn Gabirol, the great Hebrew poet and philosopher, known to the Arabs and Christians by the name of Avicebron, and Moses Maimonides, most profound of Jewish philosophers, codifiers and physicians, drew much of their knowledge of Aristotle from Avicenna's commentaries. Their writings in turn exercised a strong influence on the subsequent development of Arab philosophy and on Christian scholasticism. It was a fruitful give and take, and it was this co-operation which kept the flame of learning alive during the long centuries which elsewhere came to be known as the Dark Ages.

[13] It seems appropriate that we should at this hour and in this assembly recall the memory of this great effort of intellectual search and co-

operation. The concepts evolved by Avicenna and his successors reflect a view of life and of the world which is still a permanent element of Western civilization. To Avicenna and Maimonides science and philosophy were not water-tight compartments. They formed integral parts of a comprehensive view of the universe. We have moved a long way from that view and it may be that the ills of our present age are in significant measure due to that fundamental cleavage. Our scientists are becoming increasingly aware of the urgency of a new comprehensive approach to the totality of spiritual and physical phenomena. In that great endeavour they may well derive inspiration from the stupendous achievement of the great Persian thinker whose anniversary is being celebrated this year.

[14] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Egypt.

[15] Dr. Mohamed AWAD Bey (Egypt) — Mr. President, I have but very little to add to the tribute paid by my colleague, the leader of the Persian delegation, on this subject, except very briefly to state in what manner Egypt itself is celebrating the millenium of the great savant and philosopher. Egypt intends to commemorate this great occasion by issuing a uniform edition of all his works, and most of these works cover an encyclopaedic area—medicine, philosophy, physics, astronomy, mathematics and even literature. Most of them are at present in manuscript, scattered all over the world in many obscure corners and libraries. Egyptian authorities are exerting a great effort, and have already collected microfilms and copies of most of these manuscripts, and a committee under the leadership of Dr. Taha Hussein Bey was set up a year ago to study, collate and publish these books in a uniform edition. The first volume of this edition is due to appear in September or October this year. This will be the first volume issued of his famous philosophical treatise, *The Cure, Al Shifa.*

[16] At the same time, many of Avicenna's books were translated into Latin in the Middle Ages, and a French lady, Miss Dalverny, has been working on a Latin translation of this very book, *Al Shifa.* With the collaboration and approval of the French authorities, she was invited to Cairo to come and compare her labours with those of the Egyptian scientists who are editing the same book, in order to collate the Latin text with the Arabic text. She stayed a few months in Egypt last winter, and this Latin edition will also be available to scholars all over the world in the next few months. In this manner, Egypt is intending to celebrate a scientist who comes from a period of history when no racial or religious distinction divided the world or countries or peoples from each other.

[17] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We now come to the commemoration of Johann Sebastian Bach. The delegation of Egypt will again speak.

[18] Dr. Hussein FAWZY (Egypt) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow-delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it is only right that the Egyptian delegation should, along with other countries, join in the solemn tributes that Unesco is paying to the memory of Johann Sebastian Bach. Not that Egypt has in the past played any part in the development of Western music; but by joining in this tribute, Egypt, with its different historical background, gives striking proof of the universality of Bach's genius; for both my delegation and Unesco this gesture symbolizes the unity of peoples. Egyptian music belongs to another current of civilization; it still preserves its own modes and means of expression, so unlike those used in Western music. Nothing is more foreign to the taste of my compatriots, to whom music still means a single line of melody, than the harmonies of Western music. Yet, owing to the evolution of modern Egypt and its rapid assimilation of Western culture, we have among us a small band of amateurs and professionals, for whom Bach stands as the same towering, many-sided genius as for music-lovers of the West.

[19] There is one striking fact that I have noticed among my countrymen: Egyptian audiences, not trained to value the importance of harmony in music and with ears attuned to melody only, do not seem to grasp the harmonic accompaniment, which they almost entirely disregard, to concentrate on the line of melody. But when it comes to polyphony, where there is no disregarding the antiphonal melodies, interwoven in a clear, close-knit sound pattern, the Egyptian listener is struck by the architectural character of the music. Hence the dominant part played by Bach in initiating the general public to the music of the Western masters. I tell you this to stress the educational value of the composer whose anniversary we are honouring; that value is of course recognized in your colleges of music and conservatoires, but it takes on a special meaning from the fact that I have mentioned. For us it is not merely a question of studying the fugue as a musical form and of penetrating its harmonic and contrapuntal subtleties; what we find is a quite exceptional means of helping the public to

appreciate great music. In my opinion, this aspect deserves special consideration by Unesco since it is our aim to discover the methods best calculated to bring about an inter-penetration of cultures to strengthen understanding between the peoples.

[20] Following another train of thought, it is pleasant to recall that, some time before Bach was born to carry on the work of his predecessors, Pierluigi da Palestrina, Olseghem and Josquin des Prés and others, to whom we owe the Golden Age of polyphony, it was in Florence itself that Count Bardi and his music-loving friends gathered at the opening of the seventeenth century to decide the fate of the musical forms that were to usher in the age of monody. Bach was born at a time when music was turning to new ideas, whose source was in Florence itself. He was to follow the older current of ideas and to enrich it with his genius; with him, one of the most glorious periods of music came to a close. This accounts for the eclipse of Johann Sebastian Bach in the period immediately following his death. But the cantor of St. Thomas in Leipzig was not a genius destined to remain of mere academic interest: the Passions according to St. John and St. Matthew, the B Minor Mass, the chorales, toccatas, fugues, passacaglias, and the forty-eight preludes and fugues of the "Well-Tempered Clavier" were not the kind of works to lie buried under the dust of the past. One of Bach's sons, Karl Philipp Emmanuel, was to divert the current by laying the foundations of the sonata, a subtle and novel form more suited to dramatic expression in pure music, but by reason of its very subtlety far from attaining the architectural perfection of the fugue; men of genius of the calibre of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven would be needed to bring the sonata to its ultimate perfection of form and profundity of expression. It was in the best days of the Viennese school that the monodic current, which had its origin in Florence, and the polyphonic current traceable to Bach were re-united to inaugurate the richest period of European music.

[21] At this time, it must be admitted, there had yet been no general Bach revival, although a few collections of his works were still used by music teachers. Our present knowledge of Bach is due to the toil and clearsightedness of Felix Mendelssohn and also to the patient research and learning of Spitta, whose biography of the composer is a monument worthy of the cantor and a landmark in the annals of musicology. We should in all fairness associate in our tribute both Spitta and Mendelssohn—these two men who have made their mark in the history of music and musical scholarship—for they have every claim to our gratitude. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in celebrating the anniversary of Bach, Unesco is fulfilling a pious duty directly related to its mission in seeking to build the city of Mankind; Bach is one of its greatest sons. The Egyptian delegation is proud to associate itself in the commemoration of the bicentenary of the death of Johann Sebastian Bach.

[22] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before calling on the delegate of China to pay his tribute to Confucius, I have to announce that the delegation of Canada, which wished to associate itself with the memorial addresses you have just heard for Avicenna and Bach, has, to save time, withdrawn from the list of speakers and will merely send in the address it was intending to give, for publication in the *Records* of the Conference.[1] Likewise, the French and Italian delegations who were to have paid honour to Muratori and Balzac are renouncing their incontestable right to speak, in view of the tributes paid during the series of lectures given in the Palazzo Vecchio. I now call on the delegate of China to present his tribute to Confucius.

[23] Mr. WEN YUAN NING (China) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, do you remember what Voltaire wrote when Vauvenargues praised Racine at the expense of Corneille? Voltaire's words to Vauvenargues deserve quotation. This is what Voltaire said to young Vauvenargues: "A man of culture like you ought to have preferences, but no exclusions." We who are gathered here now have come to do honour to the memory of five great men of the past. And if I speak of only one of them, this must not be construed to mean that I exclude four of them from my homage and admiration. I prefer to speak only of Confucius, because I know that others can speak with greater knowledge and propriety of Avicenna, Bach, Muratori and Balzac.

[24] Confucius was a great humanist. When asked by one of his disciples about death and the after-life, his answer may be paraphrased thus: "We know so little about life, why bother about death and the after-life? Learn to live well, and the rest will take care of itself." This answer reflects the typical Chinese attitude towards life, and it is a humanistic attitude. To concern oneself wholly with the problem of living, to learn how to behave towards one's parents, elders, superiors, wives, children and friends, this is the alpha and omega of Confucian teaching. Confucius accepts man as he is, with all his appetites, his desires, his vices even, his goodness, his ambitions.

1. See Annex, p. 201.

The Latin saying that "nothing which is human is alien to me" is very Confucian. To Confucius the ascetic, who denies himself the good things of life, the hermit who eschews the society of his fellow-beings, the saint who forsakes wife and children and home in order to follow God, they are not the men that Confucius would like to see in Chinese society. The good man in Confucian eyes is one who lives a full live of the senses, the heart and the mind. But the appetites, the emotions, the intellect and the body must not be indulged to the extent of impairing the harmony which should exist in any well-balanced life. Hence the great Confucian doctrine of Chung Yung Tse Tao, which can be translated as "the doctrine of the golden mean". The appetites are good and necessary to man's happiness: they are evil only when control is lost over them. Kindness in man is good and desirable, but in excess it is also harmful. Even truth and nothing but the truth cannot be good for man, without respect to time and place. In other words, according to Confucian teaching, nothing is good in itself: it is only good if it promotes the well-being of human society as a whole. Confucius does not conceive of a good human society as something static. Being the great individualist that he was, he expected every man to be different. But in a well-ordered society, differences among men should not be a cause of discord; differences in points of view and in personalities should be resolved in a harmony which is dynamic, like the harmony in music, ever striving towards a new equilibrium.

[25] To Confucius, the world, and not the particular state of Lu in which he happened to be born and bred, was his home. He wanted harmony in the home extended to the State, and from the State to the whole world of living men and women. Hence his doctrine of the unity of the world, of universal harmony. To bring this about it is sufficient if every man were to behave as a reasonable human being, observing the rule of the golden mean, or in the words of the Greek saying: in nothing too much.

[26] In the time of Confucius, China was in intellectual, moral, material and spiritual chaos, just like the world of today. Political philosophers and sophists proposed all kinds of nostrums to cure the ills of life. Have we not the same situation today? What cure did Confucius propose? Something very simple and yet profound. The first step that men must take to restore order out of chaos must be what he calls the rectification of names. By this, Confucius meant that words must be made to mean what they mean. In times of moral degeneracy, he knew that key words which expressed great ideas were the first to suffer. Love, benevolence, filial piety, respect, honesty, etc., meant very different things from what they ought to mean. Murder was never called murder, but something else. Do we not find the same thing happening in our time? What multitudes of sin and crime lurk at this very moment behind the words democracy, freedom, peace-loving, and equality? These words are like oranges sucked dry, empty of all meaning. They must be made flesh and blood again before men and women can ever hope to see a better world arising from the present sad chaos. Confucius was a great leader who did restore life to the great words of his time. Is it not the function of leaders now, is it not the function of Unesco, to make the half-dead words such as democracy, freedom, peace-loving and equality, take life and fire once again, so that men and women can be inspired to give even their lives, if need be, in order that those great ideas may be a living reality today?

[27] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Fellow delegates, this closes the series of tributes. In compliance with the decision of the Executive Board, I call on Mrs. Montessori.

[28] Mrs. MONTESSORI (Italy) — [*Translation from the Italian*] I think that, if we are to put into practice Unesco's great ideals, to which we all whole-heartedly subscribe, we must enlist the co-operation not only of those here present, but of another category of beings who can help us actively to achieve our aims. I refer to children. For all men have, of course, at first been children. It has been said by the poets that the child is father to the man; but in speaking of children I would like to emphasize a particular fact. From the point of view with which I am concerned, we must really take the small child, from birth to the age of six, for that is the "formative" period. Children, at that stage, are very unlike ourselves, and we fail to understand them; we leave them, so to speak, on one side, as if they were of secondary importance. I would stress, however, that this is the age at which most attention should be devoted to these children, not merely if we want to produce better balanced individuals, but also if we want to help civilization to progress. The child is not only "father to the man"; he is also an essential aid to the construction and advancement of civilization itself. This is generally overlooked, so that I feel it necessary to mention it. Without the help of children we could make no sustained and regular progress; we should merely have to do what others had done before us and, if heredity were all that counted, that alone would make any real progress

impossible. Here lies our problem; this is the most important point. It is, in the final analysis, only the child who can absorb the characteristics of the age into which he is born, incarnating them so as to produce, or at least mould, contemporary man, as he develops.

[29] If it is one of our objects to bring about understanding between men who are different in character, our work must begin with the children, not with the adults. Unesco's ideals must be applied in the education of the child from the moment he enters this world. Is it not surprising, for instance, that within their first two years of life children learn to speak their own native tongue? At the outset, they know nothing; they have no "awareness"; they can achieve nothing by the exercise of the intellect, memory or observation and concentration; but by some higher faculty they learn to speak their own language—language, if we analyse it, being something really created by man, man who thinks, man who evolves. How, then, has the child been able to acquire it? Here we are confronted with a number of factors to which we have not paid sufficient attention, and which show the importance of protecting this stage of children's existence, for it is the treasure-house of the future. Children, however, possess not only this particular psychic power, but other psychic powers as well.

[30] We regard the child as a being that can have no share in culture. Yet long experience has proved that this is not so. The child, just as he absorbs his environment, can of his own accord absorb the rudiments of culture; and he does this in so singular a manner that for us it is a veritable lesson, a veritable revelation. In absorbing culture he does not tire; indeed, he feeds and fortifies his own intellect; he can work but, in working, he strengthens himself. Children have succeeded in combining freedom and discipline, and a number of other lessons imparted by education now applied in almost all schools throughout the world have in fact been learnt from children themselves. We should, then, pay great attention to this particular period of childhood, which also contains the seeds of a number of undesirable developments, some of them, as we know, resulting in a "deficient" type of man. We need not elaborate on this fact, which is common knowledge. It would however be well to remember that, since children have these great powers for good as well as the power to develop in an undesirable direction, a great responsibility rests upon society to protect and help them. They should not be left to the care of their mothers alone, as if we were still in the cave-dwelling age. They need an environment in which all the resources of modern science are employed; mothers should be trained with that end in view; there should be schools for teachers and for parents. In that way the plant of "humanity" would be watered as it should be.

[31] We have noted an interesting fact, and that is that very small children can absorb a large amount of culture. I will not mention all the things they can learn, but will merely refer to mathematics, geography, grammar and so forth. The curious thing is that such accomplishments are common not only to children of one race—to those of Europe, let us say, or America—but also to children of every race on earth, even the most backward. We have examples from all over world, concerning children in Central Africa and in the South Sea Islands, as well as those in more civilized countries like Japan, China, India and all the nations of Europe and elsewhere. This shows that there are common laws applying to all children, which enable them to absorb a great part of their environment in that particular way and at that particular age; and those laws are something uniting all the inhabitants of the earth, giving them all the same introduction to life, and making them all subject to the provisions of those laws. Why, therefore, in order to correct what we think is wrong, should we not begin where, in fact, everything has its beginning?

[32] A curious fact has been noted in connexion with writing at this period of childhood. We can say with mathematical accuracy that it is at the age of four that the child can learn to write and thus acquire the basic tool of culture. Why the age of four? One explanation is physiological; this is the period at which the sense of language naturally develops and at which it is very easy, not only to learn other, foreign, languages, but to learn how to express thoughts in writing. If, therefore, for instance, there were any plans for developing backward peoples (e.g., the great literacy campaigns), the problem to be tackled would be that of the age at which it is best to begin to teach the art of reading and writing. The reply would undoubtedly be that the best age was that of early childhood, that is the creative period, from four to five years, and even earlier. This is a very interesting point, since the instruction given to adults often misses the mark, whereas instruction imparted to children is certain to be absorbed.

[33] If, on the other hand, it were desired to provide for a short period of preparation, what would the proper age for this be? The reply is that an even earlier age would have to be selected. The representative of Israel has confirmed to me that, in the case of the immigrants to his country, this problem arose in regard to the many children, of all ages, that were involved. The question

considered most important was that of how to deal with the small children under six years of age, and the first thing done was to institute schools and instruction for them. This is the real solution that should be considered in cases of "emergency".

[34] Not merely infants, but young people as a whole are undoubtedly full of energy and resources, to which we have paid insufficient attention. We, who have always concentrated on the problem of teaching and transmitting our knowledge to young people, never seem to have thought that, conversely, we have so much to learn from them, so much of the hidden resources of human nature itself. We should be ever on the look-out for what young people, through their lives and activities, have to teach us in this way. I think, therefore, that, if Unesco one day decided to regard children as a factor in the reconstruction of the world and the establishment of peace, and tried to enlist their aid, organize them, discuss matters with them and make use of everything they have to teach us, this would be of great assistance in breathing fresh life into this society, which must be built up not by one section of men, but by all men, from the beginning of their lives onward. It is the young people, the children, upon whom we may base our hopes of building a better world, since they can give us more than we in fact have today, and more than we at one time had but have since lost.

[35] I will not quote recent examples, but I would ask you to think what people who had a particular social or political object in view, especially those who aimed at conquering the world, have done. Their first step was not to accumulate arms; their first step was to train children and young people as they wished; this was the course followed, for instance, by Mussolini and Hitler. We have all seen it; these people realized that to achieve a social aim they had to train the younger generation for that purpose, from its earliest years. This, of course, was a horrible thing, for it directed the energies of the younger generation towards the destruction of the world. I am reminded of atomic energy, that great discovery which at the outset was used for destructive purposes; but we know that that same energy could be used to build a wonderful world, if directed to different ends. We should regard children rather as we regard atomic energy. Having discovered this great human secret, we can do what we like with it. We can use it for good or for evil and influence society with it. Should it first have been used for undesirable ends, it can equally now be used, by Unesco for instance, as a great example to the world; it can be used to help us to build a better universe, in which there shall be understanding between all men. Prepare for this from the outset; not in your own personal interest, but on behalf of an ideal, an ideal that shall breathe fresh life into the world, arouse the enthusiasm of youth, and create fresh energy. In that way the ideal may really attract all men, who, so to speak, have been prepared for it from their earliest days.

[36] Then, too, there will be hope, a better hope than that to be placed in politics alone, since children and young people are plastic, creative and full of life, and have so much to teach us; we can therefore adopt them as our friends and teachers, and the whole of humanity can advance together towards the common goals. This is what I wanted to say, as a contribution from my own experience and observation—the contribution, I would rather put it, of the children and of their resources, which it is for us to turn to good account.

[37] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Fellow delegates, the applause with which you have greeted the eloquent and inspiring address from Mrs. Montessori makes it unnecessary for me to convey to her the gratitude of the Conference. I now call on our Director-General, whom I know you are all very anxious to hear.

XXV. Statement by the Diretor-General.

[38] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, on the afternoon of 13 June the Programme and Budget Commission began discussion of the question of Unesco's contribution to the consolidation of peace. I myself regarded this matter as of decisive importance and, judging by what was said at the plenary meeting when my Report was discussed, delegations themselves were unanimous in the view that it must be the dominant consideration throughout the present Conference. Whatever the answers arrived at, they would clearly determine the true inner significance to be attached to the decisions on all other questions submitted to the Conference.

[39] Personally I had already made my own position too clear for anyone te be able to allege ignorance of it or to misunderstand it. Last March I submitted to the Twentieth Session of the Executive Board a number of considerations and suggestions with regard to the Programme and Budget proposals for the General Conference, accompanied by the following comments:

In 1950, who can be unaware that peace is in danger? Can Unesco then be needless of the world as it is today?

Such an attitude is all the more excluded because the setting of this world drama is the same as Unesco's own. Rivalries between States have assumed the form of ideological conflicts and what may prove to be the decisive battles of the cold war are being fought in the minds of men. When the mind is assailed on every side by the passions of war, how can an Organization be silent which was expressly created to establish peace with the resources of the mind?

It will rest with the General Conference to define Unesco's position at this grave juncture. The Conference alone is empowered to decide, it alone has the means of acting, should it decide upon action.

Obviously, whatever steps may be agreed upon to help the United Nations in its efforts to build up peace, they would have to take the form of intergovernmental action far transcending the limits of the technical programme to which the Organization has so far confined itself.

[40] The Executive Board was good enough to accept my views and accordingly sent to Member States the appeal contained in paragraph 6 of the Statement attached to the Draft Programme to the Conference.

[41] When I presented my Report to the present Session I reverted to the same question:

What, I asked, can fifty-six (now fifty-nine) countries do to strengthen peace by means of education, science and culture?

Answering my own question, I went on

. . . They can study and try out together the various modern means of helping men to participate actively in the progress of the international community. They can undertake together to further all steps which may help educators to form citizens conscious of their rights and yet equally conscious of their duties towards their fellow-men of every nation, language, race and religion.

Above all they can infuse a spirit of justice and concord in their domestic and foreign policies, so that there may prevail between peoples and governments that atmosphere of mutual confidence which is essential for peace. Such an atmosphere is indispensable for the success of Unesco's mission also. Only in a world free from the continual threat of war can culture, science and education bear their finest fruits.

[42] Lastly, in my reply to the discussion on my Report, I stressed the same grave problem yet again, in these words:

After Mr. Laugier's stirring appeal on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, it seems to me that the General Conference must have realized the responsibilities we bear in the present state of the world. Let us now consider what strength we have. Unesco consists of fifty-nine Member States, some of which are to be found in every continent, representing every school of thought, and united in their consideration for the dignity of the individual and their care for international peace.

I also pointed out that

. . . the General Conference is an assembly of delegates of governments, and as such necessarily has political authority and a political character. That being so, it is hard to see why the political authority, so much in evidence in dealing with certain specific cases, should suddenly become perilous when it is sought to use it to strengthen the foundations of the United Nations' work for peace, which is our essential task and the reason for our existence.

[43] That was my declared attitude, from which I have never swerved and which I see no reason to change today. It was in that spirit that I attended the discussion which began the day before yesterday in the Programme and Budget Commission. The quotations I have ventured to make from my earlier statements may enable you to understand how deeply disturbed I was by what was said. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I most earnestly beg of you not to misunderstand me. This is the time to tell the naked truth: as your elected servant I have never deemed myself entitled to take sides for or against a particluar proposal or point of view nor to set myself up as the censor of the governments on whom the world's present state lays responsibilities so heavy. Nevertheless as the loyal executant of your decisions I feel that that loyalty itself would be worthless if it implied the stifling of my own conscience. That conscience told me that if the discussion of two days ago was to be accepted as the answer to the question set the General Conference by the Executive Board, the notion of Unesco which it implied and the policy to which it committed us made it impossible for me to continue to serve you. If our present discussion really has any meaning and any useful purpose—and in my view its usefulness can be fundamental and decisive—that purpose can only be to settle these specific fundamental questions once and for all, and I myself will try to bring to the task all the logic and frankness I can command.

[44] Mr. President, gentlemen, it is legitimate to have different views on how Unesco can serve peace and on the extent of its effectiveness. It is legitimate to differ as to the value of the programme of the Programme and Budget Commission regarded as a contribution to the strengthening of peace. What I find it difficult to understand, however, is that you should assert that this programme represents the best contribution Unesco can make towards peace and that you have full confidence in its successful execution, while simultaneously you judge it to deserve a budget of no more than $8,200,000. As I say, I find that difficult to understand, for there is much danger lest we might all see in such an attitude towards the obligations our

Constitution lays on us an admission of impotence, from which, I am convinced, Unesco could not recover. In such circumstances, could any Director-General fit for his post agree to remain in office? Could any right-feeling man agree to remain as Director-General of an institution dedicated by its Constitution to the noblest task of all, that of achieving peace through the mind, but which in fact, in the tragedy through which the world is passing was forced to confine itself, even on the technical side, to a series of mere pilot projects all too inadequate to meet the crying needs of mankind? Gentlemen, I wanted you to know that if Unesco were definitely to enter upon that road, I would not be that man. I could not be.

[45] This morning the President of the Conference acquainted me with your desire that I should withdraw my resignation. Let me tell you how greatly I appreciate this striking proof of your confidence. During these last few days, when my conscience has been so sorely troubled, it has been my privilege to receive many marks of sympathy and understanding from many of you, and from different parts of the world. May I say here that I have been much moved by them. But nothing could touch me more deeply than the unanimous action you took this morning. The unanimity of your confidence is tantamount to a command for me, and I will not wait longer to tell you that I would gladly defer to your wishes if there were only a personal question at stake. Had my decision been due to any doubts I might have felt of your confidence in me, the vote of confidence with which you have honoured me this morning would, I need hardly say, cause me to withdraw that decision immediately, as you are asking me to do. But I promised that first and foremost I would be completely frank with you, and frankness obliges me to say that I do not think that the situation which led me to resign has been finally cleared up by a vote of confidence passed in myself. The question which I raised when I resigned was not a question of confidence in myself, but a question of confidence in the Organization, or, more correctly, a certain conception of the Organization's main lines of work. It is for you to decide those main lines of work, but since you are today faced with this problem as a result of the action I took the day before yesterday, I realize that it is incumbent on me to explain my ideas in order to avoid any misunderstanding. In doing so, I feel, moreover, that I am complying with the very legitimate wishes of a certain number of delegations.

[46] Unesco can only have an active peace policy in its capacity of a Specialized Agency of the United Nations. That is to say, this policy must, on the one hand, take the form of co-operation with the efforts of the United Nations and, on the other hand, be circumscribed by the limits of our Organization's powers. Any action by Unesco on behalf of peace is inconceivable except within the framework of the action taken by the United Nations and by the means of education, science and culture. Is it supposed that we can take no action within that framework or within those limits? Surely not. Would it, for example,—and this is only an example—be of no avail for this Conference to pass a solemn declaration whereby the delegates of fifty-nine governments would urge, in order that education, science and culture may develop and simultaneously foster the progress of mankind towards intellectual and moral solidarity, that the political and technical machinery of international co-operation established by the system of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, which is at present arrested, should be set going again?

[47] By reason of its nature as a Specialized Agency of the United Nations, Unesco, as I have already said and repeated, and I repeat it again, can only act on the basis of the principle of universality. For Unesco that principle means the recognition and admission within its orbit of the widest possible diversity of opinions. The duty of tolerance is Unesco's law. The spirit is not neutral. But it can and must be tolerant. It is thus that it achieves peace. In a world devoured by passion, Unesco must set a steady example of mutual understanding. That means that we must take care to become neither auxiliaires nor victims in the disputes by which the world is torn. Here again I ask you do you, in the present circumstances, believe that a solemn declaration in the sense I have indicated by the representatives of the fifty-nine governments assembled in this Conference would be of no avail?

[48] In my view, the Organization's entire programme must be swayed by these major objectives. I consider that, in its present form, the Programme adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, while representing some advance, is still imperfectly attuned to this fundamental aim. And endeed, it was because they felt that this was so that some have suggested that a make-weight might be found in certain projects extraneous to the normal line of our activities. I understand their reasons. But it would, I believe, be wiser to keep our efforts within the framework of our programme while taking greater care to ensure its effectiveness. In my opinion the technical character of our work, which follows from the very nature of our speciality, does not exclude effective work in the cause of peace, and not only of tomorrow's peace,

but of peace today. But if that is so, it is essential that the programme should be concentrated and directed firmly upon realistic lines, at any rate along those main lines which in the world as it is today actually condition understanding between the peoples. It is, of course, too late now to make a systematic revision of the programme in that direction. But I do believe that this Conference can take a decisive step forward by expressing its firm intention that this shall be done in the future and, so far as the immediate present is concerned, authorizing the Executive Board and the Director-General to fix for the carrying out of the existing programme priorities in accordance with these new ideas. Lastly, it is possible to single out a few big composite projects into which our various technical activities would fit, so that we may give practical effect to the concentration asked for by all the resolutions. These projects would be examined by the Secretariat in the coming months with a view to their submission to the next session of the General Conference. In so far as they were adopted, they might become the mainsprings of our future programmes.

[49] There remains the question of financing such a programme. As I have already said, the time has come to leave behind the stage of studies, stimulation and symbolic gestures and pass on to that of effective achievement. Only on that condition shall we be able to overcome the scepticism and indifference which, if you will allow me to say so, now surround us. If our counsel and appeals are to be heard, we must give proof of useful work. That however requires a certain scale of resources below which no results could be expected. To achieve greatness, we must wish to be great. An annual ceiling for the budget is not the way in which we shall succeed in enlarging our activities. On the contrary, as we have seen, it threatens their satisfactory development. I do not intend to reopen discussion of the budget. I know the difficulties of governments and the limits of their present financial capacity. But it is permitted to hope that you do not regard Unesco's budget as permanently stabilized at its present meagre figure. When you get back to your countries after regaining confidence in the Organization's capacities, and loyal to your assertions of the value of Unesco's programme as an instrument of peace, you may perhaps feel what you, ladies and gentlemen, have already felt, a wish to redouble your efforts to persuade your governments of the urgent need for increasing both their moral and their financial assistance to our Organization, so that it may at last be able to fulfil the world's requirements. As things are at present, the financing of big concrete schemes by voluntary contributions in money and in kind and services as well, outside the normal budget, is of course a means of providing the necessary funds for these projects. But such funds and such contributions must be on the widest basis. It is not enough that our aims and purposes as well as our decisions should be collective. Our means must also be collective to the fullest possible extent. The universality which is the reason for our existence should characterize our work at every stage and in all its aspects. The universality of a decision is not secured by a unanimous vote, but by effective participation of all in the efforts that it calls for. The news that I have just received from the Conference on the Plan of Technical Assistance for Economic Development, which has just concluded its work at Lake Success, shows that so far as that plan is concerned the danger has been averted. Forty-nine countries have undertaken to share in its financing by contributions amounting in all to more than $20,000,000. I fervently hope that the same spirit of international co-operation will be shown in the case of the projects you have adopted. I hope the same will be true of all the other projects we may launch on a large scale as an effective solution, through international mutual aid, of certain major problems in the field of education, science and culture, which are of immediate concern to social progress and the consolidation of peace.

[50] Those, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, are the considerations I wanted to put before you. There are times when men abandon their posts in order to avoid the abandonment of principles. In its personal aspect my resignation is withdrawn by the very fact that you have unanimously asked me to withdraw it. It is for you now to decide whether that also means—and this is really the only thing that counts—that you are agreed upon a policy and not merely upon a person.

[51] Even in the twentieth century, as you go about the streets of Florence flanked by the grim walls of palaces which have witnessed so much wrath and tumult in past ages, you may see, if you lift your heads, what look like clenched fists wrought in iron jutting from the stone-work. Yet there is no threat in them: it is said that they once held torches whose light guided wayfarers through the night. Let us pray then that Unesco's hopes for culture's future may be fulfilled and that our age's harnessing of giant forces may find its justification in the eyes of future generations, like these iron fists, not in the terror of the beholder but in the light they bring to the building of a world community with

feeling and understanding for its citizens, and where every man may see his honour plain, and serve and respect mankind in all his deeds.

[52] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Fellow-delegates, as you have just heard, our Director-General's resignation has not been withdrawn unconditionally, for he has made it clear that the continuation of his term of office will depend on the implementation of certain projects. You have all realized this fact, which gives an added meaning to his speech and your applause. But as President of the Conference, my formal duty is merely to record that the Director-General has withdrawn his resignation. Consequently, I consider as null and void the letter he addressed me and the communications I have received from various delegations as a result of his letter.

[53] We shall now proceed with our regular business. Are we to open a discussion on the Director-General's statement? I warn you that such a step may lead us into involved political discussions and prolong our meeting unduly. If, on the other hand, we wish merely to note the Director-General's statement and its implications for the Organization, we can only resume the consideration of our regular agenda. I therefore ask the Conference: Must we open a discussion? Would those in favour of a discussion on the Director-General's statement please raise their hands.

[54] The meeting has decided against that proposal and I therefore consider the incident closed. We shall turn to our normal agenda, on the clear understanding that the Director-General has made no mere rhetorical statement; it must be regarded as one of the official decisions of our Conference binding delegates present at this meeting to endorse it with their several countries. Thank you, gentlemen, the meeting is closed.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

ANNEX

Tribute to Avicenna prepared by Mr. Jean Désy, of the Canadian delegation

(Translation from the French)

[55] Canada takes pleasure in paying tribute to Avicenna, the great scientist and philosopher, who might be epitomized as the prince of thinkers. No doubt many of the reasons for his renown in the Middle Ages no longer hold good. Although Avicenna was for several centuries the leading authority on medicine and enjoyed so wide a reputation that Dante himself in his Divine Comedy *had no hesitation in placing him alongside Socrates and Plato among the greatest thinkers of mankind, today, as a result of the progress of science since the Renaissance, his findings have to a large extent been superseded and the influence he exerted is of interest mainly to the historian. The same considerations apply to the humanities. Avicenna made a tremendous contribution to the spread of Peripatetic ideas in the mediaeval world and it is to him that many of the most influential thinkers of this period owed their acquaintance with the writings of Aristotle. But the Renaissance, by introducing scientific philological methods and seeking out the authentic texts, brought modern thought into direct touch with the very sources and is responsible for the neglect of so many thinkers who, like Avicenna, had for several centuries served as the main interpreters of, and links with, those sources. On the other hand, Avicenna even today is a living force in the world of philosophy. He is a master acknowledged in Canada by all who are influenced by scholastic thought and Thomist philosophy. In Canada, students of philosophy are aware of the important part he played in the formulation of the major scholastic creeds. Their masters teach them that the great schoolmen drew largely on Avicenna in regard to such matters as the classification of sciences. Several of their main tenets on the hierarchy of beings, the concept of "good", etc., are traceable to their acquaintance with Avicenna's philosophy.*

[56] For generations of Canadian intellectuals, the name of Avicenna has been a richly instructive symbol. Through him, our students have learned that history records more than the names of great conquerors and powerful monarchs who all too often claim attention only because they were able to ride roughshod over others; they have learnt that an honoured place is set aside in history for those who have dedicated their lives to the pursuit of truth and the liberation of the mind. The name of Avicenna also suggests to them that in the world of the mind, abundant lessons may be learned from conflicting ideas that may be a source of progress. Scholastic thought and, through it, the philosophic thought of Canada, has been enriched by the intellectual wealth of Avicenna. In one sense, Canada may be said to be the direct heir of certain aspects of the truth perceived by Avicenna. But his influence does not stop there. For such is the power of truth that even in a distorted and weakened form, it passes on to other minds who complete it, purify it and set it free; and so Avicenna, by his influence on scholastic thought, the impetus he imparted to it and the limitations he imposed on it, is the indirect author of certain

trends whose repercussions are still discernible in Canada.

[57] In commemorating the anniversary of Avicenna, Canada wishes to pay tribute above all to his pursuit of truth as a means of enriching the lives of peoples and drawing them closer together. The teachings of Avicenna contain a special message for all who have Unesco's mission at heart. For 900 years, he has served as a proof that truth knows no frontiers and that the progress of ideas depends on an intellectual exchange that close collaboration between all peoples alone makes possible.

Tribute to J. S. Bach prepared by M. Jacques de Tonnancour, of the Canadian delegation

(Translation from the French)

[58] Before paying verbal tribute to Bach on behalf of the Canadian delegation, I should like to mention the musical tribute that has been paid to him by my country in the course of the present year. From January to April, Radio Canada broadcast over its national network a series of Bach concerts, comprising 13 performances of his chamber music and 13 of his organ music, as well as the Saint Matthew Passion and the Mass in B minor. Radio Canada also broadcast from its local stations a great number of other concerts dedicated to the memory of Bach. Philharmonic societies, chamber music societies and other musical associations commemorated Bach's bicentenary in such a way that the master's genius was brought home to everyone in my country.

[59] This bicentenary, which is being commemorated this year in all countries, gives us food for thought on the fallibility of man's judgment of the arts. Bach is in fact a relatively modern discovery, and I should like to consider him in connexion wth a sudden and widespread phenomenon that occurred quite recently: the revival and appreciation of the world's heritage of ancient arts. In their earlier days, these arts knew many vicissitudes—periods of renown and periods of eclipse—but never before were they so widely appreciated as they are now, in our time. We are astonished to note to what a degree earlier generations—which for centuries past have argued with considerable accuracy and profundity about art and beauty—failed to realize how many different forms might be taken by that same beauty, which each civilization interpreted in its own way, so that each could seldom or never appreciate the interpretations of the other. Moreover, generally speaking, it is only since the beginning of the present century that people's notion of beauty has been sufficiently generous and all-embracing to include sculptures from the Pacific Islands and the works of Praxiteles, Angelico and Picasso, the Brandenburg concertos and the "Sacre du Printemps". Now that we are able to take a long-range view of the past, the particular differences between the works of art produced by one period and another, or one part of the world and another, tend to be less striking, on account of their number. We are apt to see primarily the affinities between those works; we seek some relationship between them; we regard them as having their source in the same desire and the same fundamental aspirations, as being conceived in similar psychological conditions and subject to rules which are more or less always and everywhere the same. It was archaeology, or one of its branches, which first rescued those works from oblivion, towards the middle of the nineteenth century; but it remained for modern art to recognize them as living things and lay claim to that multiform treasure in order to give it new life—in the words of André Malraux, to "welcome, order and metamorphose" it. Although Bach was regarded by a small number of his contemporaries as the supreme master, after his death his art suffered an eclipse which lasted until the middle of the nineteenth century, when musicians reawakened to the value of his works. It was not until the twentieth century, however, that men realized not only their value but also how perfectly they accord with our modern trends.

[60] Can this be due to pure chance? Is the concurrence of this revival of Bach and the birth of our modern movement no more than a coincidence? Let us compare the case of Bach with what I was saying just now, and we shall see that his revival is not an isolated fact. In the past, many more works of art were produced in the field of the visual arts than in that of music, and it is here that the phenomenon strikes us forcibly, through the amazing number of works recovered and preserved—firstly by the archaeologists, on account of their historical interest, and later to fulfil their original function of exerting a direct influence on human emotions throughout the ages. Now, Bach and his predecessors were rediscovered and hailed with enthusiasm at about the same period, that is since the rediscovery of the architectural principle in art—a vital principle that is common to all these works which we have "recreated".

[61] The modern return to form thus marked the end of Romanticism and brought to us a love and understanding of true classicism. And what have we ourselves in common with these forms of art? I should say that we have a certain attitude towards creative art and the conditions in which it can and should be produced. This immediately

raises the age-old question of substance and form. In my opinion, it is the shifting of the focus of the artist's attention, in creating his work, from form, *as in the rediscovered periods that I mentioned earlier,* to substance, *as in the more sentimental periods, which distinguishes truly classical and humanly balanced art from all other kinds of art. Moreover, by truly classical art I mean art which succeeds in combining all human qualities, from the sexual to the spiritual. For, as soon as an art is concerned with the senses alone, it is no longer classical; it already contains the germs of decadence. It the attention of the true artist, who has fully grasped the fundamental ideas of art and life, is concentrated on form, that is to say on the abstract relations of correctly proportioned depths, strength and endurance, and if he has the necessary means to carry out his work, the latter will become permeated with the very substance of his being. It will then be, for us, the most enduring musical, pictorial or other expression of that substance, which must always be an implication of the form, if both are to constitute a poetic whole. For that substance is of a subconscious nature; it can only pass into the work, dilating and inspiring it, if it is left entirely free. It then transcends the form and makes it as boundless as life itself.*

[*62*] *It is not true that the artist seeks beauty as his immediate aim. The Romanticists sought beauty in this way and, when they did so, beauty always eluded them. Rodin, who was less of a Romanticist than is generally believed, well understood that fact: "I am not a dreamer, but a mathematician, and my sculpture is good because it is geometrical." He also said: "Beauty is not a starting point but a finishing point." The impact of a work on the spectator, reader or listener, is through the radiations of its form, that is to say through the substance that informs it. He may, then, easily be mistaken and think that the artist, in creating that work, was moved by the same feelings as himself. But the artist's mission is not to assemble familiar and accepted sentiments, for which he has merely to provide an outward symbol. I do not think that I am profaning the deeply religious work of Bach or Giotto or of the Romanesque fresco painters by seriously doubting that their thoughts, when some work was taking shape under their hands, were specifically religious. When a conscious effort was made to create religious art, it was too late; the result was like colour-prints. And this was because the artists had lost all religiousness. Had they retained a deep feeling for religion, they would not have been obliged to direct to it their conscious thoughts.*

[*63*] *Bach, who liked to consider himself as a mere artisan, tells us that we must not consciously seek after noble feelings. The possessor of such feelings has no need to seek them: Bach was actuated above all by a "will to create", as Valéry has pointed out, and it is to this will to create that we owe his art. Bach tackled his works by way of the "façade", to borrow an architectural term, confident that if he produced a balanced and coherent elevation the rest would fall into place automatically, according to the principle inherent in the design; and in so doing he produced a concentrated expression of his on personality.*

THIRTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 16 June 1950 at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XXVI.	Consideration and adoption of the Reports of the Commissions and Committees:	
	A. Official and External Relations Commission	205
	B. Budget Committee	210
	C. Procedure Committee	213

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before going on with the agenda, I call on Professor Calò, of the Italian delegation, who wishes to express his thanks to the meeting for the collection announced yesterday by Dr. Walker. I call on Professor Calò.

[2] Professor Giovanni CALO (Italy) — [*Translation from the French*] I speak in the name of the Tina Lorenzoni College of Girl War Cripples at Pozzolatico, near Florence, named after the heroine of the Italian Resistance, of which I have the honour to be President, in the name of the similar institute for child victims of the war at Galluzzo, and in the name of the Italian National Organization for War Cripples, which founded and administers these two institutions and a number of others like them. As their spokesman, it is my duty—which I count an honour—to express the profoundest gratitude for the effort made on their behalf, of whose remarkable success Dr. Walker spoke to us yesterday, in his report, in terms so warm and cordial. The sense of solidarity which inspired an act as noble as it is moving and which couples sympathy for the city of Florence with generous solicitude for the many innocent victims of the war, cannot fail to awake a deep response in the hearts of the Italian people. It will never be forgotten. Over the ruins and the scars which the war has brought on the bodies and the souls of so many countries there spreads a healing and revivifying balm from these proofs of human sympathy and love, which—we must always hope—prevail over the causes of hatred and death. The feelings I have expressed are shared by the whole Italian delegation, in whose name I also speak. To the originators of this generous gesture, to all who have contributed to its success and above all, to the ladies whose assistance has been so enthusiastic and effective, we once more offer our thanks from the bottom of our hearts.

XXVI. Consideration and adoption of the Reports of the Commissions and Committees.

[3] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, we shall now go on to the most important part of our work, namely, consideration of the reports of the Commissions. They have all been the subject of keen debate, and so we have to avoid two dangers—I think equally serious. Firstly, we must not begin the discussion all over again, which would amount to rendering the work of the Commissions negative and would also keep us here for hours. The other danger is the converse of the first and is by no means negligible: it consists in the plenary Conference becoming a sort of commission with the task of ratifying and recording decisions, without discussion; frankly, that is too humble a task for a sovereign assembly such as this. I therefore venture to suggest a composite procedure, which the General Committee has just approved and which seems to me to meet the case. The general lines of it are as follows: Rapporteurs to be both entitled and required to address the plenary Conference freely and without time-limit; delegates in favour of the Rapporteurs' conclusions to be requested not to ask for the floor since their views will have been embodied in those of the Rapporteurs. Delegates against the Rapporteurs' conclusions or wishing to present amendments to be entitled to express their views and submit their amendments subject to a time-limit—I suggest five minutes; one can say much in that time. Thereafter the Rapporteur would reply and the vote be taken without further discussion. What I have outlined is of course only applicable in cases

where the Rapporteurs have definite conclusions to submit. Where Commissions have reached no definite conclusion or have left questions open, it follows naturally that the matters in question remain open for free discussion by the meeting, though subject to the time restrictions I have outlined, i.e., no time-limit for Rapporteurs and a time-limit of five minutes for other speakers. If you agree, we shall conduct our proceedings along these lines. Are there any remarks on this point? There being no remarks, the procedure is *adopted*.

[4] We now come to the report of the Official and External Relations Commission. I call on the Rapporteur, Professor Alf Sommerfelt.

A. Report of the Official and External Relations Commission.

[5] Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway), Rapporteur of the Official and External Relations Commission — Mr. President, fellow delegates, I have the honour to present to you the Report of the work done by the Official and External Relations Commission (document 5C/OXR/23 and corrigendum). This is a very extensive report. The Commission has had a very heavy task and I beg your permission not to read these 40 pages entirely, but only to insist upon the main points. I would therefore at once draw your attention to the organization of the work. You will see how the Commission was composed, on the first page; and on the second page you will see that it was necessary to constitute two sub-committees, and you will also see the compliment paid to the excellent work done by the Secretariat, which has collected exceedingly useful information, and to the Executive Board and its External Relations Committee. Then, I draw your attention to how the agenda was dealt with, and on page 3 you will find the recommendations of the Commission.

[6] I should say here, that we had prolonged discussions on several points, especially on the relations between Unesco and the non-governmental organizations. These discussions were carried out in the sub-committees, but also in the full Commission, and I should like to pay a tribute to the excellent spirit of co-operation which was shown there. There were, as you will see later, divided opinions, but we were all able to work very happily together. As regards the recommendations on page 3, you will see the first item: "Consideration of the recommendations submitted to the General Conference by the Representatives of the National Commissions at their Second Session." You will see that the Commission examined the recommendations submitted by the representatives of the National Commissions and certain of these recommendations were, prior to their approval by the Commission, referred to the Budget Committee of the Conference for consideration of possible budgetary implications. The Budget Committee reported that all the recommendations referred to it could be adequately executed within the framework of the 1951 budget proposals, with the exception of the following:

To send, at the request of a Member State, a member of the Secretariat to serve, in a temporary capacity, on the staff of the National Commission of that State to assist in the development of its work.

The Commission decided to change this and you will find the change in paragraph 4 (*a*) of resolution C on page 6.

To send, at the request of a Member State and at its expense, a member of the Secretariat to serve in a temporary capacity on the staff of the National Commission of that State, to assist in the development of its work;

That was the important point—it will be at the expense of the Member State. Then follow the resolutions which you will see on pages 3 and 5. On page 5 I draw your attention to the correction in paragraph 5, second line; "full reports" must be corrected to "information". The resolutions follow on page 6 up to the top of page 7.

[7] Then we come to the future policy with regard to annual reports by Member States. You will see there a report about Member States which had sent in reports, and the recommendations and the resolution proposed to the General Conference by the Commission at the bottom of page 7 and on pages 8 and 9. On page 9 I draw your attention to paragraph III, line 6: the sentence "They shall be issued in one volume. . ." is to read: "They shall, if possible, be issued in one volume. . ." Then I draw your attention to Annex I of this report, which contains a list of recommendations elaborated for the guidance of the Director-General, and to which reference is made in paragraph II.

[8] Then we come to the United Nations and to "Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the programmes and budgets of the Specialized Agencies." You will see that this question was referred to the Programme and Budget Commission and to the Administrative Commission, prior to its consideration by the Official and External Relations Commission. The Programme and Budget Commission recommended unanimously the adoption of the resolutions set out below. The Administration Commission saw no objection to the adoption of this same resolution

but had several observations on certain administrative questions; these comments will be found in the report of the Administrative Commission, document 5C/ADM/25. Then follow the resolutions.

[9] On page 10 we come to: "Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on educational problems in the non-self-governing territories." You will see that this question too, was referred to the Programme and Budget Commission for consideration at the time of the study of the education programme, and the report is found in the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission, document 5C/PRG/19.

[10] Next we have: "Collaboration with the Trusteeship Council", and you see the resolution which the Commission recommends to you at the bottom of page 10 and on the first half of page 11.

[11] Following that there is: "Relations with international inter-governmental organizations." We have, firstly, the relations with the International Bureau of Education. The Commission considered this question in great detail. It expressed the wish to see collaboration with IBE continue, in view of the valuable collaboration with that organization. But it considered that the agreement itself should be reviewed and brought up to date. Then the resolution follows, which you will find at the bottom of page 11 and at the top of page 12. After that we have: "Consideration of the Agreement between the International Committee of Weights and Measures and Unesco", and you see the solution proposed there. Thereafter follows the report on the negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement with the Organization of American States, and the Commission recommends that the Conference take note of the Report of the Director-General.

[12] Now we come to the topic which called for the most elaborate discussions—relations with international non-governmental organizations. We have first the report by the Executive Board of the experience acquired by Unesco in the matter of relations with international non-governmental organizations under the directives at present in force, and consideration of the Board's proposals regarding future policy in this field. As I said, this item was considered in great detail by the Sub-Committee; therefore it was for the Commission to consider questions concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations. The Sub-Committee recommended substantial changes to the existing directives. The Commission itself also studied these questions very extensively and made further modifications, and you will find the modified directives attached as Annex II to this report. Note should be taken by the General Conference that the Commission recommends the inclusion of regulations concerning formal agreements with certain non-governmental organizations, contrary to the original proposal of the Executive Board. I draw your attention to the fact that opinions on this subject were divided in the Commission. The majority was in favour of Unesco's recognizing special interests in a certain international non-governmental organization of a federative and world-wide character. It was their opinion that this special interest should be indicated by formal agreements which would put these organizations in a separate class. The minority considered that all non-governmental organizations should be on the same level, particularly as the granting of subventions, the according of office space, etc., were no longer linked with the conclusion of a formal agreement. A draft resolution is proposed by the Commission to the General Conference. You will see the first two paragraphs of that resolution on page 13. The commentary following these two paragraphs is to be altered and you will find the new text in document 5C/OXR/23, corrigendum to page 13. There is the new text and I will read it to you:

It was the opinion of the Commission that the Executive Board, when granting subventions for which applications are already pending with the Executive Board, should take action on the basis of the criteria set forth in the Directives adopted by the Third Session of the General Conference.

You see, these new Directives will not be applied to the *pending* applications, but only to the new ones. The Commission, while considering the general question of relations with international non-governmental organizations, recommended to the General Conference the adoption of the resolution which you will find on page 14.

[13] Then we have item 7.2: "Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board regarding the first general review of the list of international non-governmental organizations with which Unesco has made consultative arrangements." You will see here that the Commission has different recommendations to make. Firstly, it recommends that some organizations be taken off the list of organizations enjoying consultative arrangements. The reasons for these proposals are varied: in some cases the organization in question has shown no interest in Unesco or does not seem to be inclined to co-operate with Unesco. In other cases, organizations have become parts of larger, federative organizations and it is therefore proposed that it is more logical that only the federative, the broader organization should enjoy consultative status. In some cases you will see, for instance on page 15, that some are proposed to remain

provisionally on the list of those who enjoy consultative status. And then, in view of the fact that certain applications for consultative arrangements are pending at the present time, the Commission recommends also that the Executive Board be authorized to consider applications which were submitted to the Organization prior to the opening of the present session of the General Conference. Therefore, a proposed draft resolution is submitted to the General Conference, and you will find this draft resolution at the bottom of page 15 and the top of page 16. There I draw your attention to a correction which is to be inserted into line 2 from the top. Instead of: "within the framework of the previous Directives", the text is to read "within the framework of the Directives adopted by the Fifth Session of the General Conference, . . ." etc.

[14] Then we come to item 7.3: "Consideration of the formal agreements concluded with certain international non-governmental organizations." Underneath you will find the list of those who now enjoy these formal agreements. The Commission decided, contrary to the proposals of the Executive Board, to propose that formal agreements be maintained with a certain number of international non-governmental organizations and, in the light of this recommendation, a draft resolution is submitted for consideration by the General Conference. You will see this resolution at the bottom of page 16; and on page 17 you will see continued comments by the Commission — how the Commission considered in detail information about the seven organizations in question, and how it proposes to maintain formal agreements with these seven international non-governmental organizations.

[15] Then we come to item 7.4: "Report by the Director-General on contracts concluded with international non-governmental organizations and on grants-in-aid made since the Fourth Session of the General Conference." The Commission there recommends that the Conference take note of the report by the Director-General, and the same action is proposed for the report of the Executive Board on the employment of the sums paid to international non-governmental organizations under grants-in-aid or contracts.

[16] Then we have item 7.6: "Co-operation with the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER), and you will there see at the bottom of page 17 the proposed resolution.

[17] On page 18 we have Legal Questions. Firstly, 8.1: "Draft Regulations concerning the approval by the General Conference of recommendations to Member States and International Conventions." You will see how this question was considered in a preliminary manner by the Commission, and the Commission decided to refer the question to the Procedure Committee, but wished to go on record as not being in favour of the establishment of a Legal Committee, as was proposed in the document before the Commission. You will find this matter dealt with in the report of the Procedure Committee.

[18] Then we have 8.2: "Consideration of Cultural Agreements and Conventions at present in force and proposals likely to facilitate the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral cultural conventions." This question was referred to the Budget Committee in order to determine whether the additional work to be undertaken by the Secretariat would involve increased expenditure within the year 1951. It was the opinion of the Budget Committee that the present staff of the Legal Service could handle the activities currently anticipated. And, in consequence, the Commission recommends the resolution which you will find at the bottom of page 18 and on page 19.

[19] Then we have 8.3: "Agreement with the French Government on the privileges and *immunities* (not *amenities*), but immunities granted to Unesco." You see that we propose to take note of the report of the Director-General on this question.

[20] Then we have the activities of Unesco in Germany and Japan. You know that that was discussed by the two Commissions together—the Programme and Budget Commission and this one —and the results will appear in another report.

[21] Then follows "Other Business": item 10.1: "Consideration of the draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation concerning the Junior Red Cross." The Commission, although recognizing unanimously the great value of the work accomplished by the Junior Red Cross, felt that the adoption of the proposed resolution would create a precedent leading to presentation in the future of similar proposals in support of other organizations which enjoy consultative status, particularly in the field of youth activities, and which contribute in some way to the achievement of Unesco's objectives. The Commission recommends, therefore, and I may say it was to the regret of the members, that no resolution be adopted on this question. Then follow the annexes, and I hope that it will not be necessary for me to go into the details here.

[22] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] I offer my warmest congratulations to Professor Sommerfelt on the extremely important work accomplished by his Commission. We now have to consider its findings. If no one indicates a wish to speak, I shall take a vote on each section

separately. It will of course still be open to anybody to comment on each section before it is voted on.

[23] Page 3 of the Report: "Consideration of the recommendations submitted to the General Conference by the representatives of the National Commissions at their second session (meeting of 18-20 May 1950) [document 5C/OXR/2]. There are three resolutions on pages 4, 5 and 6 and at the top of page 7. I shall now put this section to the vote. If there are no comments I shall deem the section to be adopted. *Adopted.*

[24] We now go on to page 7: 4.2: "Future policy with regard to annual reports by Member States" [document 5C/OR/3] The resolutions in this connexion will be found on pages 7, 8 and 9 (English text). If there are no remarks, I shall deem them to be adopted. *Adopted.*

[25] Page 9: "Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the programmes and budgets of the Specialized Agencies" [document 5C/OXR/4]. I call on Dr. Walker, Head of the Australian delegation.

[26] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, I take it that we are now discussing what appears in the English text on page 9 under No. 5. We are presented with a resolution for the Conference to adopt in the light of the resolutions referred to us by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the programmes and budgets of the Specialized Agencies. The Australian delegation finds it impossible to vote on this resolution at this stage because the resolution in certain paragraphs states that we have done certain things that we have not yet done. If you turn to page 10 of the English text, the first two paragraphs certainly are true; we have noted these resolutions relating to the problem of the proliferation and overlapping of the programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, and the questions of the budgets of the Specialized Agencies, and we have received a report from the Executive Board, which examines this matter in some detail, with special reference to Unesco. But I do not think we can go on to say that we have in the budgetary field taken certain decisions which appear to the Conference to meet adequately the General Assembly's concern expressed in resolution 311 (IV). I say we have not, because I believe the Budget Commission at this moment is discussing the terms of the appropriation resolution and I do not know just what form that resolution will take when it is proposed to this Conference. The United Nations' resolution among other things proposed that Specialized Agencies should restrict their expenditure to revenue that can reasonably be expected in connexion with the year in question, and asked or recommended that expenditure be reviewed throughout the year. For my part, I have had to refer to that view, which is still the view of the Australian delegation, which accepted this view at the United Nations and follows the same policy at Unesco as it does at the United Nations. For those reasons I would ask, either that this resolution be not voted on until we have had an opportunity of examining the text of the appropriation resolution, or failing that, if it were felt essential to vote on this resolution at this stage, I would have to ask for it to be voted on in parts and a separate vote taken on the paragraph to which I have referred, because we should be obliged to vote against the inclusion in the resolution of a paragraph which does not, in fact, in our opinion, reflect the true state of affairs. We do not feel at the present time we can say that the Conference has taken decisions in the budgetary field that, in the opinion of the Australian delegation, adequately meet the General Assembly's concern expressed in this resolution 311 (IV). I think I would prefer that the vote on this resolution as a whole, be held over until this body has received and considered the terms of our appropriation resolution.

[27] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the Rapporteur.

[28] Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway) (Rapporteur) — There is no objection to the proposed course of action.

[29] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The suggestion by the Australian delegate that voting on this section be postponed until the details of the appropriation resolution are known is accepted by the Rapporteur. Am I to take it that the Conference adopts this motion? *Adopted.*

[30] In the following section we come first to a resolution on page 10: 5.3: "Collaboration with the Trusteeship Council" [document 5C/OXR/6]. Are there any remarks? None? The section is *adopted.*

[31] Item 6, page 11: "International Inter-Governmental Organizations: "Consideration of the Provisional Agreement between Unesco and the International Bureau of Education" [document 5C/OXR/7]. Has anybody anything to say on this point? No one? *Adopted.*

[32] Page 12, 6.2: "Consideration of the Agreement between the International Committee of Weights and Measures and Unesco" [document 5C/OXR/8]. No remarks? *Adopted.*

[33] Page 12, 6.3: "Report on the result of the

negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement with the Organization of American States" [document 5C/OXR/11). (This has only to be noted). No remarks? *Adopted.*

[34] Same page, 7: International Non-Governmental Organizations. 7.1: "Report by the Executive Board on the experience acquired by Unesco in the matter of relations with international non-governmental organizations under Directives at present in force, and consideration of the Board's proposals regarding future policy in this field" [document 5C/OXR/10]. There are a number of corrections here which are given in document 5C/OXR/23, Corrigendum. I call on the representative of the United States of America.

[35] Mr. Otis MULLIKEN (United States of America) — Mr. President, I simply want to report that the delegation of the United States wishes to vote against the resolution contained on page 13, approving the Directives.

[36] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] We have before us a suggested form of words by the Rapporteur, which you will find on page 13 of the English text (page 14 of the French text) and which reads:

The General Conference, . . .

Approves the Directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations as set forth in Annex II of this document . . .

The American delegation has announced its opposition to this paragraph and the Rapporteur declines to yield. I shall accordingly take a vote on the Rapporteur's conclusions. Those who agree with the views expressed by the United States delegation will vote against the Rapporteur's conclusions.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The proposal is *adopted* by 29 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

[37] We now come to the resolution on the next page. After considering the question of relations with international non-governmental organizations, the Commission recommended the adoption of a resolution which you will find at the top of page 14 in the English text (foot of page 14 and top of page 15, French text). Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[38] Page 14, 7.2: "Consideration of the recommendations of the Executive Board regarding the first general review of the list of international non-governmental organizations with which Unesco has made consultative arrangements" [document 5C/OXR/9]. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[39] Page 16, 7.3: "Consideration of the formal agreements concluded with certain international non governmental organizations" [document 5C/OXR/12]. (These organizations are listed on page 16, the resolution beginning on the same page). Any remarks? I call on the representative of the United States of America.

[40] Mr. Otis MULLIKEN (United States of America) — Mr. President, the United States delegation has insistently, and I might almost say persistently, opposed the continuation of formal agreements. The United States delegation will therefore vote against the resolution at the bottom of page 16 of the English text and opposes the continuation of formal agreements with the seven organizations listed.

[41] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] I call on the delegate of Switzerland.

[42] Mr. Alexandre de MURALT (Switzerland) — Mr. President, in order not to create a false impression I would like to say on behalf of the majority of the Commission that formal agreements were considered to be most important for the maintenance of good relations with the international non-governmental organizations and that we are all very warm for maintaining these formal agreements, and I would like to ask you to vote for the proposal as it is before you.

[43] Mr. C. E. FLETCHER (Australia) — Mr. President, the Australian delegation finds itself conforming to the view expressed by the United States delegation and will vote against this proposal.

[44] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before I call on any others who may wish to speak, I must point out that the two last speeches we have heard did not comply with the procedure we have adopted. I shall therefore be extremely strict about its observance from now on. Under the procedure there should be one speech only against a motion, to which the Rapporteur replies; as it is, one of the two previous speeches was in favour of the motion and one against and they amounted to no more than speeches in support of previous speakers. I shall now ask you to vote on the Rapporteur's conclusions.

Adopted by 33 votes to 4.

[45] Will you now turn to page 17. Here there is no vote to be taken and we have merely to take cognizance of the reports mentioned in 7.4 and 7.5 [documents 5C/OXR/13 and 5C/OXR/14]. I shall therefore call for no vote.

[46] We will go on to item 7.6: "Co-operation with the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER)" [document 5C/OXR/15]. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[47] Page 18, 8.2: "Consideration of cultural agreements and conventions at present in force and proposals likely to facilitate the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral cultural conventions" [document 5C/OXR/17]. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[48] Page 19, 8.3: "Agreement with the French Government on the privileges and immunities granted to Unesco" [document 5C/OXR/18].

[49] The next item before us is 10.1: "Consideration of the draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation concerning the Junior Red Cross." The Commission has expressed itself against this item. Does any member of the Italian delegation wish to address the meeting? There being no speaker from the Italian delegation, I rule that the report of the Commission is *adopted.*

[50] I shall now ask you to vote on the report as a whole. The report is *adopted* with no dissentients but two abstentions.

[51] The next document before us is the report of the Budget Committee, document 5C/BUD/2 and Corrigendum. I call on Dr. Bender, Chairman of the Committee.

B. Report of the Budget Committee.

[52] Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands), Chairman of the Budget Committee — Mr. President, fellow delegates, I have the honour to submit for your consideration, on behalf of the Budget Committee, the final report, document 5C/BUD/2, Report No. 1. As you will remember, an Interim Report was presented to you on 31 May. This latter report gave the result of a preliminary review of the Budget Estimates for 1951. In addition, you will receive today or tomorrow, through the Programme and Budget Commission, the draft appropriation resolution and appropriation table, from which you will be able to note that, despite certain extra items that had to be added to the budget estimate for 1951—I mention the suggested use of Spanish as a third working language, and increased activity in Germany—it has been possible, by effecting certain economies, to present for your consideration the final budget figure of $8,200,000.

[53] On the report before you, 5C/BUD/2, I do not have to give a lengthy commentary. It gives its conclusions and recommendations based on the experience of the Committee during the present Conference. One of our main problems has been that of timing. This may be clear from the fact that instead of the 14 meetings scheduled, we had to hold 30 meetings, of which eight were night meetings. And at this moment I wish to pay tribute to the members of the Committee, and indeed also to the members of the Secretariat, for the very good and efficient assistance they have so willingly given to the Conference and to myself.

[54] The suggestions for organization and method of work of the Budget Committee and the Sixth Session of the General Conference are briefly the following (you will find them in the paper before you, 5C/BUD/2): In the first place, that the Nominations Committee of the Fifth Session of the General Conference designates, and this General Conference confirms, the appointment of eleven Member States from which delegates would form a Budget Committee to meet during the week preceding the opening of the Sixth Session. That is the first point. Second point: this Committee would make, during that week, a preliminary review of the Budget Estimates for 1952 and draw up a report for the General Conference. Thirdly, in an effort to solve our timing problem in another way, it is suggested that (*a*) the Executive Board and the Director-General submit the draft Programme and Budget Estimates two months prior to the opening date of the Conference. We have been assured by the representatives of the Executive Board and by the representative of the Director-General that this will be possible. A very important further point was the question of the final date at which new resolutions would be submitted. If I tell you that during this Conference more than a hundred new resolutions were submitted and are to be examined by us, you will appreciate that this puts a very heavy strain on the work of the Committee. Therefore we suggest that, in future, new resolutions shall be submitted at least two weeks before the opening of the General Conference.

[55] On page 3 of the Report we deal with the suggested terms of reference of the Budget Committee. We recommend in general that the present terms of reference of the Budget Committee be maintained. A further point I would like to make is this: that our suggestions are intended mainly for the Sixth Session of the General Conference, so that they are not final. As you will read on page 3 at the bottom, there are many important considerations which may affect future methods for conducting the budget review. For instance, the Venezuelan proposal for the establishment of a Supervisory Commission and the United States proposal for biennial conferences may result in major organizational changes which in turn may necessitate changes in the budget review. Therefore our suggestions are for the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[56] In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to move the proposed resolution you will find on

page 4 of the document, which I will read out to you.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

HAVING RECEIVED the Report of the Budget Committee [document 5C/BUD/2] concerning the organization of its work during the Fifth Session of the General Conference, and

HAVING CONSIDERED the recommendations of the Budget Committee proposed for the next session of the General Conference,

RESOLVES that

(1) There shall be established for the Sixth Session of the General Conference a budget Committee consisting of eleven members elected by the Fifth Session of the General Conference on the recommendations of the Nominations Committee. The Budget Committee shall elect its Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. The Chairman of the Executive Board or his designated representative shall take part in the meetings of the Committee without right to vote.

(2) The Budget Committee shall begin its work one week prior to the opening date of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

(3) The Committee shall examine the Budget Estimates presented by the Director-General with a view to determining whether the estimates are reasonable and actual. It shall consider the report and recommendations of the Executive Board; it shall submit as soon as possible after the opening date of the Conference a report making such recommendations as are necessary. The Committee shall examine new proposals, draft resolutions and amendments presented by Member States, having budgetary implications. It shall be consulted by all bodies of the Conference before they make decisions or present resolutions having budgetary implications. The Committee shall submit to the plenary Conference, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Commissions and Committees, the draft appropriation resolutions, the appropriation table for 1952 and the general report on the Budget.

[57] In addition, I have the honour to move the adoption of the following amendments to the Rules of Procedure, which are consequential to the suggested resolution.

SECTION II. (1) Member States shall receive all documentation required for the examination of the points on the agenda at least 25 days before the opening date of the Conference. They shall receive the additional documentation required for the examination of the questions included in the additional agenda at least ten days before the opening date of the Conference.

(2) Member States shall receive the draft programme presented by the Executice Board, and the Budget Estimates, at least two months before the opening date of the Conference.

And finally, Section XIV, Rule 78: I am afraid there was misdrafting in the English revision. I will read it as it should read:

Proposals and Amendments. In draft resolutions, the basic proposals and the amendments calling for substantial modifications in the Programme and Budget Estimates should be submitted, in writing, at least two weeks before the opening date of the Conference.

[58] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] I thank the Chairman of the Budget Committee on behalf of the meeting. In opening the discussion on the report as a whole, I have one preliminary remark to make: you have just heard from Dr. Bender that his Committee asked the Procedure Committee to present certain resolutions. However, the Procedure Committee is no longer competent to do this as it has concluded its work. No further proceedings of the Committee can be valid or receivable until the next session of the Conference. I have accordingly ruled out of order what the representative of Denmark had proposed to say. I call on the delegate of Switzerland.

[59] Professor Jean PIAGET (Switzerland) — [*Translation from the French*] I am sorry, Mr. President, I am not clear whether the report of the Rapporteur of the Budget Committee is to be discussed now or held over until the next Conference?

[60] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] My remarks referred only to the draft resolution by the Budget Committee given on page 4. This can be voted on but cannot become effective at this stage.

[61] Professor Jean PIAGET (Switzerland) — [*Translation from the French*] Then what we are discussing is the suggestion for a Committee of eleven members to sit before the Conference. In that case, I shall ask leave to comment on this proposal for a Budget Committee of eleven members to meet two weeks before the Conference. I am afraid that the work of the whole Conference may be to some extent prejudiced by these prior meetings of a Committee of eleven members. This may be necessary for the smooth progress of the Conference's work; if it is necessary, however, I personally should be against restricting the carrying out of such a preliminary examination to a body only eleven strong. What they do will have a considerable effect on the Conference as a whole and it therefore seems to me antidemocratic that the numbers of those participating should be restricted to eleven. I ask that all members taking part in the Conference be entitled to join in this preliminary examination.

[62] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on Dr. Bender.

[63] Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands), Chairman of the Budget Committee — Mr. President, I would like to reply to the delegate of Switzerland that this Committee will be a small technical Committee that occupies itself only with the preliminary review of the budget estimates. It will not deal with programme matters at all; it is just intended that the work which has to be done very hastily during the Conference should be done at a more leisurely pace, but I do not think, as you fear, that the work of the Conference should be prejudiced by this Committee, considering the kind of Committee we are going to appoint.

[64] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The Conference has heard the comments of the Swiss delegate and the Chairman's reply. I now ask you to vote on the draft resolution given on pages 4 and 5 in the light of the remarks just made. First, however, are there any other comments? I call on the delegate of Brazil.

[65] Professor Paulo de BERREDO CARNEIRO (Brazil) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, the Brazilian delegation has only praise for suggestions 1 and 2. We must, however, make certain reservations regarding the matter of presenting new resolutions two weeks before the opening of the Conference. In our view it is in itself a major alleviation of the Conference's work that the Budget prepared by the Secretariat should be subjected to meticulous examination by a Committee of Experts who will prepare a report on it for the Conference before the latter opens. We think, however, that it would be too great a limitation of the Conference's initiative to require that new suggestions be submitted two weeks before the opening date. In many countries delegations are made up late and, in addition, the Conference itself has a catalytic action. Ideas are conceived; personal contacts make it possible to form a sounder opinion of the desirability or otherwise of proposals which would to some extent be made "blind" if made before such contacts and discussions. I move that, as regards the third proposal, we maintain the *status quo*.

[66] Professor Jean PIAGET (Switzerland) — [*Translation from the French*] I shall vote against this.

[67] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] In that case, if there are no other remarks and unless the Rapporteur will accept Professor Carneiro's view, which seems to me difficult, I shall take a vote on each of the three paragraphs separately.

[68] Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands), Chairman of the Budget Committee — Mr. President, if you allow me, I will make a brief reply to the delegate of Brazil. I appreciate his point. I can understand that after members have arrived at the Conference they would like to discuss certain matters with other delegations and submit resolutions, but in practice it has made our work very heavy and very difficult indeed. If resolutions come in as they have done at the rate of about 100 during the Conference, it is absolutely impossible to keep pace with the Programme and Budget Commission. An alternative would be to suggest that the deadline is placed at the opening date ot the Conference, if that would meet your point. But during the Conference it complicates the work of the Budget Committee to such an extent that I must really advise you to accept my suggestion that at least the new resolutions are in before the Conference starts.

[69] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] What the Rapporteur has said meets the objections of the representative of Brazil. The amendment of the Brazilian delegate, which the Rapporteur accepts, read as follows:

Draft resolutions, proposals affecting principles and amendments involving major alterations in the Programme and Budget estimates shall be submitted in writing by the opening day of the Conference at the latest.

I therefore ask you to vote on the amendment proposed, and accepted by the Rapporteur. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[70] I shall now call for a vote on the other two paragraphs. If there are no comments, I shall take them to be *adopted.*

[71] We now have to vote on the first and second clauses of the resolution on page 4 of document 5C/BUD/2, reading as follows:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE, . . .

RESOLVES that:

1. There shall be established for the Sixth Session of the General Conference, a Budget Committee consisting of eleven members elected by the Fifth Session of the General Conference, on the recommendations of the Nominations Committee. The Budget Committee shall elect its Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. The Chairman of the Executive Board or his designated representative shall take part in the meetings of the Committee without right to vote.

I shall ask you to vote on this first paragraph. *Adopted* by 33 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

[72] Paragraph 2 reads:

The Budget Committee shall begin its work one

week prior to the opening date of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

Any objections? *Adopted.*

[73] Paragraph 3: Terms of reference of the Committee. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[74] Same document, page 5. Despatch of working papers, draft programme and budget estimates, paragraphs 1 and 2. Any objections? *Adopted.*

[75] The last paragraph has already been passed in amended form. We still have to vote on one item in the general agenda of the Conference, namely, item 17, "Establishment of a Committee for the preliminary examination of the 1952 Budget Estimates". The Nominations Committee is to meet tomorrow morning to make proposals to the plenary meeting of the General Conference at 9.30 a.m. or to that to be held to morrow afternoon. We have now finished the agenda for this morning. The afternoon plenary meeting will not take place until 5 p.m., as the Programme Commission is sitting at 4 o'clock and the Executive Board at 3. If this meeting is agreeable, we can now begin consideration of the report of the Procedure Committee. I call on the Rapporteur of the Procedure Committee, M. Thedin (Sweden).

C. Report of the Procedure Committee.

[76] Mr. Nils THEDIN (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Procedure Committee — Mr. President, I have the honour to present the second report of the Procedure Committee (document 5C/PRO/8, II and Addendum). In view of the limited time at our disposal I do not intend to read the whole of the report, but I will try to make it as plain as possible. The first point in this second report concerns the revision of the rules regarding the form of the credentials of delegates. The Procedure Committee submits to the General Conference a draft resolution which you will find on page 2.

[77] The Committee has further examined the motion of the Mexican delegation for the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the General Conference. The Committee had a lengthy discussion on this question. It took note that the Third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations decided to include Spanish as one of its working languages, and that the Food and Agriculture Organization also has decided to adopt Spanish as a working language. The report further states:

Having regard to the fact that fourteen of the Member States which ratified the Convention founding Unesco are of Spanish speech, that Spanish is spoken by nearly 150,000,000 human beings, whom it is highly desirable to keep informed of Unesco's work, the Procedure Committee decided by a majority vote to adopt the proposal of the Mexican delegation, despite much hesitation on account of the serious technical and budgetary implications of the proposal.

The draft resolution to this effect is to be found on page 3 of the report.

[78] The Procedure Committee has also adopted a number of formal amendments to the Rules of Procedure, embodied in the draft resolutions which you will find on pages 4 to 6 of this report.

[79] The Procedure Committee has also considered a certain number of questions referred to it by the Committees and Commissions of the Conference. These questions included the following:

(*a*) The draft regulations concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions;

(*b*) The draft resolution concerning the admission of Associate Members to Unesco, presented by the United Kingdom delegation; and

(*c*) The draft resolution recommending the holding of biennial sessions of the General Conference, presented by the United States delegation.

[80] At its Second Session the General Conference decided on an examination of the procedure to be followed in the exercice of the functions conferred on it by Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution for the establishment of international regulations in matters of education, science and culture. The first text was submitted to the Third Session of the General Conference, but too late to be adopted at that session. Later, a number of Member States sent in observations on this project, so that the Committee had to re-examine a preliminary report at the Fourth Session of the General Conference. As a result of this report, the General Conference adopted the resolution defining the general outlines of draft regulations to be submitted for its approval at the Fifth Session. The Procedure Committee took note of the draft regulations submitted to it and after a number of general remarks, referred then for consideration to a sub-committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Pilotti of Italy. The Sub-Committee presented, along with a text revised in accordance with the Committee's instructions, a report containing the following conclusions which I am going to read:

In submitting this text to the Procedure Committee, the Sub-Committee has thought it advisable to present the following observations:

(1) The procedure to be followed for the framing and adoption of recommendations to Member States and of international conventions can only be finally

established in the light of experience and by taking into account the frequency with which the General Conference will have recourse to the powers to make regulations vested in it under Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution;

(2) Hitherto the General Conference has seldom had occasion to frame and adopt international conventions and recommendations for the regulation of any question on an international basis;

(3) The Sub-Committee considers that in the circumstances the proposed regulations should be adopted on a provisional basis and that it may be desirable to revise them at subsequent sessions in the light of comments to be addressed by Member States to the Director-General, on the basis of the experience acquired and the practice developed, and having regard to the use that the General Conference will have made or may have decided to make of recommendations and conventions in the pursuit of the Organization's aims; and

(4) The Sub-Committee considers that, in the event of the adoption of the draft regulations submitted, they should govern not only all proposals for the international regulation of any particular question to be presented to subsequent sessions of the Conference, but also any draft recommendations or conventions that the General Conference may have already decided to frame, in so far as the provisions of the the draft may subsequently become applicable thereto.

[81] This report was adopted by the Procedure Committee. The Procedure Committee therefore recommends the General Conference to adopt the draft regulations set out in the Annex to the present report—that is to say, document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum and Corrigendum, and for this purpose submits the draft resolution to the General Conference, which you will find on page 8.

[82] As the request of the United Kingdom delegation a new item was placed on the agenda during the present session, dealing with the question of the admission of Associate Members to Unesco. The Procedure Committee has adopted a draft resolution which it submits to the General Conference. You will find it on pages 8 and 9. Under this resolution the General Conference instructs the Director-General to invite Member States responsible, in one form or another, for the development and conduct of the affairs of certain states or territories, to indicate in their annual report the points on which they have achieved co-operation by such states or territories in the work of Unesco; to invite the same Member States, after consulting the states or territories concerned, to send him any suggestions on the forms which such co-operation might take, including those which might involve amendment of the Constitution; and to communicate to all Member States the results of this enquiry by a date which will enable the Sixth Session of the General Conference of Unesco to discuss any amendment that may have been proposed in this respect.

[83] Finally, the United States delegation has presented a draft resolution for converting the General Conference's sessions into biennial sessions. The Procedure Committee submits to this effect a draft resolution to the General Conference, and I will read the three main points of this resolution, which you will find on pages 9 and 10 of this report, that is to say:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE, . . .

BEING OF THE OPINION that the adoption of this proposal would bring about a desirable change in the schedule of the General Conference, and noting also that important consequential modifications might be required in the structure and operation of the Organization . . .

REQUESTS the Director-General to undertake a detailed study of the question and, if necessary, to prepare in the light of suggestions received from Member States, the text of one or more draft amendments to the Constitution . . .

REQUESTS the Director-General to work out, in consultation with the Executive Board, for submission to the General Conference of 1951, a draft resolution making provision for the possibility of one or more meetings of representatives of National Commissions, preferably for the year in which the Conference will not be held, and independently of the possibility of extraordinary sessions of the General Conference, or of special conferences as foreseen in Article IV, paragraph 3, of the Constitution.

[84] Finally, I have the addendum, which I must read, as there are unfortunately mistakes in the English text:

The Committee has further asked the Director-General to prepare, and submit to the Fifth Session of the General Conference, the final draft of the necessary amendment to the Rules of Procedure in order to embody in these Rules provisions for (1) time-limits for the presentation of documents before the opening of the session of the General Conference as well as for the presentation of draft resolutions or proposals calling for substantial alterations in the programme and the budget; (2) rules for the validity of written ballot papers in the case of election of more than one person.

[85] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I thank the Rapporteur for his presentation of the second report of the Procedure Committee. Items I and II have already been adopted in plenary meeting. We shall accordingly begin with item III. The subject for discussion is the report just submitted to you. Any remarks? I shall take a vote on item III [document 5C/PRO/8 (II), page 2 of the English text], which is a draft amendment to Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the General conference. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[86] Page 2, item, IV, "motion of the Mexican delegation for the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the General Conference". The Swedish delegation has asked to speak on this item and has tabled a motion. I call on the representative of Sweden to state the case for his motion.

[87] Mr. Ingemar DÜRING (Sweden) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, gentlemen, in addressing you on this subject I approach it with no lack of sympathy either in my official capacity or personally—if I may be forgiven for introducing a personal note into the brief remarks I have to make on this important subject. Of this last, my love for the tongue of Cervantes, of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and the "Divine Gabriela" is proof enough. As the representative of a group of Member States of Unesco which can never aspire to have their languages used officially at international congresses, I think I can view the present problem impartially and, so to speak, from the outside. As the spokesman of the Scandinavian group, let me say at once that the arguments of the Mexican delegation must be deemed strong, logical and convincing, but that the other arguments advanced in rebuttal are no less so. The numerical importance of the Hispanic nations and the glory of their cultural traditions, can hardly be exaggerated. There are, however, certain observations to be made.

[88] The first is that statistics of this kind are often somewhat misleading. However great the thought, effort and care brought by Unesco to the production of its various publications, only an infinitesimal percentage of the 150,000,000 Spanish-speaking people is ever likely to profit directly by them—as is more or less true of all the other linguistic groups.

[89] Another objection which leaps to the eye of the impartial observer is the fact that advantages and favours of considerable importance have already been conceded to Spanish-speaking Member States. Alike in the plenary meetings of the General Conference and in the major commissions, Spanish-speaking delegates can already make free use of their own mother tongue, while a considerable number of publications and working documents already appear in a Spanish version. My delegation is in favour of a considerable increase in the number of Spanish translations of publications of general interest, designed for the man in the street. From the practical point of view, what I have outlined should be sufficient in itself, as we are fully entitled to assume that any delegate to Unesco will be of such an educational level as to be able to read documents in French or English. In the smaller commissions, sub-commissions and the like, simultaneous interpretation cannot, for technical reasons, be utilized. Any alternative method will result in a waste of time which it is our duty to avoid. The less formal negotiations which go on in the smaller commissions are of primary importance and, in view of the possible introduction of new forms of work, it would be regrettable if discussions of this kind between delegates were to be made more difficult than necessary.

[90] Furthermore, the arguments of the Secretariat against the admission of Spanish as a working language on the same terms as English and French are of the greatest weight. The first of them, in particular, merits special attention, and the minutes of the Eighteenth Session of the Executive Board, during the preparatory work for the present Conference, give an idea of the difficulties which may arise when it is sought to achieve an exact translation from one language to another. Obviously those difficulties would increase considerably if it were necessary to remodel the text of every document yet again to conform in idiom and argument with the Hispanic way of thinking. Arguments 2 and 3 are just as weighty. There is not the slightest doubt that this unnecessary lengthening of its proceedings would slow down the actual Conference, while Unesco in general and the central administration in particular would be saddled with yet another task, to the inevitable detriment of the speed and flexibility which are the conditions precedent for the efficiency and smooth running needed.

[91] In addition, there is the probable effect on the budget. The total portion of Unesco's budget payable by Spanish-speaking Member States is about 4.74 per cent—i.e., about $350,000. According to the Secretariat, the estimated cost of the Mexican proposal at a General Conference like the present one in Florence would be about $125,000. The eloquence of the comparison between the two figures has a truly Spanish clarity and crispness. It is important for us to have it clear in our minds that, if we adopted the Mexican proposal, we should not merely be deliberately augmenting the difficulties and costs of administration, but should also be obliged to cut out of the 1951 programme activities already decided on to a total of $100,000.

[92] I am nearly at the end of what I have to say. I want to add two further general observations only. To reach any solution worthy of the name, the question of working languages must be considered from the point of view of viability. To the extent that any Member State of Unesco makes such a question a matter of prestige, the whole problem is falsified; and in addition the

way is opened for further similar claims. To admit Spanish as a working language would amount to creating a precedent. It is possible that FAO may have had other grounds for accepting Spanish as a working language—as far as Unesco is concerned, practical considerations must be decisive. Of our 59 Member States, some 32—a clear majority of those represented at this Conference—have to speak in languages other than their own, even given the adoption of Spanish as a working language. In point of fact, with the possible exception of the United States and the Eastern bloc, either French or English is invariably taught in the schools of all countries as the main foreign language. On that we must all agree, whether we be Arabs, South Americans, Scandinavians, Chinese or Malays. Really it would be better, were a single language accepted for use in international negotiations, but unhappily that is at present a Utopian dream.

[93] After giving due consideration to the various arguments adduced—among which special weight must be given to the point about the the considerable advantages already enjoyed under current practice by Spanish-speaking delegations to Unesco—my Government, despite its traditional sympathy with and admiration for the peoples and governments of the Spanish-speaking world, has just instructed me to oppose the Mexican motion. I should like to propose an amendment to item IV of the Report of the Procedure Committee and I have the honour to place it in your hands, Mr. President.

[94] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Following the statement— in excellent Spanish—by the representative of Sweden, I call on the representative of Denmark.

[95] Professor Jakob NIELSEN (Denmark) — Mr. President, when this question was discussed in the Procedure Committee, I did not speak on the substance of it. With your permission, I want to offer a few remarks on some of the arguments put forward in favour of the adoption of Spanish as a full working language, partly in the written proposal and partly in the discussion at this Conference.

[96] There is, first, the argument that we ought to spread Unesco's ideas among the Spanish-speaking peoples. I think we all agree that, as far as the spreading of Unesco's propaganda material is concerned, there should be made the widest possible use of languages other than the two working languages up to the limit set by the budget of the Organization. We want to contact the broad masses for whom their own language is the only means of understanding, and even if this is in the first place the task of Unesco National Commissions, in my view, the central Organization may lend a hand by its publication policy. But the proposal of the Mexican delegation is concerned only with the work of the General Conference, and nobody can pretend that we reach the masses by translating these more than 100 draft resolutions and the daily reports into Spanish. Nobody who can read English or French has the right to claim that all this day-to-day material should also be given in the Spanish version, thus slowing down the work of the Conference and increasing the cost considerably. One might, for the convenience of the Spanish-speaking delegations, print the main documents in Spanish—that is to say, the proposed Programme and Budget, and the Report of the Director-General, perhaps one or two others. This has been offered as a compromise in the debate in the Procedure Committee, but the compromise was voted down.

[97] It has also been claimed during the debate that, by adopting Spanish as a working language, you would contribute to peace and security. Frankly speaking, fellow delegates, I must confess, that in my opinion, such an argument does not make any sense at all. In the written comments on the proposal, it is stated that the delegations from the Spanish-speaking countries feel at a disadvantage and are strongly of the opinion that "English or French-speaking delegates are able to exercise a greater influence on our proceedings". Here you are quite right. We all feel at that disadvantage. It has even been said that every delegate at our Conference should be under the obligation to use a language other than his own. That, I take it, was meant as a joke. But let us be serious about the question. Our colleagues from the English and French-speaking countries obviously have a greater privilege, but will not my fellow-delegates from Spanish-speaking countries agree with me that we too should enjoy it if they make good use of that privilege? We must have a means of understanding common to us all, and it is not fair that a minority language group should ask for a privilege for which we all have to pay and which will slow down our work. Do not forget that the majority of delegations present here come from countries where the languages are neither English nor French nor Spanish, but we use English and French because they are commonly taught as foreign languages all over the world. That is a simple fact which nobody can deny, and no consideration of language rivalries or national pride or cultural prestige ought to be allowed to interfere. We are told that many Member States can only send their ablest delegates if we admit Spanish as a working language. Frankly, I doubt whether there is a single Member State of

Unesco which is unable to find nationals who are at the same time competent in Unesco matters and can understand and make themselves understood in at least one of the present working languages. It is not true that the Spanish-speaking countries in this respect are at a disadvantage compared with the bulk of Unesco's Member States.

[98] There is also the argument that delegates from the countries in question will be better understood in our meetings if they speak their own language. I seriously doubt whether that is true. They may be better understood by the Spanish-speaking delegations, but I think we all agree that we do not need eloquent speeches from minority language groups. I prefer to understand a speaker directly, to get an immediate impression of the strength of his convictions, of the seriousness of his doubt, even if he has to cope with difficulties of language. I have the highest admiration for our interpreters, but a translation can only convey the impression of a personality to a very much reduced degree. In meetings with consecutive interpretations, of course, the procedure can be slowed down disastrously. Even in meetings interpreted simultaneously, I doubt whether the use of their own language has been an advantage for many of our colleagues who have lately started speaking Spanish, even if they know that they express themselves very cleverly in English or French. It is my strong conviction, fellow-delegates from the Spanish-speaking countries, that by so doing, you isolate yourselves though, of course, I know that that is not your intention. In all sincerity I ask our Spanish-speaking colleagues to look at the question from the point of view of the most effective conduct of our deliberations, and I ask them to accept these comments of mine in the spirit of friendliness in which they are offered. Mr. President, with your permission, I support the proposal by the Swedish delegate.

[99] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on the Mexican delegate.

[100] Mr. Antonio CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, gentlemen, the question we are discussing has been the subject of much thought, not in Unesco alone (but in the United Nations, the International Labour Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization. Neither comparisons nor allegations of differential treatment can be validly made, because, in fact, the case of the Spanish-speaking countries is a special one. We are twenty states in all—twenty states with a numerous population, occupying nearly the whole of a continent. We have a great cultural tradition behind us and a great future before us; we have ever played our part in all international organizations since first we won to independence a century ago. As I said, the question has been discussed elsewhere. Assertions of respect for the Spanish tongue and culture are universal; but nevertheless everyone opposes the acceptance of Spanish as a working language in international institutions. All the arguments have already been stated, restated, discussed and disputed, even in Unesco at the Paris Conference of 1949.

[101] It is not wrong-headedness nor pride nor any impulse to claim—or compel—the world's acceptance of our importance which makes us want Spanish recognized as a working language of the General Conference, but because we are convinced that it is essential that Unesco should complete what it began at the Beirut Conference in recognizing it as a "spoken" working language, when, for good reasons given, its use was approved at General Conferences on all occasions when simultaneous interpretation was available. Yet we still lack acceptance of the written language—of the use of Spanish as a written as well as a spoken working language of the General Conference. Doubts have been expressed about the value of Spanish versions of a series of documents of which some are entirely provisional and ephemeral. Nevertheless, as I have already pointed out in the Procedure Committee, the General Conference documents are of special importance and their issue begins long before the opening date of the Conference. The Report of the Director-General, the opinion of the Executive Board, the Budget and the Programme, are all part of the Conference documents. All of them have to be distributed to governments before the General Conference, and all of them, if distributed in French or English to Spanish-speaking countries, run the risk of being less regarded and less influential than they would be in Spanish. That this need has already been remarked is proved by the fact that on this occasion part of the report—namely the Director-General's introduction—has been translated and distributed in Spanish. My argument is equally applicable to the series of additional documents submitted to the Conference in the course of its proceedings and to the resolutions passed by it and published after its conclusion. These are documents of vital importance for the understanding of Unesco's work and hence we of the Spanish-speaking countries—who wish to co-operate with Unesco and who want our governments and National Commissions to take more interest in Unesco's work—seek to have all these documents published in Spanish. Moreover, how are we to set about "breaking down" a Conference's proceedings? While it may transpire, on publica-

tion, that some of the documents could have been omitted, this inconvenience is more than offset by avoiding the difficulty of effecting a classification—in other words establishing in each specific case a kind of norm by which to judge whether the document should or should not be translated.

[102] In my view the acceptance of Spanish as a written working language of the General Conference is fully justified, not on the grounds alleged, as being for the satisfaction of a continental bloc or national pride, but simply and solely as a means of facilitating the co-operation of all Spanish-speaking countries in Unesco's work. Furthermore, as I have already remarked, the matter has already been settled by the United Nations, of which Unesco is an organ, a working Agency. It would be incongruous if, when the United Nations had approved Spanish as a working language for their General Assembly, a similar decision were not taken by Unesco, since it has, in my view, far more reason to do so than the United Nations. The United Nations Organization is a political body dealing with governments rather than peoples. The influence of Unesco reaches the people themselves through the learned members of National Commissions and even through the schools and teaching centres. For this reason, I think it my duty to support the draft resolution presented by the Procedure Committee and ask that you approve it as it stands in their report.

[103] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] You have heard what the Mexican representative has to say. The amendment tabled by the Swedish representative reads as follows:

CONSIDERING the fact that 14 of the Member States which ratified the Convention founding Unesco are of Spanish speech, that Spanish is spoken by nearly 150 million human beings whom it is highly desirable to keep informed of Unesco's work, the General Conference authorizes the Director-General to publish annually the basic documents of the General Conference in Spanish and to increase the number of Unesco publications in the Spanish language, particularly publications of general interest to the great public.

The Rapporteur does not accept this amendment and I must therefore call for a vote on it.

The amendment is *rejected* by 24 votes to 15, with 4 abstentions.

[104] This brings us to part IV on page 2 of document 5C/PRO/8 (II), on which we have to vote. On page 3 there is an amendment of the Rules of Procedure, the former Rules 52 and 55 being rescinded and replaced by the following:

RULE 52. English, French and Spanish are the working languages of the General Conference.

RULE 55. All documents and records, as well as the Journal of the Conference, shall be issued in English, French and Spanish.

Adopted by 25 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.

[105] We now come to item V: Formal amendments of the Rules of Procedure,—which you will find on pages 4, 5 and 6 of the English text. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[106] Item VI on page 6, which deals with recommendations to Member States and international conventions, is divided into parts A, B and C. The draft resolution is given on page 8 of the English text. The draft regulations are shown in document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[107] Part II of the document relates to the admission of Association Members and will be found on pages 8 and 9 of the English text. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[108] Item III, page 9 of the document, relates to a draft resolution for making the General Conference's sessions biennial. The resolution itself is on pages 9 and 10 of the document. Any remarks? I call on the delegate of France.

[109] Mr. Guy LADREIT de LACHARRIÈRE (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, the French delegation is in agreement with the whole of this resolution with the exception of the second paragraph. The French view is that it is just, logical and normal to examine all the possible consequences of the proposed change. We feel, however, that, before this has been done, it is neither logical nor permissible to assume that change is desirable at a stage when its consequences are still unassessed. Accordingly, the French delegation suggests that the resolution be amended by striking out the first part of paragraph 2 of the resolution, so that the text would read:

CONSIDERING that with the adoption of this proposal important consequential modifications might be required, etc.

In other words, we should strike out the phrase

BEING OF THE OPINION that the adoption of this proposal would bring about a desirable change in the schedule of the General Conference.

[110] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Does the Rapporteur accept the amendment?

[111] Mr. Nils THEDIN (Sweden), Rapporteur of the Procedure Committee — Mr. President, I have only to report that the majority of the Committee refused to accept this formula and adopted the text as it stands here.

[112] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As the Rapporteur does not accept this proposal, it must be seconded by at least one other delegation. Seconded. I shall now ask you to vote on the amendment just read to you, which is proposed by the French delegation.

The amendment is *rejected* by 24 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

[113] Will you now vote on the decisions set out in section III on page 9. Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[114] We have still to vote on the substance of document 5C/PRO/8 (II), Addendum, which reads:

The Committee has further asked the Director-General to prepare and submit to the Fifth Session of the General Conference the final draft of the necessary amendment of the Rules of Procedure in order to embody in these rules provisions for:

(1) Time-limits for the presentation of documents before the opening of the session of the General Conference as well as for the presentation of draft resolutions or proposals calling for substantial alterations in the programme and the budget;

(2) Rules for the validity of written ballot papers in the case of election of more than one person.

Any remarks? *Adopted.*

[115] I shall now ask you to vote on the report as a whole. If there are no remarks, I shall take it as *adopted.*

[116] May I remind you that the Programme Commission will meet at 4 o'clock and, when its business is concluded, we will meet here at about 5. The first business will be consideration of the report of the Sub-Commission of the Programme and Budget Commission appointed to examine the draft agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials (document 5C/PRG/20).

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

FOURTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Saturday, 17 June 1950 at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XXVII.	Consideration of the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission.	219
XXVIII.	Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission . . .	226

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

XXVII. Consideration of the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission.

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I declare the meeting open. We will now discuss the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission. I call upon the Rapporteur.

[2] Mr. Marcel FLORKIN (Belgium), Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour to submit to you the Report of the Programme and Budget Commission, consisting of documents 5C/PRG/19, 5C/PRG/19 (I) (II) (III) (IV) (V) and (VI). In the form in which they are submitted to you today, these documents do not yet contain all the resolutions adopted but these will, of course, be inserted in the places where you have decided to put them. This report includes a brief introduction to which I will make no further reference and in which only one resolution has to be included. That is the resolution authorizing the Director-General to alter, if need be, in the Records of this Conference, the numbering and order of the resolutions: this practice was adopted at previous Conferences, and I venture to draw your attention to it. In regard to the other documents it is not, of course, my intention to comment upon them or describe them in detail on this occasion. They reflect the spirit and the letter of your deliberations and decisions, to the best of the ability of the Drafting Committee. That Committee has done everything in its power to give faithful expression

to those decisions, and I do not think you will expect any further comment from me at the present moment.

[3] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] On behalf of the delegates. I should like to thank the Rapporteur, not so much for his very brief statement as for the splendid work done by the Commission in the course if its long and laborious task. I feel sure that we have valuable material here, which will be of the greatest use to Unesco. I open the discussion by calling upon the Yugoslav delegate, who has asked to speak.

[4] Mr. Vladislav RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President. I will say only a few words about the programme that we have before us today. While participating in the work of the Programme and Budget Commission, the Yugoslav delegation submitted various projects and amendments with a view to ensuring that Unesco's work during 1951 should be more effectively and more profitably devoted to the development of international understanding and to concrete co-operation in the educational, scientific and cultural fields. Certain of our projects were adopted, while others met with a lack of understanding on the part of several delegates. We consider that the suggested programme, though it provides for much useful activity in 1951, could have been better and more substantial. We hope that, in the execution of this programme, the Executive Board and the Director-General will be able to give priority to those resolutions best calculated to contribute towards constructive international co-operation and to a better understanding between nations.

[5] But, as I emphasized at the beginning of this session, we consider that this programme is far from adequate as a means of achieving the fundamental aims set forth in the Constitution of Unesco. In addition to the activities included in its programme, Unesco should, in our opinion, take a direct share in an effective campaign for peace. It was with this in mind that we submitted a definite project, suggesting the convening, before the end of 1950, of a congress on intellectual co-operation for peace. This project has been rejected by the General Conferenc, and the solution of the question of Unesco's direct action in the cause of peace is postponed until 1951. The project submitted by the Yugoslav delegation nevertheless provided a means—in our opinion, the most rational means—of initiating a large-scale peace movement, such as is expected of us by all the peoples of the world. This movement was to start by bringing into play the great forces of peace, those forces which must form the basis upon which Unesco rests—its collaborators, its combattants, its army—the educators, scientists and artists of the whole world. By rejecting this movement, or any other of comparable scope and international repercussion, the Conference has shown that it is far from contemplating any real campaign for peace at the present moment. It is clear that certain delegations persist in their desire that Unesco shall remain confined to a narrow circle, cut off from life and from those events upon which its very existence depends, and powerless to influence the course of those events. The Fifth Session of the Conference, in fact, has admitted the helplessness and the isolation of Unesco. The moving words spoken by the Director-General clearly showed us this, and a series of grave errors committed by the majority during this session have given further evidence of helplessness. The first of these errors was the acceptance of the credentials of the Kuomintang delegation. The second was the withdrawal from the Eastern European countries of the only seat so far attributed to them on the Executive Board. The third and gravest error was the *de facto* rejection of the definite and immediate peace action proposed by the Yugoslav delegation.

[6] This session will leave public opinion with the impression that Unesco is to be ranked among those organizations where a lot of talk—sometimes excellent talk, indeed—goes on, and where the majority, as at this session, says one thing and, in practice, does another, There has been talk of universality, of the need to hear all ideas and allow various ideologies to be upheld. But, in actual fact, a certain number of delegations do their best to turn Unesco into the representative and spokesman of one single conception of the world, one ideology—and that, moreover, an ideology retrograde in content and scholastic in form. There is talk of peace, while in actual fact, through passivity, through helpless and problematical pacifism, the majority is helping to lull to sleep the forces of peace and thus to encourage and stimulate the forces of war. What interpretation can be put upon facts such as the scarcely veiled appeals for an anti-Communist crusade which have been issued within and around Unesco by various members of certain delegations? We stand firmly by the point of view that Unesco's task in the campaign for peace must not consist in transforming the Organization into the political instrument of one group of States, or in following one or another of the great powers. Unesco must remain independent of all political groups, whatever they may be. In this sense, and in this sense alone, politics must be kept out of Unesco. But that does not by any means signify that all politics are to be excluded from the work of the Organization. Unesco cannot ignore the

present-day world, the international problems in process of being solved. Peace is necessary to the nations; it is particularly necessary today, with the political chess-board standing as it does; and it should not be merely a prospective peace, resulting from some abstract form of cultural co-operation achieved regardless of any political principles whatsoever.

[7] Five years have already gone by since Unesco was founded, since great hopes were placed in it; and during those five years Unesco has not yet found its true path. By ignoring the great international problems Unesco has been led into a position where it may lose its leadership in the struggle for peace and progress at present being carried on by the peoples of the world. If this path is adhered to, Unesco will suffer a steady diminution of prestige especially after this Fifth Session of the Conference at Florence. The only solution is to undertake without loss of time some course of action calculated to remedy, at least to some extent, the mistakes made up to now. It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that the Yugoslav delegation will be unable to vote, as a whole, for the programme chosen.

[8] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Israel.

[9] Dr. Pinhas KOHN (Israel) — Mr. President, during the last few days, the Programme and Budget Commission has heard a number of speeches on the subject of the Arab refugee children. The delegation of Israel has not taken any part in this discussion and I am glad to hear that this restraint has been appreciated by a good many delegations. But is a danger that our complete silence on this subject may give rise to misconceptions, so I should like to say a few words to explain our attitude in the matter. We have not voted against the allocation of funds to help in the education of these refugee children because we know the difficult position in which many of them are placed. The delegation of Israel will not oppose any humanitarian effort, whether it is designed for the children of its friends or its enemies, although, of course, we all realize that the granting of relief is not among the major objects of Unesco: the United Nations has other organizations and institutions to deal with these purposes and there are a good many outside bodies concerned with such humanitarian and social work. But, for the reasons stated, we have not opposed this.

[10] I must, however, say that, though we have not opposed these grants, our view of the origin and solution of the problem differs fundamentally from that of the delegate who had just spoken. What we are all concerned about at present is that this conflict, and all the human suffering produced thereby, should be brought to an end as soon as possible by a comprehensive peace settlement. The Palestine Conciliation Commission, which was appointed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 11 December 1948, in a recent note to the governments concerned, made a statement on this subject as follows:

> This Commission is convinced that each government will recognize the urgent need for the establishment of conditions of peace and stability in the Middle East as a necessity for bringing to an end the suffering of these refugees.

This is in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly of 11 December 1948, which called upon all the governments involved in the Palestine dispute to seek agreement by the negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly, with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them. The Government of Israel has on various occasions declared itself ready to enter into negotiations for such a comprehensive settlement and, as part of that, to discuss also ways and means of helping towards the solution of the Arab refugee problem by the joint efforts of the United Nations and all the governments concerned. That, in our view, is the only collective and definite way of solving the Arab refugee problem, including that of the children.

[11] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Iraq.

[12] Dr. Mohamed Fadhel JAMALI (Iraq) — Mr. President, honourable delegates, I did not expect to have the pleasure and honour of standing before you this morning, but the previous speaker has impelled me to do so, and I am grateful to him for that. We heard at the beginning of the Conference, and we hear now, that there is a desire for peace. We desire peace, but peace on what grounds? Every one of us here cherishes peace. Peace must be based on justice. Peace must be based on Human Rights. If any of you here open the Declaration of Human Rights, and read Article XIII, you will notice that every human being is entitled to a country—to a home, and he is entitled to leave his home and return to his home. Article XIII of the Declaration of Human Rights has been denied to the Arabs—they cannot return to their homes. Those who return to their homes, as we have been reading this week in the news, are being butchered. Butchering is going on this very day, and the Jewish authorities declare that they cannot allow any person to go back to his own home. Now, we want peace—I say that again—

but peace must be based on justice, must be based on the recognition and implementation of United Nations decisions. United Nations decisions—although they have been very cruel and unjust to the Arab—in 1947, 1948, 1949 have been continuously and completely forgotten—not forgotten, but opposed by the Jewish authorities. They do not want to recognize the decision of the United Nations that there is a partition plan, nor do they want to recognize that the refugees are entitled to go back to their homes if they so desire, and that those who do not desire shall be compensated. That is why we have one million people who are not permitted to go back to their homes but are forced to live in tents, in caves and on mountains, and in privation, misery and disintegration. That is not the fault of the Arabs. The Arabs cannot negotiate, cannot accept a peace which is not based on justice, on Human Rights. I am very grateful for this Conference, which enables me to explain some fundamentals. I am very gratified to see that we here are earnestly thinking of fundamental matters, of matters that are causing tension and political unrest in the world; and I hope that Unesco will, as it should, gradually from year to year do more intensive work in trying to get to the basis of these matters, studying them and providing the educational remedy for them. I was very much encouraged this year by all the debates we had in the Programme and Budget Commission. The Programme and Budget Commission gave us some excellent points of view, some excellent guidance. We all desire that our efforts shall be concentrated, shall be directed towards the basic problems of the world today, and one of those problems is to make the world live according to Human Rights, according to the saying "Live and let live". I hope, Mr. President, that you will agree that the Arab refugees have a case; that case is more than political, it is human; and it is in the name of Human Rights that those refugees deserve the most careful consideration of this honourable conference.

[13] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The Israel delegate wishes to speak again. I allowed him and the delegate of Iraq to speak, because I considered that opinions should be freely expressed; but I cannot allow a controversy to be started in the assembly on this subject. So I ask the Israeli delegate to excuse me if I do not agree to his request. I am very sorry, and I hope to have other opportunities of calling upon him to speak. I put the question to the Conference; it is for the Conference to decide. I do not think that a controversy should be started on this subject.

[14] We will now proceed to discuss the programme chapter by chapter. Does anyone wish to say anything about the Preamble? No one. *Adopted.*

[15] *Basic programme*: Does anyone wish to speak on this? No one. *Adopted.*

[16] *Resolution for 1951*: the Italian delegation has asked to be heard. I call upon the Italian delegate.

[17] Mr. Giorgio MAMELI (Italy) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, I apologize for taking up a few minutes of the Conference's time. The Italian delegation would like to put forward a few brief observations concerning resolution 4.2421, which was formerly 4.242. The phrase "more particularly of Renaissance paintings" has been deleted from this resolution. This suppression has already attracted attention in Italian cultural and artistic circles. The Renaissance is not, of course, an Italian monopoly. Nevertheless, in Florence you have been enabled to admire it in all its splendour, and I think it would create an unfortunate impression if in Florence, of all places, Unesco excluded the Renaissance from one of its resolutions. Moreover, I think there has been misunderstanding, owing to a difference between the English and French wording. It may be, therefore, that some delegates have taken this to be a new resolution, a new phrase in the resolution. On the contrary, it is a resolution that has already been passed and is still being carried out. I should like to ask the Director-General to be good enough to state whether Renaissance works are included among those that the Secretariat has already dealt with in this field. If so, I think that is a further argument in favour of retaining the phrase in the resolution. The Italian delegation expresses the hope that the assembly will decide to retain in the resolution the phrase referred to: "more particularly of Renaissance paintings".

[18] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] The Italian delegate has just asked me a question. I will confine myself to repeating what I said to the Programe and Budget Commission during the discussion of the resolution mentioned by Mr. Mameli. I think that, in arriving at its decision, the Programme and Budget Commission rather confused the idea of the "basic programme", which is a very extensive idea, including a far-reaching plan for the future, which could not reasonably be confined to the artistic achievements of the Renaissance, with the idea of the "1951 programme", which represents the first step in the execution of a wide programme.

[19] I am asked to state what projects the Secretariat has formed in this connexion. I should like to say that we have not only projects but also certain achievements. In co-operation with an

Italian publishing firm, we have brought out an album on Masaccio—the very fine frescoes which you have had an oportunity of admiring in the Brancacci Chapel of Santa Maria del Carmine. We propose to issue, in the near future, another album, on Raphael, probably devoted to the frescoes of the Stanza dell'Assignatura. We are also planning a series of albums on Michelangelo and Piero della Francesca, whose moving and unforgettable frescoes you may have seen at Arezzo. That is the programme we had in mind for the year 1951; and when it was under discussion by the Programme and Budget Commission I expressed the wish that mention should be made in the summary record of the fact that these Unesco projects would be carried out. I think that I have replied to Mr. Mameli's question.

[20] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I thank the Director-General for this explanation. I will now ask the Rapporteur whether he is prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the Italian delegate.

[21] Mr. Marcel FLORKIN (Belgium), Rapporteur — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, I do not think that the resolution, as it at present appears in the programme, in any way runs counter to the Italian delegate's proposal, and for my part I see no objection to putting it to the vote and adopting it. I think, however, that what he said is already included in the resolution and leaves the Secretariat entirely free to act in the manner just defined by the Director-General.

[22] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Does the Italian delegate maintain his suggestion?

[23] Mr. F. Giorgio MAMELI (Italy) — [*Translation from the French*] Yes, Mr. President.

[24] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] As this suggestion has already been accepted in substance by the Rapporteur, I think it could be voted with the general resolution. If this is so, and if there are no comments, I consider the text as having been adopted with the amendment proposed by Mr. Mameli. *Adopted.*

[25] We will now proceed to the discussion, chapter by chapter.

Chapter 1. Education. No one has anything to say about this chapter? *Adopted.*

[26] Natural Sciences (pages 11 tot 15). Does anyone wish to speak? No one. *Adopted.*

[27] Social Sciences (pages 16 to 18). The Swiss delegate wishes to speak on this chapter.

[28] Professor Jean PIAGET (Switzerland) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, resolution 3.13, in its amended form, runs thus:

> To undertake surveys in four countries of the types of courses and methods of instruction in the social sciences.

I do not want to waste the time of the Conference or to go back over this discussion; I would simply like to recall that the point was discussed in the Programme Commission: if I remember rightly, there were 13 votes in favour of fixing the number at ten, and 14 or 15 votes in favour of fixing it at four. I propose a compromise solution, and I suggest that "in several countries" be substituted for "in four countries". I do not suggest any alteration in the budget; the Secretariat itself will decide whether it can undertake this survey in more or less than four countries: "several" seems to me to be a prudent formula.

[29] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I should like to ask the Director-General whether he sees any practical objection to the Swiss delegates's proposal.

[30] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] No. On the contrary, I am most grateful to the Swiss delegate for this proposal, which may be said to be linked with the arguments I ventured to put before the Programme and Budget Commission. I consider that this resolution would be better expressed in the form proposed by Professor Piaget.

[31] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] If there are no other comments, I shall consider the project *adopted*, with the alteration proposed by Professor Piaget. Does anyone else wish to speak on the social sciences? *Adopted.*

[32] Chapter IV: "Cultural Activities". Any comments? No. *Adopted.*

[33] Page 29, Chapter V: "Exchange of Persons". No speakers? No comments? *Adopted.*

[34] Page 31, Chapter VI: "Mass Communication". No comments? *Adopted.*

[35] Page 39, Chapter VII: "Relief Assistance Service". No comments? *Adopted.*

[36] "Miscellaneous Resolutions", page 41. Resolution No. 1, concerning the placing of economic and social rights on an international basis. No comments? *Adopted.*

[37] Item 2: "Universal Declaration of Human Rights". No comments? *Adopted.*

[38] Page 45: "Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Material". No comments? *Adopted.* I now call upon the representative of the United Kingdom.

[39] Mr. A. R. ASHFORD (United Kingdom) — Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to say just a very few words about the agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural material. I count it my very good fortune that I was present in Annecy when the first steps were taken which led to the preparation of this agreement, and that I had the privilege of taking part in all the subsequent stages of its development. It is therefore a very happy moment when the agreement has been finally adopted by the General Conference of Unesco. Like all those who have taken part in preparing the text, I believe this agreement is good: a real practical step forward in the accomplishment of the aims and objectives of Unesco. The Conference has passed the text of the agreement. It now remains for the Member States to bring it into force, and I am happy to be able to say that in the United Kingdom we intend to sign this agreement and to submit it to our Parliament for ratification.

[40] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The Director-General wishes to make some remarks on this subject.

[41] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, gentlemen, I am very grateful to the United Kingdom delegate for having drawn the attention of this plenary meeting of the Conference to the importance and truly symbolical significance of the unanimity of the Annecy agreement, which has enabled us to submit to you a text that seems to me to be really expressive of a will to international co-operation towards peace, operating through education, science and culture. In my opinion, this Conference would be acting unfairly if it failed to stress the satisfaction which a result of this kind deserves and justifies. But I ought at the same time, not only to thank the delegates here present for approving the fundamental principles of this agreement, but also the group that worked at Annecy, and once again to thank the International Trade Organization, which facilitated this result in many ways. I should like also to express the very definite wish that the delegates here present, when they return to their respective countries, will do everything necessary to ensure the speedy ratification of the agreement. It would be distressing if, following the excellent result obtained by this Conference in adopting the agreement we were unable to envisage, I will not say an immediate, but a very rapid, achievement of the aims represented by that agreement.

[42] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Would the Rapporteur like to make any further statement on this subject? If there are no comments, I shall consider item 10 of the resolutions as *adopted*.

[43] The Secretary tells me that we have accidentally left out several items. In particular, item 3, page 43, dealing with the proliferation and overlapping of the programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. No comments? *Adopted.*

[44] Item 4: "Decentralization". No comments? *Adopted.*

[45] Item 5: "Preparation of the annual Programme and Budget as a single integrated document". No comments? *Adopted.*

[46] Item 6: "Choice of central themes". No comments? *Adopted.*

[47] Item 7: "Exceptional projects calculated to render services of major importance to the cause of peace and world security". No comments? *Adopted.*

[48] Item 8: "Record of the activity of the Organization and its general policy as regards publications during the twelve months preceding the Conference." *Adopted.*

[49] Item 9: "World Friendship Flag for children". No comments? *Adopted.*

[50] We now comme to item 11: "Technical Assistance for Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries". No comments? *Adopted.*

[51] Item 12 : "Teaching in Non-Self-Governing Territories". No comments? *Adopted.*

[52] I have just received three draft resolutions adopted by the Commission after the drafting of this report, that is to say, yesterday and this morning. The first is the "Draft resolution on behalf of children of the Middle and Near East" (document 5C/120). No comments? *Adopted.*

[53] The second is contained in document 5C/51, as amended: draft resolution "Assistance to Arab refugees of Palestine". No comments? *Adopted.*

[54] The third [document 5C/119] reads as follows:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

HAVING HEARD the statements of various delegations and of the Director-General,

NOTING that the programme of the Organization, as decided upon by the present Conference, constitutes a more direct and important contribution to the cause of peace than the programme of previous years;

CONSIDERING that all the activities of Unesco must, in accordance with its Constitution, be directed towards the peace and prosperity of mankind, within the framework of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

CONSIDERING that these activities, to be fully effective, must postulate a truly and sincerely universal outlook that shall eschew all thought of aggression and shall be based on recognition of the principles of justice and freedom on which the Constitution of the Organization is based;

REMINDS all Member States that the effectiveness of Unesco's contribution to peace depends directly on the extent of each Member State's active participation in the programme of the Organization;

INSTRUCTS the Executive Board and the Director-General to carry out the programme for 1950 and 1951 in the most effective and concentrated manner possible, bearing prominently in mind the guiding principles laid down in the preamble to the basic programme;

INSTRUCTS the Executive Board to prepare, for the Sixth Session of the General Conference, a draft programme for 1952 in which the various activities involving international co-operation in the fields of education, science and culture shall tend more directly, within the framework of the United Nations and its other Specialized Agencies, towards the maintenance and consolidation of peace; and, in the preparation of this programme, to give special emphasis to projects involving the active participation of Member States;

REQUESTS the Executive Board and the Director-General to study, for that purpose, projects that can be financed apart from the regular programme, by voluntary contributions of money or services from public and private sources in the greatest possible number of countries;

INVITES Member States, with a view to the successful execution of a concentrated programme of this nature, to consider the possibility of increasing, starting in the year 1951, the resources of the Organization in the future.

You have now heard the draft resolution put forward by the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Are there any comments? *Adopted.*

[55] Before opening the discussion on Part IV of the report: "Resolutions concerning the activities of Unesco in Germany during 1951", I must read a telegram which I have just received from Count Sforza, Foreign Minister of the Italian Republic:

Retained tomorrow in Rome by urgent government business, I beg you to express to all the members of the Conference my great regret at being unable to spend at least one day with them and my assurance that they will remember the lively sympathy with which the Italian people have followed their efforts for intellectual brotherhood between all free nations. Sforza.

I will venture to interpret your applause by replying to Count Sforza that the assembly welcomes his message.

[56] We will now pass to the resolutions concerning the activities of Unesco in Germany in 1951. Does anyone wish to speak? No comments? *Adopted.*

[57] Part V: "Resolutions concerning the activities of Unesco in Japan in 1951". No comments? *Adopted.*

[58] "Statement of Methods" (this is the last chapter of the report). No comments? *Adopted.*

[59] I therefore put the whole report to the vote.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[60] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The report is adopted by 38 votes. No votes against; one abstention.

[61] His Excellency Monseigneur Borgongini-Duca, the Papal Nuncio, has asked leave to speak. By virtue of the authority which the Regulations confer upon me in this respect, I call upon him to do so.

[62] Mgr. BORGONGINI-DUCA (Papal Nuncio)— [*Translation from the Italian*] In my capacity as official observer on behalf of the Holy See at the Unesco General Conference, now met in its Fifth Session, I have the honour to say, in the first place, a few words of congratulation upon the noble aspirations towards human fellowship and social progress with which so many States are striving, in close co-operation, to advance education, science and culture in all parts of the world, for the greater good of the peoples and in the cause of peace.

[63] It is no small source of pride for mankind to have brought about the meeting of so many delegations, which have come together here in Florence—the Athens of Italy—from all quarters of the world, eminent scientists and scholars among them, and for some weeks have been conversing and discussing, creating relationships and valuable friendships which will have extensive and beneficial results in the future. To all those who have worked together untiringly to bring this about—to the Director-General and the Secretariat, to the Executive Board, to Count Jacini, President of the General Conference, to the National Commissions, the delegations, and the non-governmental organizations—I offer my cordial greetings and best wishes.

[64] I should like to add a few brief remarks which may be of use in the carrying out of the plans set forth in your programme in regard to elementary education, fundamental education and adult education. There unfortunately exists in teachers' training colleges a small but diligent minority labouring under the delusion that young people and adults can be helped towards higher standards by the disparagement of the idea of God. Yet it is on that idea that almost all educators, no matter to what nation or religion they belong, base their traditional systems, to which the world owes its civilization. No nation denies the existence of God. On the temple of Delphi, the ancient Greeks set the inscription: "Thou Art"; and in

Athens St. Paul found an altar which bore the words: "The Unknown God". So that in the Areopagus, where philosophers of all schools, from Stoics to Epicureans, came to hear him speak, he declared with vigour:

Whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. He is the God that made the world and all things therein, he is Lord of heaven and earth.

When God called Abraham out of his tent at night, He said to him:

Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: so shall thy seed be, as the stars of the sky and as the sands of the sea.

And He meant, I who have made the firmament will make peoples and nations.

[65] And indeed this God is in the hearts of all men and of all peoples. A teaching from which God is left out will never be generally loved or accepted. Biology, ethnology, sociology, social psychology and demography can never take the place of God, just as a description of the complicated mechanism of a clock can never replace the clock-maker. If the child who is learning fundamental elements and the adult whom we wish to make useful to the life of the community know who is their first Father, they will feel that the rest of mankind are their brothers and all make up one single family. And if they know God, they will know that, just as the stars have a law which they obey, so men have a law which governs them and a Law-giver to whom they owe obedience. Without the idea of God, all our words—even those which head the vocabulary of the most progressive Legislative Assemblies—will be meaningless. Liberty, morality, democracy, duty, crime and punishment, war and peace, can be interpreted in the most contradictory sense; and instead of unity among the peoples, we shall have the Tower of Babel. If there is no appeal to a divine law which compels recognition by the human will, there would seem to be no final reason why one man should not kill another, if his own interest suggests it. It is of the highest importance to future human relationship to know whether the men of tomorrow will be brotherly, ready to hasten to the aid of their suffering fellows and even to sacrifice themselves for them; or whether they will be a generation of egoists and enemies, thieves and bandits.

[66] With all the energy at my command, I urge the powerful organization of Unesco, in the name of education, science and culture, to encourage those systems of teaching which are based on the idea of God and which make of that idea the principal factor in that noblest of all arts, the education of mankind.

XXVIII. Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission.

[67] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We will now consider the Report of the Administrative Commission. I call upon the Rapporteur. The document concerned is 5C/ADM/25 (rev.). There is also a draft resolution from the United Kingdom delegation, document 5C/121.

[68] Mr. W. G. St. C. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour to present to you the Report of the Administrative Commission to the Fifth Session of the General Conference. Fourteen meetings of the Commission were held, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Tara Chand of India, and Professor Photiades was unanimously elected to the office of Vice-Chairman.

[69] As indicated in the report, two committees were appointed to make certain recommendations to the Commission on rather contentious subjects, and the recommendations of the Commission are based on the reports of these committees. If I might refer to the form of presentation of the report, you will note that pages 1 to 11 contain a résumé of the deliberations of the Commission; and the resolutions which the Administrative Commission has recommended for adoption to the General Conference are set out in two annexes—Annex I dealing with financial questions, and Annex II dealing with staff questions. With your permission, Mr. President, I do not propose to deal with the report in detail, as the results of the deliberations are fully set out, but rather to interpret the wishes of the Commission in indicating to you those resolutions and discussions which the Commission considers of greatest importance.

[70] On page 2 of the report you will see the result of the deliberations on the scale of contributions of Member States for 1951, and the resolution contains the subsequent modifications which the Commission decided to recommend to the formula on which contributions of Member States for the year 1951 should be calculated.

[71] In dealing with the currency of contributions, the Commission has recommended that the categories of currencies in which Member States may contribute be limited to three, and has considered sympathetically requests from Member States for transfer from one category to the other. It thought, however, that it was its duty to point out that, should a large number of similar requests be received in the future, the whole question of the currency of contributions would have to be reviewed by the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[72] In dealing with the non-payment of contributions, the Commission has recommended an important constitutional amendment for submission to Member States and consideration by the Sixth Session of the General Conference. The text of this amendment is contained in resolution 18.21 of Annex I. The Commission has recommended the proposals of the Director-General and of the Executive Board for the amendment of Financial Regulations 25 and 26. It has also recommended that the Conference adopt a resolution making exception to the Financial Regulations in that no surplus shall be surrendered to Member States while a net deficit exists in the accounts of the Organization.

[73] It has also considered the effect of devaluation on the 1950 budget and the report of the Director-General in this regard, and has recommended that the Conference accept the Director-General's recommendation that these savings be declared surplus to the 1950 budget and be applied in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

[74] The Administrative Commission gave careful consideration to the appropriate resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations and has already reported on this matter to the Programme and Budget Commission. The substance of this report is summarized in Section 7 of the report now before you.

[75] It further considered the resolution which the Programme and Budget Commission adopted on 6 June 1950 with regard to the Budget for 1951. The results of its deliberations are shown in Section 8 of the report, which merely reaffirms the Commission's previous decision, but points out to the General Conference the steps that it must take if it adopts the resolution as proposed by the Programme and Budget Commission.

[76] Turning now to staff questions, the Commission has recommended many changes, in accordance with the Report of the Expert Committee of the United Nations, on salaries, allowances and leave provisions. In particular, it has recommended the application of salary differentials to internationally recruited staff, the inauguration at as early a date as possible of a local salary scale, and the revision of travel subsistence rates, installation allowances and leave provisions in accordance with this same report.

[77] On page 10 of the report, you will find reference to the Commission's recommendation that it is desirable that some further attention be given to the recruitment methods of the Organization, with a view to placing the geographical distribution of members of the Secretariat on as wide a basis as possible. It has further recommended, in Section 6 of the same page, that the Director-General and the Executive Board give consideration to the proposal of the Venezuelan delegation for the establishment of a Supervisory Commission, and that this matter be placed on the agenda of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[78] The Commission also considered the report of the Headquarters Commission, but did not think it was advisable at the present time to authorize the Director-General to enter into any firm commitment for the provision of a new building. It has, however, requested him to continue his negotiations and, with the agreement of the Headquarters Commission, to take the option on a suitable site which might be offered by the French Government.

[79] The final point to which I would like to refer is the Commission's recommendations, in paragraph 8 of this report, on the provision of space and facilities at Unesco House for Member States and international organizations. The Commission's recommendations in this regard are set out in resolution 27 in Annex II. Mr. President, it is my privilege to present the Report of the Administrative Commission for the consideration of the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

[80] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The work done by the Administrative Commission certainly deserves the applause with which you have greeted this report, and I thank the Rapporteur on your behalf. The discussion of the report as a whole is now open. Does anyone wish to speak on this subject? No one? Then we will go on to discuss the separate articles.

[81] Document 5C/ADM/25 (rev.), Annex I, Financial Questions:

Item 15: "Report of the Auditors." We are merely taking note of this, so I will not put it to the vote.

Item 16: "Scale of Contributions for 1951." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 17, page 2: "Currency of Contributions." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 18, page 4: "Collection of Contributions of Member States." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 19, page 5: "Amendment of Financial Regulations 25 and 26." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 20, page 7: "Administration of the Working Capital Fund." No comments. *Adopted.*

[82] Annex II:

Item 21. "Salaries, Allowances, Leave Provisions and Income Tax." No comments. *Adopted.*

The Director-General wishes to speak on item 21.

[83] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] I should like to make an explanation, Mr. President. The Administrative Commission is proposing an amendment of the

present system and the application of a local salary scale. This question was discussed at considerable length at the meeting of the Commission. I do not wish to speak further of the substance of the question, but I wish to give the plenary meeting the following explanation. We have repeatedly expressed the wish to work in close co-ordination with the United Nations. Here, however, we are actually forestalling a decision by the United Nations Assembly, which has not yet met. It may be that the United Nations Assembly will take decisions similar to those taken by the Unesco Conference, in which case it will be quite natural to apply the system. But should it be otherwise, Unesco, on 1 January 1951, will have to face the following problem. Our co-ordination may be weakened by the fact that the United Nations Assembly has not taken decisions calculated to support and give full practical force to the execution of the decisions of the Unesco Conference. I should therefore like to explain to you that, in that event, I should have to ask the Executive Board to include the problem in the agenda of the 1951 General Conference, so that the Conference, in possession of all the facts, may be able to take a decision on a matter which threatens to weaken that spirit of co-ordination to which so many tributes have been paid on other occasions.

[84] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Does anyone else wish to make any comments, following on those of the Director-General? I consider the item adopted, with his reservations.

[85] We will continue with the further items:

Item 22, page 7: "Medical Benefits Scheme." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 23, page 7. "International Administrative Tribunal." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 24, page 8: "Distribution of members of the Secretariat by nationality." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 25, page 8: "Organization of the Secretariat." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 26, page 8: "Report of the Headquarters Commission." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 27, page 9: "Provision of Space and Facilities at Unesco House." No comments. *Adopted.*

Item 28, page 9: "United Nations Joint Staff Pensions Scheme." No comments. *Adopted.*

[86] In connexion with the report, there is a draft addendum submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, suggesting an addendum to the resolution given on page 7 of the report of the Administrative Commission. This draft bears the reference number 5C/121.

[87] Mr. W. G. St. C. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission — Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I think I should draw the attention of the General Conference to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the report, that is, pages 5, 6 and 7. This resolution, as set out, was not adopted by the Administrative Commission. Paragraphs 7 and 8 give a summary of the deliberations. If any further explanation of those deliberations is required, I would be pleased to give it; but I think we should consider this as an amendment to the report presented by the Administrative Commission.

[88] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] On behalf of the Administrative Commission, the Rapporteur submits this draft to the decision of the plenary Conference, because it was not discussed by the Commission itself. I therefore put the amendment to the vote before a vote is taken on the report. I call upon the Australian delegate.

[89] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, this resolution proposed by the United Kingdom is in part an attempt to ensure that the Organization shall operate on as large a scale as possible from the financial point of view; it is also in part an attempt to give effect to the recommendations of the United Nations regarding the general control of expenditure in the Specialized Agencies. I am afraid the Australian delegation is not in a position to support the resolution in its present form, because the general policy of the Australian Government, in relation to the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies at this time, is to press for prudent and careful financial administration and the development of organizations only in accordance with the funds that are actually available. Now, Unesco is not the only Specialized Agency which has been running into some financial difficulties, and we feel obliged, in our approach to this problem, as a Member of all the Specialized Agencies, and as a country very deeply interested in the United Nations, to follow a consistent policy in attempting to ensure that the financial administration of all these Agencies is conducted on the principle that seems to us to be sound. From that point of view, we have supported the recommendations of the United Nations that each Specialized Agency should, at frequent intervals, review its expenditure to ensure that it is kept within the limits of the revenue available. Our reason for this is that, if such procedure is not followed, Specialized Agencies will gradually fall behind owing to the failure of certain Member States to pay their contributions, and the Organizations will find themselves, at some stage, in a very

critical situation in which the Member States that have paid will be called upon to make very substantial contributions to cover the debts that have accumulated. I fear that there are many countries in which the emergence of that situation would constitute a very serious blow to the degree of governmental and popular support for the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

[90] Now, having said that, of course we realize the very great desire of the Conference to carry on the full Programme of Unesco in so far as it is possible. And we know that it is for those reasons that it has been suggested that in the coming year—in 1951—the Director-General should attempt to restrict expenditure, not only to the contributions which he can expect to receive for that year, but also to whatever monies come from the other sources that are specified here. We do not feel able to agree that it is sound financial policy, at a time when this Organization has an accumulated cash deficiency, according to the Executive Board, of about half a million dollars, and when we have looked to certain of these funds that are mentioned here as methods of covering part, at least, of that accumulated cash deficiency —we do not consider it to be sound policy to say: "Use these funds to build up your Organization to a higher level". The day of reckoning inevitably comes in one, two or three years; and if the Organization and the permanent commitments of the Organization, in terms of staff and other matters, are built up on the basis of windfall receipts, which in the nature of things cannot recur or are not likely to recur, then the inevitable implication is that one, two or three years later, the Organization will be faced with the need to find the money from different sources altogether, which will mean increased contributions from the Member States. We would regard this practice of applying to 1951 the various special funds that are mentioned here, as being only defensible if we were certain that the financial situation in 1951 was going to be entirely healthy. But we regret to say that, looking over the whole structure of the Specialized Agencies, and the United Nations, we think that assumption is a little premature. For these reasons, Mr. President, we have very grave reservations regarding the detailed drafting of this resolution. We would be able to support it if the latter part were removed, but in its present form I am obliged to abstain.

[91] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the United Kingdom delegate.

[92] Sir Ben Bowen THOMAS (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, I think members of this Conference know that the United Kingdom has a reputation for believing that imaginative resourcefulness had better not be applied in the fields of finance. But nevertheless, we believe that the discussions that have taken place in this Conference with regard to the size of the Programme are such that we are now committed to the figure of $8,200,000; and the United Kingdom delegation wishes to say that it regards that as the starting point of this discussion. If, then, $8,200,000 is our figure, we have to try to see how we can bridge the gap between what we know will be received by way of contributions from Member States, and what are easily available resources elsewhere within the Organization. Members of the Administrative Commission know that within that Commission we had serious reservations. But we have reflected upon them and by now we feel that we must take the advice that is offered in the Administrative Commission's report. And all we do, really, is to suggest that the General Conference might accept its preamble, so as to be certain that, when we meet in our next Conference, we will not have added to our difficulties. The Director-General and the Executive Board, in reviewing the resources that have come from contributions of Member States and from these other sources, will see to it that income and expenditure have been keeping in step—that, consequently, we shall not have added to our burdens in that way.

[93] Mr. President, I do not know how you wish to take this document. Would you wish me now to move that the advice of the Administrative Commission be accepted in the form of a general resolution which would include this preamble in addition to the points laid down on page 7 of the document? Mr. President, I have pleasure in moving that.

[94] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of the United States.

[95] Mr. Howland H. SARGEANT (United States of America) — Mr. President, as one having had a modest part in the development of what has been referred to in such diplomatic terms by the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom as ingenious and resourceful financial proposals, I hope that none of you will let the Corporation of which I happen to be President in the United States (the Magnesia Development Corporation) know of your doubts as to my financial integrity and soundness.

[96] I come to the rostrum merely to make a couple of points which I think should be made

before we proceed to the vote on this particular resolution. First, I would support the amendment introduced by the delegate of the United Kingdom, in the form in which he proposes it; but I would ask him whether he would permit the insertion of what may seem to be a minor phrase, but which I think may prove to be one of some consequence, particularly to an administrator who is attempting to do the best he can in predicting income and outgo. I would propose, if this were agreeable to the delegate of the United Kingdom, that the preamble which he has moved as an amendment to the resolution of the Programme and Budget Commission on financing, be amended in this respect: that in the third line, following the words "as to ensure", there be added the words "in so far as possible", so that his resolution might then read:

Instructs the Director-General, in consultation with the Executive Board, so to regulate the rate of expenditure in 1951 as to ensure in so far as possible that the total amount of expenditure shall not exceed the total amount of income. . .

That is a small point, but frankly, if I were your executive in this programme, I should be inclined to like to have simply that small degree of tolerance and leeway: I hope that the United Kingdom may find that it is possible to accept it. . . I find that the honourable delegate of the United Kingdom is willing to accept that proposal.

[97] Second, I would like to make one or two remarks on the suggestions made by the honourable delegate of Australia. First, I think it is quite important to note the following: the Administrative Commission has not in fact made an adverse report on these proposed financial practices, which I know that Dr. Walker regards with a certain amount of rather dark suspicion and apprehension. Second, it does seem to me that, in accepting the United Kingdom proposal, I should make it quite clear that it is my understanding, in accepting this proposal, that the reasonably anticipated contribution level is, in fact, no less than the amount receivable from all Member States, minus the contribution of any country which states it will not pay in 1951. I think it is quite important that we adopt that as an understanding, otherwise I think the formula will not be sufficiently workable.

[98] The only other point that I think I would like to make is that my delegation has examined with extreme care the soundness of these imaginative proposals that are made. We have, in fact, started with the premise that we want Unesco, in 1951, to have a programme which can be maintained at the full level authorized by this Conference. We do believe that Unesco is now in a sound financial position. We do not believe that the adoption of the proposals that you have examined here this morning will impair that degree of financial soundness. What we are really doing here is to make an investment, in my opinion, in the growing programme of Unesco. I could agree with some of the doubts that have been expressed; and without entering into the technical points, (*a*) if Unesco were a business enterprise and (*b*) if we were talking about liquidating that enterprise, the liquidating value would be quite a different thing. What we are really talking about here, however, is a growing, healthy, soundly-based institution; and it is the opinion of the experts in my delegation, who have examined these financial proposals, that we shall not in fact impair the financial soundness of Unesco in this way, and that we shall, in addition, be able to assure the full programme level for 1951.

[99] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon Dr. Walker, the Australian delegate.

[100] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, there is only one point to which I wish to refer, and that is the definition suggested by the honourable delegate of the United States for certain words in the resolution. He said that the phrase concerning the total amount of income which may reasonably be expected to be received should be interpreted to mean the amounts assessed on Member States minus the amount which any Member State says that it will not pay. I suppose it is really for the drafter of the resolution to tell us whether that is the meaning he would place upon those words; I could only say that, on the basis of years of experience with the League of Nations and years of experience with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, to adopt such an interpretation and to enforce it strictly would really invalidate a great deal of the thinking which the United Nations have given to this problem in recent months. I would have interpreted it to mean that the Director-General and the Executive Board were to review the situation at regular intervals and to make up their minds, in the light of the information at their disposal, whether they could reasonably expect to receive money. But it happens, Mr. President, that countries just do not reply at all to enquiries; it happens that they sometimes say they will pay when they can, and they still do not always pay; and, unless the decision regarding what can reasonably be expected is left to the judgment of the Director-General and the Ex-

ecutive Board, it seems to me that the resolution should have been drafted very differently.

[101] My position frankly is that, while I was prepared to abstain on this resolution as it stood, if it is interpreted in the sense that the Director-General is to be urged and encouraged to spend up to the full amount of the contributions assessed, less only any amount which the Member States say they will not pay, then I shall have to vote against it. The point is that Member States are not asked, will they pay in a particular year, but will they pay some time; and the question is whether the money is receivable with respect to any particular year. Now the present position is that no country which is still in this Organization has told us that it will not pay its contribution for any year, and we still have an arrear of 500,000 dollars or something like that. In other words, it seems to me that, on the interpretation suggested by the United States, this resolution in effect amounts to an authorization to go ahead and spend the full amount without having regard to the reasonable probability that certain contributions will not be paid.

[102] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the South African delegate.

[103] Mr. I. F. A. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) — Mr. President, I regret to say that the South African delegation cannot support the addendum as moved by the United Kingdom delegation, and particularly as amended by the United States delegation. We agree entirely with the remarks made by Dr. Walker of the Australian delegation and will be compelled to vote against this addendum.

[104] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the French delegate.

[105] Mr. Guy LADREIT de LACHARRIÈRE (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow delegates, the resolution suggested by the British delegation is based on administrative considerations with which we cannot but concur. Technically, its various points are in accordance with sound administration, as also with the resolutions voted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Nevertheless, I would like to point out that, while this principle of strict administration is one of those by which Unesco must be guided, Unesco cannot be administered either like a business enterprise that is going into liquidation, as the United States delegate remarked just now, or like a bank or savings association which has to be prepared at any moment to give strict account of the money entrusted to it. This money is used for activities which we have all recently and solemnly declared to be of vital concern to the world, and strictly administrative considerations have to be modified in some degree by the primary necessity of enabling the Organization to play the important part that we have decided to entrust to it. It was yesterday, I believe, that this assembly decided that, on their return home, the delegations should draw their governments' attention to the need to revise their position with regard to the funds which they put at Unesco's disposal. And today there is no further question of asking our various governments to consider increasing their funds; the contrary seems now to be envisaged. The question is to ration still more strictly, in a more strictly financial spirit, the funds that we had already decided to put at the disposal of the Organization.

[106] The French delegation considers that to the sound, judicially and administratively correct basis of the suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegation, we should add the amendment suggested by the United States delegation—that is to say, that the words "in so far as possible" should be inserted in the third line of the second paragraph. This insertion gives a measure of flexibility to a resolution which, while financially and administratively justified, perhaps expresses a too strictly administrative point of view. For this reason, the French delegation will vote for the amendment proposed by the United States delegation—pointing out once again that we are here for the purpose of organizing the existence of the administration, and that that existence depends largely, but not wholly, on finance.

[107] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the Canadian delegate.

[108] Mr. Sidney POLLOCK (Canada) — Mr. President, I have no intention of participating in this particular phase of the discussions today. Those who were present in the Administrative Commission know what a difficult and long discussion we had at that stage. They also know that this proposal presented by the United Kingdom delegation is an exceedingly fair and generous compromise, in view of the strength and conviction with which they put forward their case in the Administrative Commission. I agree, as the representative of Canada, with the first amendment recommended by the representative of the United States. I believe the addition of the phrase "in so far as possible" is a sound and fair administrative proposition. But I am inclined to believe that we should not, on the second point he raised, attempt to adopt a somewhat

arbitrary and somewhat doubtful formula in place of what I feel we must always do—rely on the sound judgment of the Director-General and the Executive Board. I think it is fair to say that the Director-General and the Executive Board are no less anxious to maintain this Organization on a sound financial basis than are the Member States themselves. The adoption of the resolution as presented by the United Kingdom places on their shoulders the responsibility for making judgments in the light of the situation as it develops. I do not think we can depart from that. I do not think the question can be solved by the straight adoption of a formula. I would urge, in the interests of unanimity, and in order to permit the representative of Australia and others who have indicated their strong feelings on this latter point not to oppose the resolution but merely to abstain, that the representative of the United States should not press the second part of his resolution. That will enable us to adopt this resolution, which we think from a Canadian point of view to be a sound approach to the Organization's financial problems for 1951, and also to have a unanimous resolution.

[109] Mr. W. G. St. C. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission — Mr. President, my intervention will be very brief. As Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission, I feel I must in that capacity take exception to one phrase which the delegate of the United Kingdom incorporated in his resolution—that is the phrase, "on the advice of the Administrative Commission". If I might draw your attention to page 7 of the report of the Commission, you will see there that the Commission considered the resolution adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission. Paragraph (*a*) goes on to say that the Commission reaffirms the views which it has expressed and which it has communicated to the Programme and Budget Commission. Paragraph (*b*) says.

The Administrative Commission wishes to *indicate* the steps which it would be necessary for the General Conference to take if it decides to adopt the proposals made by the Programme and Budget Commission.

It then went on to outline the resolution, but I would stress that it did not proffer any advice on this subject to the General Conference.

[110] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the New Zealand delegate.

[111] Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand) — Mr. President, before deciding which way to vote on this particular resolution, the New Zealand delegation would like to ask the mover of the motion two questions. In the first place, does this statement of the instruction to the Director-General definitely mean that the cash deficit will not increase during 1951? I ought to know the answer to that, but I am afraid I cannot get it from this paper. I should be very glad if the mover would answer that question first. Secondly, would he state what was meant by the United Kingdom delegation with reference to the point raised by the United States? Does he take the term "may reasonably be expected" to mean that we will be able to spend up to the limit, and will only be stopped when we are told by any country that it will not pay? Our experience, as Dr. Walker has said, is that practically no country will say it will not pay. The easiest thing is to say nothing at all, and most countries in such circumstances do the easiest thing. We would like to know the answer to those questions before we can decide whether to vote for or against, or to abstain.

[112] The PRESIDENT — Does the delegate of the United Kingdom wish to reply?

[113] Sir Ben Bowen THOMAS (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, may I take the point raised by the Rapporteur and say that I would—as I am sure other speakers would—be quite prepared to hear the words that were used, and if it were necessary to precede this resolution by another sentence, to say that this General Conference decides to take the steps indicated in the Report of the Administrative Commission.

[114] With regard to the point raised by the delegate of New Zealand, we would find ourselves really in complete agreement with what was said both by the delegate of Canada and the delegate of France; we feel that this discretion could safely be left with the Director-General and the members of the Executive Board. We note with satisfaction that, over the period of the last two or three years, we can visualize what the income during any given period of years is likely to be, and consequently expenditure can be regulated in that way. We also note that the Director-General is taking certain steps, and we make additional suggestions in the Administrative Commission's Report regarding the ways in which he should bring a sense of responsibility to bear upon Member States. So we feel that the utmost we can do is to leave it to the Director-General and the Executive Board, in the light of their experience over the last few years, and as they keep things under current review, to see that expenditure is not outrunning income. And, of course, we would regard—as I have already suggested—the maximum of 8.2 million dollars as the maximum

beyond which no expenditure would be incurred. I hope that meets the point that was put by the delegate of New Zealand.

[115] Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand) — My first question was whether the net cash deficit could, under this resolution, actually increase during 1951.

[116] Sir Ben Bowen THOMAS (United Kingdom) — It is the intention of this resolution that the net cash deficit should not increase—that we should not find ourselves at the end of 1951 with an increase in that respect.

[117] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] No one else wishes to speak? Then we can proceed to the vote. In this connexion, I must draw the attention of the Conference to page 5, No. 7. "Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning Programmes and Budgets of Specialized Agencies", and more especially to items 1 and 2 on pages 5 and 6 respectively. We have before us a draft resolution presented by the Commission. We have an amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and opposed by the Australian and South African delegates, and another amendment, submitted by the United States and supported by France and Canada; I would prefer to call this an interpretation rather than an amendment. We will therefore adopt the following procedure: we will put to the vote the amendment, or interpretation, suggested by the United States, then the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom, and then the Commission's draft resolution. Does anyone wish to say anything about this procedure? I call upon the Director-General.

[118] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] I think the procedure you suggest is good, Mr. President. But we must realize that we have before us a formal amendment suggested by the United States delegation and supported by France, and also the interpretation of the preamble suggested by the United States of the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom. I think this question must be cleared up, because it is of the greatest importance with regard to the possibility of actually carrying out the programme that you have just approved.

[119] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I do not think that the very judicious remarks of our Director-General necessitate any change in the procedure that I proposed just now. Consequently, I ask the assembly to make its decision on the United States amendment, which I will read out. The suggestion is that the words "in so far as possible" should be added after "to ensure" in the resolution proposed by the United Kingdom. The amendment is *adopted* by 21 votes in favour, 2 against, and 3 abstentions.

[120] We will now vote on the formula proposed by the United Kingdom.

[121] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, we have had a formal amendment by the United States delegation to the amendment put forward by the United Kingdom. A majority has now adopted that amendment. There remains the interpretation of the preamble which was expressly made by the United States delegate. It seems to me that before proceeding to adopt the United Kingdom's amendment, we should clarify the matter by taking a vote on the interpretation given by the United States delegate, so that it may appear in the record.

[122] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] In that case it will be necessary for the United States delegate to formulate that interpretation or to repeat it. I therefore ask him to formulate it, so that I may put it to the vote.

[123] Mr. Howland H. SARGEANT (United States of America) — The interpretation which I asked for on the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom is really a simple one. Here is my intention. I think it is difficult for an executive or for the Director-General and the Executive Board to know fully what is in the minds of this General Conference when we speak in these terms. We ask them to ensure, in so far as possible, that the total amount of expenditure shall not exceed the total amount of income which may reasonably be expected to be received from the contributions of Member States. All I am suggesting is that this General Conference might wish to adopt an interpretation by which the Director-General and the Executive Board do know what it is we mean, what is our judgment regarding reasonably expected income. How do we know on 1 January who is going to pay and who is not? My suggestion was that I was making an interpretation of the United Kingdom amendment, on my understanding of this amendment, which was as follows:

The reasonably anticipated contribution level is no less than the amount received from all Member States, minus the contribution of any Member State which declares that it will not pay its assignment in 1951.

I hope that is perfectly clear.

[124] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The assembly has heard the interpretation just put forward by the United States delegate. As it has already been discussed, I do not think there is any need to re-open the debate.

[125] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — I would like to point out that it is my view that this interpretation makes nonsense of the whole resolution and my delegation will have to vote against it.

[126] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I think it is necessary to put to the vote the interpretation suggested by the United States delegate. Those who share the opinion expressed by the Australian delegate will vote against it. The French delegate wishes to speak.

[127] Mr. Guy LADREIT de LACHARRIÈRE (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, my humble opinion with regard to the procedure is as follows: we cannot vote on an interpretation before having voted on the text which is to be interpreted. If the American delegation suggests an amendment to the British amendment, we have to vote on the American amendment before voting on the amended proposition, that is to say, on the British proposition. If it is not an amendment in form, but an interpretation, it seems to me natural to vote on the text first of all, and afterwards on the interpretation of the text voted.

[128] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I think the French delegate is right. The United States delegate proposed an addition which we adopted by vote. Now we have an interpretation, and consequently the United Kingdom amendment should be put to the vote first, and the interpretation we wish to give to it afterwards. I call upon the Australian delegate.

[129] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, I would agree with the delegate of France that, as a general rule, you pass a resolution and then interpret it if there is any doubt; but the two suggested interpretations are so divergent that in fact there is a substantially different recommendation. The text of the United Kingdom resolution says that the expenditure shall not exceed the total amount of income which may reasonably be expected. The United States says that the way to determine that figure is to determine it in a purely mechanical way by simply saying: what is the amount of the contributions assessed? 8.2 million. Has any country declared on 1 January 1950 that it would not pay? Take the answer, if any, deduct it from 8.2 million, and that is how you apply it. It seems to me that that proposal is in effect clearly an amendment to the text which reads: the amount which may reasonably be expected. It substitutes almost a mathematical process to be applied, and from that point of view I certainly do not think that it could be introduced into the resolution after the resolution has been adopted. I would submit from the point of view of procedure that, if the United States delegate's view is to be pressed at all, it should take the form of an amendment to the wording of the resolution. I do not mind doing the drafting for him. I have to vote against it, but his words should read: "should not exceed the total amount of the income assessed for the year, minus—and these are his words now—the amount of any contributions which the State in question has declared that it will not pay as of 1 January 1951". I think in principle it is an amendment of substance and should therefore, in some way or other, be taken before the resolution is voted.

[130] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The United States delegate has just set down his interpretation in writing. It thus constitutes an amendment and I am obliged to put it to the vote. Here is the interpretation proposed by the United States delegate:

The reasonably anticipated contribution level is no less than the amount receivable from all Member States minus the contribution of any country which states it will not pay in respect of the year 1951.

This therefore constitutes a true amendment, and I put it to the vote.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[131] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The amendment is *adopted* by 17 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

[132] We now go on to the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom, in the wording with which you are acquainted, document 5C/121. I put it to the vote.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[133] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The amendment is *adopted* by 16 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

[134] We will now go on to the recommendations in document 5C/ADM/25 (rev.), page 6, to which the Commission wishes to draw the attention of the Conference. I put them to the vote. No comments? *Adopted.*

[135] We can now put the report as a whole to the vote, taking into account all that has already been said and voted. If there are no further comments, I take it as *adopted.*

Gentlemen, the meeting is closed.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 5 p.m.

CONTENTS

		Page
XXIX.	Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission (*continuation*)	235
XXX.	Consideration of the Second and Third Reports of the Budget Committee and of the draft Appropriation Resolution and Appropriation Table for 1951	238
XXXI.	Proposal for the establishment of a Committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture.	238
XXXII.	Draft Resolution on international understanding presented by the Belgian delegation	239
XXXIII.	Draft Financial Resolution presented by the French delegation	242
XXXIV.	Consideration of the Report of the Nominations Committee	243
XXXV.	Tribute to Dr. Walter H. C. Laves	244
XXXVI.	Final speeches of the Fifth Session of the General Conference	244

President: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy).

[1] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, before we resume our discussions, there is one matter I must set right. At this morning's meeting, the delegate of Iraq spoke on the treatment of Arabs by the State of Israel. Certain of his remarks were out of keeping with the dignity of this gathering and I regret that I did not use my authority as President to silence them. I have no wish to open a discussion on this subject, which would lead us into deep waters, quite apart from the fact that it is not within the purview of Unesco. But I wish to state that the Conference cannot accept the type of speech and the accusations we heard this morning from the delegate of Iraq. It was my duty as President to make this clear.

XXIX. Consideration of the Report of the Administrative Commission (*continuation*).

[2] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Secondly, as you are aware, the discussion on the financial question led to a somewhat confusing vote which has been accepted with a certain degree of coolness and scepticism. Several delegations have requested me to clarify the situation. I hope this will not mean a renewing of the whole discussion, which would be too complicated. However, I would suggest that the Conference should allow the United States representative to put forward a proposal revised in consultation with the delegations of other Member States. We could allow two speakers to this proposal, one in favour and the other against, provided they do not exceed the normal time-limit. Then once the situation has been made quite clear and full agreement has been reached among the majority of members, we could take a new vote ratifying or modifying this morning's vote. If the Conference has no objection, this is the procedure we shall adopt. I call upon the representative of the United States of America.

[3] Mr. Howland H. SARGEANT (United States of America) — Mr. President, I will try to be very brief. It seemed to some of us, after the conclusion of the debate that took place this morning, with regard to the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom and the resolution of the Programme and Budget Commission on financing the 1951 Budget, that, first, there were a number of delegates who were not entirely clear as to the provisions for which they had voted. Secondly, it seemed to me, as it seemed to others, as the President has reported, that this is an issue which,

in fact, is grave for some of the delegations here. Now, we have no brief for the proposal which my delegation put forward. Since this is the only way of achieving a solution which I think most of us do, in fact, want to achieve, I have a proposal to make which is by way of explanation of the objective we are trying to reach. If this were found more acceptable to the members of the Conference, I would then be willing to withdraw the interpretation that was made with regard to the United Kingdom amendment and was voted on this morning.

[4] In the resolution of the Programme and Budget Commission on financing the 1951 Budget —you will find this on page 7 of your document, under item 8—you will see that there is at present an indication by the Administrative Commission of the action which it would be necessary for the General Conference to take, if it decided to adopt the proposals made by the Programme and Budget Commission with regard to the ceiling of $8,200,000. This would consist of passing the following resolution: you will note points 1, 2, 3 and 4. This morning you voted the United Kingdom amendment, which comes as a preamble to this section. My proposal is a very simple one. It is that we add a fifth item to this resolution, reading as follows:

By special exception to Financial Regulation 25, the amount of $167,496, saved as the result of the further effects of devaluation of the 1950 Budget, shall be transferred to the Miscellaneous Income for the year 1951.

I believe that agreement on the addition of this amendment to the present Programme and Budget resolution would, in fact, contribute to the attainment of the objective which many of us would like to have achieved, of giving to the Director-General and the Executive Board for the year 1951 a programme level which is commensurate, in fact, with the amount of money which is being voted. On condition that you give your approval to the item 5 which I am suggesting to you, I would be willing, with the agreement of this body, to withdraw the interpretation which was discussed at some length this morning and was ultimately approved by this body. I do this in part because I think the discussion was rather complicated and confusing, except to a few of the more learned experts here, so that it was difficult for the General Conference to deal with it; but—what is more important—I have reason to believe and to hope that delegations which have had a certain reserve with regard to the position taken here, might be able to associate themselves more readily with this new proposal; and I think it is in keeping with the spirit of Unesco that we try to find that kind of unanimity.

[5] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] According to the procedure you have just adopted at my suggestion, we should now allow one delegate to speak against this proposal. I call on the delegate of Australia who, I think, will oppose the motion.

[6] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, if it were necessary, I would speak in favour of the withdrawal of the United States interpretation which was voted on this morning, because we voted against that interpretation: but, since the withdrawal is made conditional upon the acceptance of still another financial arrangement to try and cover the Budget of 1951, I am obliged to speak against it.

[7] I would agree with the honourable delegate of the United States that it would appear as though many delegations were not altogether clear as to what we were doing this morning, and in that connexion I might say that, as I understand it, this is what we are doing. We already adopted a report this morning in which we had a resolution [you will find it on page 6 of the English text of Annex I of document 5C/ADM/25 (rev.)] in which we said there was a cash deficit of $504,000. We therefore decided that, so long as any cash deficiency exists, any surpluses that appear in any year are not to be surrendered to reduce the contributions of Member States in subsequent years. They are to be held instead by the Organization. Under the Regulations, normally, if we had a surplus in one year, we would use that money to reduce the amount that Member States pay two years later; but, so long as this cash deficiency exists, we have decided to withhold any surpluses that are created.

[8] Now, the methods suggested by the United States to finance any gap appearing in the 1951 Budget all take the form of saying—"Let us take any of the surplus that emerges and apply it, not for the purpose of covering our past deficiences, but the purpose of covering our expenditure in 1951". This new suggestion is along those same lines. The Director-General said, "as a result of devaluation I need not spend quite as much, and therefore, provided I get all my income, I shall have a surplus." But, under the decision already taken this morning, if he does have a surplus, he is not able to distribute that money by way of reduction of Members' contributions—he is to keep it to cover our past deficiencies. Under the United States proposal, he is not to use it to cover our past deficiencies; he is to use it to support the programme of 1951. Our view of

sound financial administration is, that when you take a resolution to apply certain monies to cover your past deficiencies, you should not at the same time try to apply the same money to meet your future deficiencies.

[9] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] As you have just heard, the delegate of Australia is against the proposal. I can therefore accord the right to speak only to a delegate in favour of the proposal. I call upon the delegate of the United Kingdom.

[10] Sir Ben Bowen THOMAS (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, the delegation of the United Kingdom would like to identify itself completely with the statement made by the delegate of the United States of America. We accept the programme of $8.2 million, as we said this morning, and we are most anxious that in 1951 that programme should be carried out. We are most anxious, too, that the resources provided—it is true, by exceptional measures—should be at the disposal of the Director-General and the Executive Board, and for that reason we hope that the new and additional suggestion made by the delegate of the United States will be found acceptable to this General Conference.

[11] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of New Zealand.

[12] Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand) — Mr. President, I think I did ask for the right, as a possible abstainer, to speak today, because I feel that my own state of confusion of mind perhaps represents that of other delegates who have no financial experts with them. There are various matters on which I am still not clear and at this stage I shall not ask more questions. It appears to me, in my simplicity perhaps, that our net deficit—if I may answer the question that I asked this morning myself—that our net deficit for 1951 will, in effect, actually be up, and that we shall have a deficit of $247,000 more than we would have had if we had not adopted this particular method, because that $247,000 was going to be used to reduce our existing deficit. It appears to me also that the one result that perhaps some of us have not clearly got, from the passing of certain financial regulations this morning, is that we have decided not to redistribute, in future, contributions from Member States which, in fact, we have never yet received. That also affects the situation. There is one thing on which I think I am clear, and that is that Member States in 1951 —if the whole series of proposals we are considering are passed—will in effect be paying some $400,000 that they would not have paid otherwise, because that money would have been carried over from the previous year to reduce their 1951 contributions. We, of the New Zealand delegation, are not at all happy about the financial measures that have been taken today. If I understood them better, I feel that I should be able perhaps to vote against them; but I am very anxious not to vote against, Sir, and if I can take advantage of my own ignorance of the situation, and abstain, I shall be very happy.

[13] Mr. W. G. St. C. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur of the Administrative Commission — Mr. President, I would just like to point out, *à propos* of the United States resolution, that there is in the report of the Administrative Commission a resolution 19.4, proposing a certain disposal of this surplus in accordance with the Director-General's recommendations. I would like to point out that, coupled with the United States resolution as proposed to this meeting, there will have to be a rescission of this particular resolution 19.4.

[14] The PRESIDENT [*Translation from the French*] We can now take a vote. I put to the vote the following amendment presented by the delegation of the United States of America:

By special exception to Financial Regulation 25, the amount of $167,496, saved as a result of the further effects of devaluation on the 1950 Budget, shall be transferred to the Miscellaneous Income for the year 1951.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[15] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The amendment is *adopted* by 19 votes cast in favour, with 4 against and 8 abstentions. As the Rapporteur has pointed out, resolution 19.4 in document 5C/ADM/25 (rev.), Annex 1, pages 6-7, is therefore rescinded. May I express my gratification at this result, since, to be frank, the discussion on this matter was becoming too prolonged? We may take it that the interpretation of the United Kingdom proposal suggested this morning by the American delegation is also cancelled.

[16] We shall now return to our discussion of document 5C/OXR/23 - Report of the Official and External Relations Commission: Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the programmes and budgets of the Specialized Agencies. This item was not considered at our previous meeting. Are there any comments? There are none. ***Adopted.***

XXX. Consideration of the Second and Third Reports of the Budget Committee.

[17] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the Rapporteur, who is Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

[18] Mr. Sidney POLLOCK (Canada), Vice-Chairman of the Budget Committee — Mr. President, the Conference has already dealt with the first report of the Budget Committee, which recommended the basis for proceeding next year. There are two further reports which the Budget Committee is responsible for submitting to the General Conference under its terms of reference [documents 5C/BUD/3 and 5C/BUD/4]. The first includes the recommendations on the current year's financial practices and on future financial practices, which are derived from a study by the Budget Committee of the financial activities of the Organization. Now, as you know, the Budget Committee had a very large number of meetings and in the course of those meetings it recommended a very large number of detailed proposals. Some of those were included in the interim report which was submitted, and others are included in the summary record. Rather than attempt to prepare a long, complicated resolution, which would set forth all the detailed proposals which we have recommended, the Budget Committee instead, in its report No. 2, is recommending a simple resolution asking the Executive Board and the Director-General, in carrying out their programme and in administering the Budget for next year, to take into account the conclusions and recommendations made by the Budget Committee in the course of its meetings. In that way the Secretariat will have at its disposal the exchange of views and the previous reports of the Budget Committee, on which to decide whether or not there are useful ways in which the administration and financing of the Organization could be improved in 1951.

[19] The other report—No. 3—in document 5C/BUD/4 is merely the reflection of the decisions of the various Committees and Commissions of this Conference in a budget resolution. As you know, there was extensive discussion in the Programme Commission, the Budget Committee and the Committee of Eight, with a view to arriving at budgetary appropriations which would provide the funds required for carrying out the Organization's programme during 1950. The present appropriation resolution merely reflects the combination of all those decisions, and it is set forth in the Draft Appropriation Tables which are recommended for adoption by the General Conference. I should perhaps draw attention to only one exceptional feature in that appropriation. You will note in the appropriation resolution that the appropriations total 8.3 million dollars, and from them—on page 4 of the English text—there are deducted savings due to the institution of a local salary system and other changes in the salary and allowance system. The reason for including those as a deduction, rather than by deducting them from the individual appropriations, is that there are very technical and complicated financial formulae that enter into the computation in the exact way in which these changes in the salary and allowance system will be reflected in the appropriations and in the appropriation resolution. The Director-General is authorized to make those changes when he has completed his calculations, therefore the Appropriation Table, in the final analysis, will be established at 8.2 million dollars, and the resolution on page 1, Annex I, authorizes the Director-General to make expenditures in conformity with the same principles which have been adopted in previous years for voting and administering the Budget.

[20] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Fellow delegates, you have just heard the Rapporteur's comments on Reports 2 and 3. Are there any speakers on this matter? There are none. I therefore put Report No. 2 to the vote. As there are no comments, I declare it *adopted.*

[21] Report No. 3. I understand that if this report is adopted, a number of delegates will abstain—those of Australia, Norway and New Zealand. It would therefore be preferable to take a vote.

The vote was taken by a show of hands.

[22] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] The report is adopted by 29 votes cast in favour, with none against and 7 abstentions.

XXXI. Proposal for the establishment of a Committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture.

[23] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We now come to item 18 of the revised agenda: Establishment of a committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science, and culture, for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between peoples [document 5C/2). The delegate of Norway wishes to speak.

[24] Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway) — Mr. President, you will recall that, at the last Con-

ference, in Paris, the subject before us was dealt with in a series of lectures at the Maison de la Chimie. The Norwegian National Commission thought that this subject ought to be followed by the preparation of a declaration of the duties of the States in these matters, and therefore the question has been included in the Agenda by the Executive Board. We thought that such a declaration might contribute to the aim of furthering understanding between the States. It cannot, of course, enforce anything; but such a declaration might, shall we say, be the conscience of the States. It would set forth what they ought to do. It would also have another object: it would show statesmen that certain things which they have practised hitherto have not furthered them in their real object, since, in many respects, repression has had exactly the opposite effect. I may mention, for instance, the question of linguistic oppression, of which we have had so many cases in Europe and elsewhere. Every linguistic historian will tell you that if the States in Europe had not tried to suppress minority languages, many of those languages would have died peacefully. Though, when the authorities tried to suppress them, they sprang into new life, they were galvanized, so to speak, into a new lease of life. The object is therefore not only to show States what they ought to do in these matters, but also to bring certain facts to their knowledge. The Norwegian National Commission, therefore, was very strongly in favour of the preparation of such a declaration. It applied to the Norwegian Government, and the Norwegian Government was willing to take the matter up. When it heard that, in my capacity as a member of the Executive Board, I had the right to propose that the matter be included in the Agenda of this Conference, it preferred to let me do so. That was why I proposed, at one of the last meetings of the Board, that this item be included in the Agenda, where it now appears as item 18.

[25] This matter ought to be studied very thoroughly, because we must avoid any overlapping between such a declaration and the Declaration of Human Rights. I therefore suggest that the Conference ask the Director-General to have the matter studied, with a view to possible action at the next General Conference, and I have the honour to propose the following resolution:

The Director-General is authorized to consider the setting up of a Committee to prepare a Declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture, for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between the people, and to report thereon to the next session of the General Conference.

You will understand that this does not imply any budgetary provision. The matter will be studied and brought before the next General Conference.

[26] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Are there any other speakers? As there are none, I put to the vote the proposal you have just heard regarding the establishment of a committee. *Adopted.*

XXXII. Draft resolution presented by the Belgian delegation.

[27] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We now have a draft resolution presented by the Belgian delegation. The delegate of Belgium has asked to speak on document 5C/123.

[28] Mr. Louis VERNIERS (Belgium) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, I must first apologize for asking permission of you, at this eleventh hour, to impose a new burden on the Conference, already wearied by weeks of toil and exhausted by the heat. Secondly, I must thank you for granting me, with your customary kindness, the right to speak. Without indulging in any flowery eloquence I should, however, like to appeal to your feelings and your reason in submitting the present draft resolution to you. It calls for lengthy comments, but, I assure you, I shall be very brief. I ought to tell you what heart-searchings the Belgian delegation has had over the past few days. We thought the best course was to respond honestly and loyally to the Director-General's appeal addressed to the Executive Board in March and communicated to Member States on the Board's responsibility. Our aim in submitting resolution 5C/25 was to suggest immediate action for peace, but our draft did not have the fortune to meet with your approval. Perhaps it was a rather rash proposal, put forward without sufficient regard to political repercussions. You judged it best not to press the issue and, to save the Conference from embarrassment, we withdrew the draft resolution. Subsequently you had before you the joint resolution of the United States of America, France and other countries; that resolution you adopted, with the approval of the Belgian delegation. However, I feel I am speaking for all the members of my delegation, of which I am now the sole representative, when I say that the Belgian delegation has a vague feeling of compunction and uneasiness, as it seems to us that we have fallen short of our duty. And so we thought that we might take this opportunity to sum up in clearer form the main ideas that have emerged from the stormy and somewhat acrid discussions

of the last few days. I think it would be best if I re-read this draft resolution, which you have barely had time to examine, adding brief comments as I read.

[29] What is in this draft? Firstly, it affirms Unesco's desire for peace and its resolve to contribute to the maintenance and defence of peace, acting within the framework of the United Nations, of which Unesco is an integral part, but with its own particular means and within the limits of the powers vested in it. I repeat, this contribution must be made within the limits of Unesco's competence as an educational, scientific and cultural body forming part of the larger framework of the United Nations. On this clearly defined basis, we should appeal to Member States to take action within the United Nations Specialized Agencies and the United Nations Organization itself to ensure the smoother running of the now somewhat creaking machinery of the United Nations, so that peace may be firmly established for many generations to come; and not to Member States alone; we should also appeal to all who have power to bring about better understanding between individuals and nations, to the teachers and scholars at all levels, to the journalists, film producers, specialists in broadcasting—all who do and must contribute directly to the implementation of our basic programme and our successive annual programmes. Having thus pledged Unesco's sincere desire and resolve to work with every means at its disposal for the cause of peace, which is the common ideal of the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies, we should demonstrate the sincerity of our aims to all the world and, at our Conferences, expert committees and other meetings, we should set an example of tolerance and broad understanding, showing that we favour the free and unimpeded exchange of all ideas and principles. Mr. President, these are the brief comments I would make on this draft resolution, which I should be extremely grateful to have adopted unanimously, not, I assure you, for any personal motive nor even for any national motive, but because of my firm faith in Unesco.

[30] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Have any other delegates asked to speak? I call upon the delegate of Cuba.

[31] Dr. Mariano BRULL (Cuba) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, Mr. Director-General, fellow delegates, the Cuban delegation has carefully considered the Belgian proposal you have just heard and feels it to be very important, since it is confined within the limits of our competence, and, at the same time, amplifies the resolution on the subject of peace, adopted at our meeting yesterday.

[32] I am whole-heartedly in favour of this proposal, which I find in every respect exactly in line with our aims; however, with the permission of the Belgian delegate, I should like to make one small amendment to paragraph 4, to which I would suggest adding the following: "with a view to achieving the maximum degree of co-operation between all peoples and governments". That is all I would ask.

[33] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the representative of the United Nations.

[34] Mr. Gustavo DURÁN (United Nations) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, four weeks ago, Mr. Laugier spoke to you of the Secretary-General's concern at the difficulties now confronting the United Nations, with which you are all acquainted. While, on the Belgian delegation's proposal, this meeting is now discussing a draft resolution which is the clearest demonstration of Unesco's desire to co-operate more closely, in its own particular field, in the United Nations campaign for peace, the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations feels bound to express his agreement with the spirit that inspires this proposal. I do not think I am overstepping my role at this General Conference in remarking that the adoption of this resolution would be of definite assistance to the United Nations in the present difficult situation. I am convinced that, if this motion is adopted, the Secretary-General of the United Nations will give it the most careful attention and that he would use every means in his power to ensure that it is brought effectively to the knowledge of the appropriate bodies of the United Nations.

[35] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I must apologize to the delegate of the United States of America for having called upon the representative of the United Nations before him. I now ask him to speak.

[36] Mr. Howland F. SARGEANT (United States of America) — Mr. President, I was delighted that, in fact, you did give priority to the remarks of the representative of the United Nations, Mr. Durán. I listened to them with profit, and I have perhaps saved approximately two minutes of the remarks that I was going to make—though not with the same degree of eloquence that he commands.

[37] I am happy that we have a resolution of the kind that has been advanced here by the distinguished leader of the Belgian delegation.

Conferences have a way, like people, of getting old; at least I feel I have aged a little in the course of the weeks I have spent here and, towards the end of the hard and difficult series of schedules, it is very easy to think that all we are doing is the shuffling of papers and coming to votes. It is very difficult for us sometimes, sitting here in the Pitti Palace, to remember that these are very real and live issues. I am delighted that this resolution takes into account a feeling which I know is shared by each one of us here, that Unesco, in carrying out its mission to contribute to peace and security in the world, will do this within the framework of the United Nations, and that Unesco, in acting in the capacity of what has been called the conscience of mankind, is, in fact, calling to the peoples of the world and the Member States to help make this framework of action, within which Unesco must discharge its functions, become again a truly effective and operative instrument. This is particularly pleasing to me and to the members of the United States delegation, because our own policy is, and has been, I am proud to say, based on a complete, absolute and open devotion to the principles and purposes of the United Nations. We believe that the member delegations here today, in adopting the resolution proposed by the Belgian delegation, as I hope they will, courageously and unanimously, will show to the world, as we are adjourning this Fifth Session of the General Conference in Florence, that we have not in fact lost sight of the great mission and the great goals that were in our minds when each of us came here. I would close with a thought—for which I think we are indebted to the Indian delegation—that has been with me much during this Conference. I think this draft resolution now before us illustrates this one sentence: "Reality is at the height of our conceptions". I think this is what we must feel is the mission of Unesco; I think that we can say, as we conclude our deliberations, that, in adopting the resolution before us, we shall affirm before the world that reality is, indeed, at the height of our conceptions.

[38] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Denmark.

[39] Professor Jakob NIELSEN (Denmark) — Mr. President, I want whole-heartedly to support the motion of our Belgian colleague. When I read it, a few minutes ago, it came to my mind that I might perhaps use this occasion to draw the attention of my colleagues in this Unesco General Conference, as it comes to a close, to a step which has been taken in a similar direction, even if on other ground, by one of my countrymen whose name many of you will know, the physicist Niels Bohr. He, five days ago, in an open letter addressed to the United Nations, explained his view on the conditions for open-mindedness and peaceful collaboration among the nations at a time when we are on the verge of commanding forces hitherto unknown to mankind. He did so, on the ground of his close collaboration in those matters, as regards both their scientific and their political implications. I am sorry I cannot lay before you the text of his long memorandum, which I received only two hours ago and in the Danish language; but I think many of you will be able to take cognizance of that open letter in the days to come in a language which you understand. I think it coincides exactly with the spirit of Unesco, in its special view based on the special knowledge of the man who puts it forward and the goal he aims at; it corresponds very closely to the whole spirit of the resolution put forward by our Belgian colleague. I think (with your permission, Mr. President, that I might draw the attention of all those here present to this open letter, and ask them to obtain copies of it as soon as they can.

[40] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of France.

[41] Mr. Paul MONTEL (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the French delegation whole-heartedly supports the draft resolution presented by the distinguished delegate of Belgium. We consider it an amplified, clearer and more final expression of those principles that we, with other delegations, so gladly adopted yesterday. All these resolutions are directed towards the same aim: to give increasingly concrete expression to our desire for security, freedom and justice.

[42] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, we have before us a draft resolution presented by the Belgian delegation, with an amendment suggested by the Cuban delegation. I would ask Mr. Verniers if he can accept that amendment: I think that it is merely an addition to his own proposal. You have heard both the resolution and the amendment and I therefore think it is unnecessary for me to reread them. But, considering the gravity of the vote you are about to take, it would be advisable to take it by standing and not by the simpler method we usually adopt. Would those who are in favour of the draft resolution, as presented by the Belgian delegation and amended by the Cuban delegation, please stand?

The vote was taken.

[43] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I announce the *unanimour adoption* of

the amended resolution. I call upon the Director-General.

[44] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. PRESIDENT, gentlemen, may I say how pleased I am at the adoption of the resolution you have just passed unanimously. In all sincerity I believe that this is the perfect complement to that approved by the Programme and Budget Commission yesterday evening on the motion of a number of delegations and confirmed by yourselves this morning. Taken together, the two resolutions reveal a will to peace which does honour to this Conference and testifies to the fidelity of all of us to Unesco's supreme ideal.

[45] At this stage, when you are bringing your work to a close, I feel it to be necessary to give you my absolutely frank opinion on the results achieved. I had hoped that this session of the Conference might mark a turning point in the development of our Organization. It would be going too far to suggest that that hope has been entirely fulfilled. The characteristic note of this Conference has been less one of decision than of heart-searching and, in certain matters, of clarification. That, of course, is not all that we could have wished, but it is a great deal. You have defined a basic programme which had never previously been explicitly stated. You have agreed upon a statement of methods, which had not previously been made. You have defined a policy of recommendations and conventions which will, I am convinced, be fruitful in the years to come. An excellent instance of what we can secure by these means is the Agreement on the free importation of educational, scientific and cultural material, whose ratification you are recommending to your governments. You have recorded your intention of increasing Unesco's resources and have promised to do it by trying to overcome the financial difficulties arising from arrangements which, though necessarily temporary, are the best that could be devised in view of the criteria adopted for the establishment of a budget ceiling. It would be premature to express any views on the worth of these results. As trees are judged by their fruit, so the resolutions of an international conference are judged by the action in which they issue. What happens in the year which lies before us will, in my view, be of vital importance to this Organization. We must be vigilant to ensure that the work of the Secretariat and the activities of Member States in matters within Unesco's sphere are more effectively integrated than they have been so far. We must plan bold and simple tasks, for the better service of peace through education, science and culture. We must secure action within each Member State to spur rulers and private bodies to augment the slender financial resources at our disposal. For all this, two things are essential: mutual trust and mutual understanding. But can we really doubt that we shall find that spirit of trust and understanding? We are met in a country which, in its greatest epoch, was governed by a sage, the philosopher-emperor, Marcus Aurelius, the author of the profound epigram: "What is not good for the hive, cannot be good for the bee." Its application to our own age is obvious. What is not good for humanity as a whole cannot be good for any nation, race or individual. That, surely, is an exact definition of the intellectual and moral solidarity of the peoples to which Unesco is dedicated.

[46] This has been a difficult Conference, because all definition is difficult. Let us, then, pray that the difficulties may lead to a more conscious effort to see clearly in the future so that we may all more effectively serve the noble aims of Unesco. It is with that prayer in my heart that I thank you for your work and offer to Italy, in the person of Senator Jacini, our warmest gratitude for the generous hospitality she has afforded us.

[47] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before passing on to the report of the Nominations Committee, I call upon the delegate of France.

XXXIII. Draft resolution presented by the French delegation.

[48] Mr. Guy LADREIT de LACHARRIÈRE (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Fellow delegates, after the solemn resolution that has been unanimously adopted this afternoon, it is with some diffidence that the French delegation submits to you a resolution also referring to Unesco's work for peace; it will not require a vote taken by standing, but the French delegation trusts that it will be unanimously adopted. This resolution is concerned with financial matters. You will recollect that the Conference yesterday adopted a resolution presented by certain delegations, specially requesting the Executive Board and the Director-General to consider schemes, within the framework of Unesco's work for peace, which may be financed, not from the regular budget but by voluntary contributions from the greatest possible number of countries. These schemes, once they have been initiated, can thus be financed from resources that we trust will be adequate. But, through an unfortunate oversight, there is no financial resolution in 1950

providing for preliminary consideration of these schemes, so that they may be carried into effect in 1951. The French delegation wishes to help make good that omission. The Executive Board and the Director-General would have to be authorized in 1950 to devote any savings that may be made on the 1950 appropriations to the financing, by means of transfers approved by the Executive Board, of preliminary surveys for the preparation of projects that might be set on foot in 1951. The Executive Board has general power to authorize the Director-General to make such transfers. Technically, however, to enable the Director-General to take such action, a programme resolution is required: a project to which those sums could be transferred. As we view the matter, if the resolution proposed by the French delegation is not adopted, all such transfers would be impossible. Hence, the French delegation to this Conference wishes to authorize the Director-General and the Executive Board to devote any savings that may be effected in the 1950 budget to preliminary surveys for the large-scale projects that Unesco is to carry out in 1951 to consolidate its work for peace.

[49] Accordingly, the French delegation formally proposes the following resolution:

The General Conference instructs the Director-General and the Executive Board to devote any savings that may be made in 1950 to the financing, during the current year, by means of transfers approved by the Executive Board, of surveys relating to special projects designed to attain the aims set by the resolution contained in document 5C/119.

This is the resolution, approved by the Conference, to which I referred a moment ago.

[50] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, you have just heard the French delegate's proposal. Does no one wish to speak? In that case, I will put the proposal to the vote. It is a new resolution. Will anyone second it? It is seconded by Senator Casati (Italy) and by the delegate of the United States of America. If there are no comments, I shall consider it *approved*.

XXXIV. Consideration of the Report of the Nominations Committee.

[51] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] We now come to the report of the Nominations Committee. I call upon the delegate of Australia.

[52] Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia) — Mr. President, this is a piece of routine Conference business, for which preparations were made this morning, a blackboard was prepared and names were written up. The blackboard had disappeared with the names, but we still have to complete the business. The Conference decided some little time ago to establish a Budget Committee, consisting of representatives of eleven Member States, which will begin its meeting one week before the opening date of the Sixth Session of the General Conference; and it is necessary for the Conference to elect the countries to be represented on that Committee. The matter was considered by the Nominations Committee this morning at its fourth meeting, and the Committee decided to nominate, or to recommend to the Plenary Session, the election of eleven countries, the names of which I shall read. The first country that we thought of was the Netherlands, which supplied the Chairman of the Budget Committee during the present Conference. We also thought it essential that the Committee should include representatives of the major contributors to the funds of the Organization, as well as other countries which have taken an interest in budgetary matters and would represent a wide geographical distribution. The names proposed, therefore, are as follows: Australia, Cuba, Egypt, France, India, the Netherlands, Persia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Yugoslovia. I have the honour to propose, on behalf of the Nominations Committee, that the Conference elect those countries to serve on the Budget Committee to meet before the Conference next year. The Nominations Committee also decided to recommend to the Conference that, in the event of any country which is included in the Committee being unable to send a representative to the meeting, that country should be authorized by the Conference to arrange for another Member State in the same region to provide an alternative representative in its stead. I would add that the Nominations Committee took note of the fact—as no doubt the Conference will—that, in the decision establishing this Committee, provision is made for the Chairman of the Executive Board or his designated representative to take part in the meetings of the Committee without the right to vote, but on the ordinary advisory basis. In that way the views of the Finance Committee of the Executive Board will be made available to this Budget Committee. I have the honour to move, therefore, that the aforesaid countries be elected to the Budget Committee.

[53] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] You have just heard the remarks of the delegate of Australia, speaking as Chairman of the Nominations Committee. If there are no objec-

tions, I regard the proposals he has just made as *approved.*

[54] Sir Ronald Adam has asked to speak on a particular subject.

XXXV. Tribute to Dr. Walter H. C. Laves.

[55] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, I should like, on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, to pay a tribute to the work of Walter Laves as Deputy Director-General. As you all know, he is shortly leaving to return to his own country. The Chairman of the Executive Board in the early days of our Conference paid an eloquent tribute to Walter Laves' services, but we felt that we also, from the floor, could propose another vote of thanks. He has served from the very early days of the Organization under two Directors-General, and during that time Unesco has been under the difficulty of carrying out a programme and establishing a sound organization. Under the guidance of two Directors-General, Walter Laves has done a great deal to establish that organization. As one who has sat on four Budget Committees, where I think one notices more about the organization than anywhere else, I should like firstly to pay tribute to how that organization has gained strength during the past four years. We owe a great deal to our Deputy Director-General. He has been a very loyal servant to two Directors-General, and it is by his hard and unremitting work that the results have been obtained. We should like to thank him for all he has done. We know he is not lost to Unesco and that when he returns to the United States he will add another to those many great supporters of Unesco's work in that great country. Perhaps we may even see him returning—at least, we hope so—as a member of a United States delegation. Meanwhile, in addition to our thanks, we should like to wish Walter Laves, and his charming wife, all success in the future; and, if I may, I should like to propose a definite resolution:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

NOTES with regret that Dr. Walter Laves has found it necessary to leave the Organization which he has served so faithfully and effectively as Deputy Director-General since the first days of its existence,

EXPRESSES its thanks and appreciation of the way in which he has devoted himself unstintingly to the work and ideals of Unesco, and

RESOLVES to appoint him an Honorary Counsellor of Unesco.

[56] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, gentlemen, I am moved by this well-deserved tribute that the General Conference is paying to Dr. Walter Laves as one of Unesco's most distinguished servants. I have already expressed my deep regret at his departure, both to the Executive Board and to this Conference in my report on Unesco's work since the last General Conference. But I should like once again to say how very deeply and sincerely I regret the departure of a man who has devoted years of unremitting toil to the complex task of devising the working methods of a young organization. The results so evident to us here today are largely due to his courage, intelligence and unswerving loyalty to Unesco. I think it is not only my duty, but also, in a way, my right, to express my personal gratitude to Dr. Walter Laves, my sorrow at his departure, and to thank the Conference for its applause, which has moved me as deeply as though it were a tribute to myself; I thank the Conference with all my heart.

[57] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, I should like, both as President of the Conference and as member of the Executive Board, to endorse whole-heartedly the eloquent tribute which has just been paid to Dr. Laves. As an old member of Unesco, which I joined in Beirut, I have seen Dr. Laves at work in Paris, here in Florence and in other parts of the world and know that he has never wavered in his service to the great cause that he has espoused. I am sure that I am speaking for all my colleagues on the Executive Board in expressing to the Conference our admiration for the way in which he has carried out his task and our regret that it has come to an end.

XXXVI. Final speeches of the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

[58] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Gentlemen, we are nearing the conclusion of our Conference's work. At this stage it is customary to exchange votes of thanks, not for the scope they afford for brilliant rhetoric but as a sincere expression of deep feelings. I therefore have pleasure in calling upon the delegate of France; I shall later call upon the delegates of Italy, Colombia, Persia, the Philippines and Egypt, but I would request all speakers to be exceedingly brief. Deep feeling usually requires few words to express it.

[59] Mr. Paul MONTEL (France) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, now that our work is concluded, it is fitting that we should express our gratitude to

those who, by welcoming us with such gracious generosity, have made our work so much easier and pleasanter. They felt that an Organization which is striving to unite all men in security, justice and freedom and to carry into practice the fine precept of Paul Valéry: "Let us enrich one another through our mutual differences", an Organization which seeks both to maintain peace and to exalt spiritual values by linking these two aspirations as inseparably as the vine and the elm sapling that grow together in Tuscany, is deserving of good will; and tokens of that good will have been lavished upon us. In this city of art and light, everything draws us to the cult of spiritual values; and every day as we pass on our way to work through the bombed area of the city, with its ruins that raise a plea to heaven, we have come to feel an ever deeper horror of war and an ever stronger desire to prevent it. I therefore have the honour to submit to this plenary meeting for its approval a draft resolution which is an attempt to convey our gratitude. It reads as follows:

At the close of its Fifth Session, held in Florence from 22 May to 17 June 1950, the General Conference of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization, deeply moved by the generous hospitality of the Italian authorities and by the welcome extended to it by the city of Florence,

Expresses its heartfelt gratitude to Signor Luigi Einaudi, President of the Italian Republic, who was good enough to honour the opening meeting of the Conference with his presence;

Warmly thanks the Italian Government, and especially the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and public Education and their services, for the unstinted help they gave Unesco in all respects for the purpose of ensuring the successful organization of the General Conference.

[60] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Italy.

[61] Senator Alessandro CASATI (Italy) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, in Italy we use the same word to denote both the person who receives a guest with every mark of respect and also the guest himself. It implies a mutual welcome and a brotherly encounter based on close co-operation and community of interests and ideas. We cannot claim as our own the great Christian heritage of mediaevel literature and art, nor the Renaissance which was nurtured here, nor humanism imbued with those high moral values which have been and still are the inspiration of our work; these are the common and glorious patrimony of the entire world. The Italian delegation—and I speak here, too, on behalf of the Italian Government—moved as it is by the expressions of friendship it has received, cannot accept thanks to which it is not really entitled. In looking back on its own humble contribution to the common task, its only wish is to keep fresh in its mind, to safeguard and add to the rich store of experience it has gained during these unforgettable weeks when the delegates of fifty-nine States have lived together united by common ideals. What have we all gained from this? The hope, nay the certainty, that, despite inevitable setbacks, despite the difficulties that still bar our way, despite shallow and carping criticism, men of good will are gradually becoming united; for peace means more than the cessation or absence of war: it implies above all the dedication by all men of their highest moral faculties to this ideal.

[62] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Colombia.

[63] Dr. Rafael BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) — [*Translation from the Spanish*] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to submit to the Conference for its consideration the following draft resolution, which I shall now read to you:

On the conclusion of its Session of 1950, the General Conference of Unesco *declares* that the illustrious city of Florence, the intellectual capital of the Renaissance, the cradle and dwelling place of unrivalled creative geniuses, the mother of thinkers and poets and the precious treasury of the arts, is a world monument of culture which it is the concern of all men and all nations to safeguard and respect.

Ladies and gentlemen, the terms of the motion I have had the honour to submit to you make it unnecessary for me to speak at length in its support. The idea which informs it does no more than reflect the whole spirit of this honourable assembly. We all know Florence's place in the hierarchy of literature and art. The unforgettable days we have passed in this place have brought us back to the crystal source of the whole Renaissance. All of you must have felt, in your wanderings through the narrow streets of ancient Florence, that your steps were guided by the illustrious spirits of the mighty dead, Florence's sons by birth or by adoption. The spiritual insight of Dante, the mysticism of Fra Angelico, the prophetic orginality of Masaccio, the realism of Donatello, the torrential genius of Michel-Angelo, the architectural talent of Brunelleschi, the crowded life of Benvenuto, the noble harmony of Raphael, the universal spirit of Leonardo, the irony of Machiavelli and the picaresque fantasy of Bocaccio, all have a tremendous impact; on every side there is beauty to caress us, inspiration to ennoble us, genius to guide us. In the tale of our

journeys, all of us must count this page the brightest. But as well as enchanting memories we must take hence the satisfaction of having done some small thing to preserve for the future treasures of such price. May the peoples see to it that, whatever happens elsewhere on the earth, the river of future history bathes Florence in clear and untroubled waters, like the smooth stream of Arno beneath the memory-haunted bridges that watch over its passage to the sea.

[64] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Persia.

[65] Mr. Ali Asghar HEKMAT (Persia) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, on behalf of the Persian delegation, I should like, before the close of this Conference, to express our gratitude to the Italian Government and people for their generous and memorable hospitality. We should also offer our warm thanks to you, Mr. President, to the Chairman of the Executive Board, to the Director-General and his able assistants, for all that has been done to assist the smooth running of this Conference.

[66] It is true that, since perfection is unattainable in this world, we cannot claim that this Conference has accomplished all that it set out to do. However, in our view, the adoption of the basic programme and a certain compression of the 1951 programme mark a definite step forward—an achievement that is undoubtedly to this Conference's credit. At the opening of our session, the Persian delegation expressed certain misgivings, which have to some extent been justified by the tension that has at times made itself felt in our discussions. But this should be no cause for scepticism with regard to Unesco's future. It should rather be the spur to a more united and vigorous effort for the attainment of the Organization's lofty aims. We are convinced that with its present budget Unesco cannot hope to fulfil its mission. And since most of the smaller nations have such limited resources we believe that the more fortunate States should give increased financial aid. Mr. President, fellow delegates, Unesco is still a very young Organization, and we should be guilty of a grave error for which history would blame us, if, for want of perseverance or patience, we were to deny it an opportunity of fulfilling the hopes that all mankind has placed in it.

[67] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call on Senator Pecson, delegate of the Philippines.

[68] Senator Gerónima PECSON (Philippines) — Mr. President, fellow delegates, this is certainly an unexpected opportunity, for which I am much obliged to my fellow senator, our President —Count Jacini.

[69] Friends, whenever I think of Unesco, there comes upon me that indefinable feeling of utter humility that comes when one enters the Cathedral of St. Peter in Rome, or when one finds oneself before the memorial of Lincoln, the obelisk of Washington, or the Arc de Triomphe —that sensation that I feel as a Filipino when I stand on the hallowed grounds of the Lunetta where the immortal hero of the Philippines fell. These are monuments or symbols of men or organizations through whose efforts decisive stages have been reached in raising the standard of human life. Thus, my regard for Unesco will explain why, to me, no event in my life has given me more honour than to be the recipient, the very fortunate one, of a gift from you—that vote which has made me the first woman member of the Executive Board of Unesco. Ladies and gentlemen, I will treasure this gift for ever, coming as it does from the *élite* of the architects of the world for permanent peace.

[70] Now, if I may interpret that vote, it means three very vital things. First, that vote, happily, is not a vote for this very humble person. I would like to say that it is a vote for the Filipino people. Being the fortunate medium through whom you now extend that honour to my people, and through whom wish to express, I take it, your regard for and faith in the Filipino people, may I take this opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, of expressing to you the deep appreciation of my country, the respectful fraternal pledge of our delegation and my own very humble gratitude for so great an honour to so small a country. My friends, my country, as you know, gave for her part in saving democracy during the global war a price so great that it meant the loss of her sons for industry, the loss of her homes, the honour of many of her women, and, most of all, she paid with the life of the flower of her youth. She is still suffering from the effects of that war. For that reason, ladies and gentlemen, to us Unesco is life, Unesco is the future, it is the silver lining in the cloudy sky. You may realize what Unesco means to us; it is vital and real; it is critically needed. So I am proud to say that, in spite of our poverty, because of our realization due to our utter need for Unesco, and because perhaps unfortunately we are so located that we are within the danger zone in which Unesco must work effectively, there in the Philippines twenty million people do not haggle about the cost of the Unesco projects. We do not think how much the programme costs us. In our effort for Unesco we spare neither money

nor effort nor manpower. Therefore, friends, in honouring my little country and giving her a representative seat on the Executive Board of Unesco, you are giving an extra incentive to her action for Unesco.

[71] Second, your vote for me is for the East. It is an expression of your solicitous concern for the welfare of the peoples of the East. It is in the East that Unesco has the largest area in which she has an opportunity of severing the greatest number of people who are crying for aid. It is there, ladies and gentlemen, that Unesco has the greatest opportunity of succeeding; it is there that Unesco's experiments can be concentrated in an area in which she has a chance to prove to the world the efficacy of her efforts for permanent peace. Whether that region shall be lost for ever through the forces that enslave man's spirit, or whether that region shall be lifted to the levels of education, science and culture, to ensure the freedom of man, depends very much, if not entirely, upon Unesco. I tremble when I think of the staggering enormity of the problems of the last; but although my own energy is minute even when combined with the vigour with which Unesco is working for the solution of problems there, I would like to assure you now that that energy shall be unreserved; it shall be eager, not hesitant.

[72] The third element in that vote is that it is not a vote for one woman, it is a vote for all the women in the world, in whose collective wisdom and capacity for furthering the aims of Unesco the delegates to this Conference have thus eloquently expressed their faith. I pray to God to give me the strength and guidance that I may have the intelligence to measure up to your expectations—in the name of these women, to be able to continue, perhaps by social action among the women of the world, the good work of Eleanor Roosevelt, Maria Montessori, Mrs. Pandit and Mrs. Curie. That the delegates to this Conference have granted the women of the world a seat on the Executive Board of Unesco means that you have placed Unesco foremost among the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations, for you have given, in effect, practical application to the principle of equality between men and women, which is one of the principal tenets enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This proof of the responsiveness of Unesco to the requirements of the times is an added assurance that Unesco will succeed.

[73] Before I close, I would like to express to you all the feelings of the Philippine delegation. We leave the hall of this Conference with regret, because we shall say goodbye for many months or years perhaps. We leave very much richer in experience, and feeling millionaires in friendship. We leave feeling that Unesco is alive and democratic; for here we have witnessed a free exchange of opinions and convictions, out of which has emerged an excellent programme which reflects the collective wisdom of the delegates here present, the brilliant leadership that we enjoy, and the effective ability of the Secretariat. We would like to extend to our hosts, the Italian people, our gratitude for their many courtesies. The head of our delegation has asked me to say specially that we are very grateful to all of you for having supported our project. Florence is a city that has given us occasion for sober reflection, in that the ancient Florentines, unfettered in their conviction, were able to produce such a magnificent city. We leave hopefully, because we know that, as a result of our friendship and our discussions, we may also in the future be able to say: "Unesco's Conference delegates were greater than the Florentines in a way, for they have built people who can build the world." Ladies and gentlemen, in closing, may I say that I realize the weight of the responsibilities that you have placed on my shoulders by your mandate; I realize my limited capacity both in intelligence and in physique. Aware that I shall be working with the chosen leaders of seventeen nations, and that I shall be co-operating with one of the greatest geniuses of the world, the honourable Jaime Torres Bodet, that I shall have to work with such an excellent team as the members of the Secretariat, I can truthfully affirm that I have no fear in saying now that I accept your mandate with all the devotion that I can command. I hope you will remember the inspiration that Unesco is for me today, and will be tomorrow and all the days to come. I should like to quote an expression from the speech of our Director-General. He said to us all, in encouraging us to go on with this long, difficult task of buiding permanent peace: "The future is the child of the present."

[74] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I did not like to cut short Mrs. Pecson's speech for three very good reasons. Firstly, as a Senator, she is my colleague; secondly, her remarks were so very apt; and thirdly—I suppose you have all had the same experience—I have never been able to interrupt a lady. Nevertheless, I would ask her successor, the honourable delegate of Egypt, to be brief.

[75] Dr. Hussein FAWZI (Egypt) — [*Translation from the French*] Mr. President, fellow-delegates, the Egyptian delegation has asked me to speak on its behalf at this solemn conclusion of our session. It is an honour that I do not

deserve, unless it be because I was the last to join my delegation. In viewing your work, therefore, I have been dazzled but certainly not *blasé*. It has been my privilege to make Unesco's acquaintance in this eternally lovely city of Florence: not at the corner of a street or on a bridge, but in the magnificent setting of the Palazzo Vecchio. This was my first impression of Unesco. Slowly and with difficulty I climbed the path that leads to an understanding of Unesco's lofty and tremendous task. Thanks to the perfect organization of this Conference, thanks to the spontaneous and gracious hospitality of the Italian Government and people and of the city of Florence, thanks to the ever-ready helpfulness of the members of the Secretariat, and thanks to you yourself, Mr. President, to the Chairman of the Executive Board and to the Director-General, I have come to grasp the high ideals of Unesco with their far-reaching implications. I have seen these ideals reflected on the faces of all members of this Conference. You are all idealists. But this does not mean that you are impractical visionaries. The idealist is one who has faith in his destiny as a human being—not as a zoological species, but as a being impelled by feeling and reason rather than by instinct.

[76] A few days ago I was pleased to hear of a slight amendment to a resolution regarding artists. One of our colleagues from Latin America, I believe, put the word "creative" before artist. Ladies and gentlemen, you are creative artists. For you are creating a masterpiece which is its own promise of success. You are working for peace, and if you succeed, the masterpiece will have been created. Our colleague, the Head of the Danish delegation, was speaking a moment ago of Niels Bohr and peace, and of the possibility of speaking of peace as an end in itself. As it happens, I had the honour of meeting Niels Bohr for the first time at the Congress of Scientific Unions, held in London in 1946. Among the resolutions adopted by that Congress, of which our esteemed colleague, the head of the Netherlands delegation, was President, the last and most important was a motion referring to technical and scientific matters but having a direct bearing on peace. It was, in fact, concerned with the same subject as the letter by Niels Bohr. Similarly, whilst we are acting in our capacity as scientists, intellectuals and artists, our discussions and work, as is right and proper, are directed towards peace and the attainment of peace.

[77] For five years you, in Unesco, have been an inspiration—I might say an oasis—for those treading the steep and barren path that leads towards our goal of peace. I should like to take this opportunity of greeting you all, and especially this city of Florence, the symbol of the Renaissance, on behalf of the Egypt of today and of antiquity, and should like to express Egypt's gratitude to the Chairman of the Executive Board and to the Director-General.

[78] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] I call upon the delegate of Iraq.

[79] Dr. Abdul Hamid KADHIM (Iraq) — Mr. President, honourable delegates, my delegation, at the beginning of this Conference, raised certain issues which we believe it is very important that Unesco should discuss. Subsequently, in all the Commission and Committee meetings, the same issues have been raised by the Iraqi delegation. I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to state at this last meeting of our Conference that we did this because we believe in Unesco, and because we want it to grow and to achieve its aims. It is our opinion that no organization, national, regional, or international, will ever succeed unless its own members are frank and openly discuss the issues before it. We believe that it is detrimental to any organization to make a show of agreement whilst complaints subsist in the Committees. It was in this spirit of sincerity, Mr. President and honourable delegates, that we presented our views, earnestly and honestly.

[80] Now that the Fifth Session of the General Conference is coming to a close, we would like to re-affirm our faith in Unesco. We believe that, under the wise leadership of our Director-General, and with the collaboration of the Member States, it is going ahead to achieve its ideals. May I, on behalf of my delegation, pay a tribute and express our gratitude for the generosity and hospitality of the citizens of Florence and the great Italian people. In giving us this city as the seat of our Conference, the Italian Government has given us everything needed to inspire us in our tasks.

[81] The PRESIDENT — [*Translation from the French*] Before closing our session, I think that I am speaking for you all in conveying a warm expression of gratitude to the whole staff of Unesco, from the Deputy Director-General down to the humblest member, and to all the Italian staff and workmen recruited for the Conference, for all they have done to ensure its smooth running. I feel that the organization of the Conference has been highly satisfactory, from the technical and every other point of view. At least, any mishaps that may have occurred must have been slight, as I have received no complaints. I

am also sure that you would wish me to thank those men and women who have worked for days and nights on end so that our meeting might continue according to schedule. It is likewise my duty to express the gratitude of all here to the foreign press and to press correspondents who have been present in Florence. To be frank, we should have liked the press to follow our work with a closer interest. It is not enough to give a general account of our discussions and the atmosphere in which they have taken place. The important factor to be brought out is the friendly relations that have been established between the delegates of different countries and press representatives from all over the world as well as from Italy. I therefore think that you would like me to express our gratitude to the press and our hope that it will continue to serve the interest of Unesco in the hard days that lie ahead.

[82] Now, gentlemen, I should like to take up an idea expressed by my colleague, Senator Casati, and, as an Italian, to tell you that you owe gratitude to no one, as Unesco may proudly make the same claim as the King of France who was wont to say: "The King is everywhere at home." Unesco is at home in every part of the world it may wish to visit. Unesco is at home in Florence, as it has been in the past in Paris and Beirut, and as it may be in the future in Montevideo or any other city. In every country it will find hearts and minds ready to welcome it and understand. That is why you owe gratitude to none; it is rather the host countries that are indebted to you. I forecast in my speech in Beirut and again in Paris that you would be entirely at home in Florence, and that this first-hand contact with humanism, art and remote antiquity, with the Renaissance and with periods nearer to our own day, would, as it were, add to your stock of spiritual values and help you to look with greater optimism towards the work yet to be accomplished. You have shown great discretion and tact in this matter of enriching your minds, for Unesco's work has not had to suffer from your desire to see the art treasures of Italy. I was at times afraid that the meeting rooms would be deserted, but they never have been. You have attended meetings here and still found time to visit all the places of interest. You certainly share the gift of ubiquity with one of Italy's saints, St. Anthony of Padua, who, by the way, was Portuguese. To me, this is yet another proof that we can continue, with a quiet mind, to carry out our task. Criticism has been levelled at us, gentlemen; we have been the butt of those shallow cynics who think it is simpler to destroy an institution than to keep it alive. We have been reminded of Talleyrand's saying: "Le Congrès danse et ne marche pas." The Congress certainly danced a little last night—and very well, I may say—but it has also worked hard and loyally in the Commissions and has solid achievements to its credit.

[83] All this work that has been done, though it has not been proclaimed with flourish of trumpets, has nevertheless been of great value to us and our Organization and will eventually go to benefit mankind. We can, accordingly, find cause for gratification in this work well done, in the humble performance of our duty, a duty which does not end in Florence, today, but must be faced anew in the Executive Board, at the next Paris Conference and at all the conferences to come. Each successive conference marks a further stage in the completion of a task that depends more on inner conviction than on any outward action, a task that has to do with basic principles rather than with political factors. We have attempted to reconcile planning and initiative, organization and freedom, the encouragement of spontaneous action with the necessity of governmental control. It is not a task that can be accomplished in a few days, or brought to a successful conclusion by a few declarations. Ours is the grave responsibility slowly and progressively to shape the world into a body of spiritual federations from which, sooner or later, will emerge a political organization. Unesco might be defined as the great Ministry of Education of the future World Republic. This is what we are to set our whole minds to build. Perhaps we shall not live to see it in reality, but no doubt our children will. Of that we are firmly convinced. At all events, we must fix, with golden nails, in the minds of all the ideal of peace through culture. May I close with a metaphor? On my table here I have a little gem of Florentine art, presented by this city to Unesco. I should like to think that with this hammer we shall fix, with golden nails, the ideal of peace and freedom in the minds of future generations.

[84] Gentlemen, I declare closed the Fifth Ordinary Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

The meeting is closed.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS
OF
MEETINGS

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE

FIRST MEETING

Monday, 22 May 1950 at 5.30 p.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANQ JACINI (Italy)

Nominations for the offices of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of Commissions and Committees [document 5C/NOM/2].

[1] After an exchange of views on the proposals that the General Committee of the Conference had received for the offices of Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of the various Commissions and Committees of the Conference, it was explained at the request of Sir John MAUD (Chairman of the Executive Board) that, in accordance with the provisions of Rules 30 and 47 of the Rules of Procedure, the lists prepared by the Nominations Committee were not recommendations but mere suggestions.

Organization of work of the Session [documents 5C/BUR/1 and 5C/BUR/1-Add. and Corr.].

[2] On the CHAIRMAN'S recommendation, it was *decided* to adopt provisionally the whole of document 5C/BUR/1 (Proposed Organization of Work of the Session), pending a detailed discussion of the subject.

Terms of Reference of the Budget Committee [document 5C/BUR/1Add. and Corr.].

[3] Without wishing to give the matter detailed consideration, Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) observed that the Executive Board would have preferred the report of the Budget Committee to be presented to the Conference by the Programme and Budget Commission. He asked that paragraph 3 (c) of document 5C/BUR/1 - Add. & Corr. (page 2) be amended accordingly.

[4] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL had two objections to Sir John's suggested change:

(1) The Budget Committee would then become a mere sub-committee of the Programme and Budget Commission, whereas he thought that the original plan had been different;

(2) As the Budget Committee was required to consider items involving budgetary implications within the competence of the Administrative Commission or of the Official and External Relations Commission, but not of the Programme and Budget Commission, it would hardly be possible to submit the consolidated report to the latter Commission alone.

[5] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that it was not the Executive Board's intention to weaken the Budget Committee by turning it into a sub-committee of the Programme and Budget Commission. He did not think that his suggested change would have that effect. While appreciating the validity of the second objection made by the Secretariat, Sir John thought it not impossible to present the consolidated report to the General Conference sitting as the Programme and Budget Commission—a solution which he thought even offered important practical advantages.

[6] It was *decided* to amend paragraph 3 (c) to bring it into line with the Executive Board's suggestion, by inserting the words "through the Programme and Budget Commission" after the words "and submit to the Conference".

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Modification in the order of the work of the Session [document 5C/BUR/1 Annex I].

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Conference would sit on Wit Monday, 29 May, which was not a holiday in Italy; on the other hand, since Corpus Christi Day was a public holiday, the Conference would have to interrupt its work on Thursday, 8 June. It was *decided* to alter the time-table accordingly.

Inclusion of a new item on the agenda of the General Conference [document 5C/20].

[2] The CHAIRMAN informed the General Committee that the United Kingdom delegation had notified the Director-General in a letter dated 23 May 1950, that it was proposing the insertion in the agenda of the Fifth Session of the Conference of an item: *Draft Resolution concerning the Status of Associate Membership of Unesco.* The United Kingdom delegation had remitted a draft resolution on this matter [document 5C/20], accompanied by a memorandum setting forth the reasons for its proposal [*ibid.*, Annex I]. As the revised agenda proposed by the Executive Board had been adopted by the General Conference on 22 May, this was a *new question*, and procedure under Rules 14 and 36, paragraph 3 of the Rules of Procedure, therefore applied.

[3] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation did not suggest granting associate members the right to vote at the Conference or in its Commissions, nor did it propose that they should be eligible for the Executive Board. As to their contributions, the resolution proposed the adoption of the principle observed by WHO.

[4] At the proposal of Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt), seconded by Mr. MAURIAC (France), it was *decided* to return to the question at the next meeting of the General Committee, after the texts submitted by the United Kingdom delegation had been studied.

Progress of the work of the Session.

[5] The CHAIRMAN proposed that at each meeting of the General Committee, the Chairmen of commissions and committees should report on the stage reached in the work of the body they presided over. *Adopted.*

New Draft Resolutions.

[6] The CHAIRMAN announced that a number of new draft resolutions had been submitted to the Director-General and that it was for the General Committee to divide them between the different commissions of the Conference.

Document 5C/2: Establishment of a committee to prepare a declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between peoples (draft proposal presented by Norway).

[7] It was *decided* to forward this proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Document 5C/10: Draft amendments to the Programme for 1951 (Arts and Letters; Libraries and Documentation Services) (presented by the United Kingdom).

[8] It was *decided* to forward this drafts to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Document 5C/11: Draft international convention for the protection of monuments, centres of historic interest, cultural institutions and works of art in the event of armed conflict (proposal presented by Italy).

[9] It was *decided* to forward this proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Document 5C/12: Draft resolution concerning the presentation of the annual programme and budget (presented by the United Kingdom).

[10] It was *decided* to forward this draft to the Programme and Budget Commission, but, as it had budgetary implications, it would also go

automatically to the Budget Committee under the procedure laid down.

Document 5C/13: Proposed amendments to draft resolutions 4.62 and 4.621 presented by Switzerland).

[11] It was *decided* to forward these proposals to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Document 5C/14: Draft amendments to Regulations 25 and 26 of the Financial Regulations (presented by Australia).

[12] It was *decided* to forward these proposals to the Administrative Commission.

Document 5C/15: Draft amendment to the programme for 1951: resolution 1.122 (presented by the United Kingdom).

[13] It was *decided* to forward this proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Document 5C/16: Draft resolution to provide that the General Conference shall meet biennially (presented by the United States of America).

[14] It was *decided* to forward this proposal to the Procedure Committee.

Document 5C/17: Draft resolution inviting all workers in the fields of education, science and culture, together with their organizations, institutions and agencies, to give their full support to the World Movement of the Defenders of Peace (presented by Czechoslovakia).

[15] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) could not see to which of the main commissions this proposal should be sent. He pointed out that it was the custom of ILO to set up a special Resolutions Committee. He did not propose this procedure for the moment, although there were obvious advantages in such a committee's studying resolutions that involved more or less political appeals. He felt that the question ought to be dealt with by the General Committee directly.

[16] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) seconded this proposal and hoped that it would be discussed subsequently to the decision by the Credentials Committee on the position of Nationalist China. *Adopted.*

Document 5C/19: Draft resolution for the convening of a Congress on Intellectual Co-operation before the end of 1950 (presented by Yugoslavia).

[17] It was *decided* to forward this resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[18] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary) stated that items 10.5.1 (Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies) and 10.5.2. (United Nations resolutions on educational problems in the non-self-governing territories), which appeared on the agenda of the Official and External Relations Commission, would also be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission and to the Administrative Commission. The final report on these matters would have to be presented by the Official and External Relations Commission.

[19] At the request of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee), it was explained that the part of the Executive Board's report dealing with these resolutions would also be submitted to the three main commissions.

Communication from the Chairman of the Budget Committee.

[20] The CHAIRMAN read a letter from the Chairman of the Budget Committee requesting that, in order to assist the work of the Conference,

(*a*) Every proposal affecting the budget for the 1951 Programme should be considered by the Budget Committee before it was considered by a Commission, and

(*b*) The time-limit for submitting any new proposals or amendments involving changes of substance in the Programme or Budget Estimates should be fixed for the evening of 24 May.

[21] At the proposal of Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt), it was *decided* to extend this time-limit by 24 hours, namely until the evening of 25 May.

Admission of New Members.

[22] At the proposal of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) it was *decided* that item 13 of the agenda (discussion of the recommendations of the Executive Board for the admission of new Members) would be taken by the Plenary Meeting immediately after the discussion of the Director-General's Report, in order that these new members might participate in the proceedings as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.

THIRD MEETING

Friday, 26 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Inclusion of a new question in the Agenda of the General Conference (*continuation*) [document 5C/20].

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that it was for the General Committee to prepare a recommendation for the General Conference in accordance with Rules 14 and 36 of the Rules of Procedure.

[2] Mr. DELBOS (France) emphasized the importance of the question and associated himself in principle with the project. But he drew the attention of the General Committee to Article XIII of Unesco's Constitution relating to proposed amendments to the Constitution. He suggested that the question be referred to the Procedure Committee, so that the latter might give its opinion on the application of Article XIII to the present case.

Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) seconded this proposal.

[3] Mr. DELBOS (France) was glad to note that the general feeling was in favour of referring the question to the Procedure Committee. He pointed out the uselessness, and even danger, of beginning a detailed discussion of the matter before the Procedure Committee had taken a decision and before the delegates had consulted their Governments.

[4] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL raised the question whether, during the discussions of the Plenary Conference on the inclusion of the question in the Agenda, the substance of the matter could be discussed or whether it should be postponed.

[5] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. DELBOS (France), thought that substantial discussion would be inopportune at the moment, as delegates lacked the necessary information.

[6] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) remarked that, before informing the Plenary Conference of the British draft, it would be necessary to scrutinize the legal aspects of the problem and the consequences of the proposed discrimination between two kinds of Members.

[7] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed that the General Conference be informed of the inclusion in its agenda of the proposal submitted by the British delegation. The General Committee would recommend the Conference to refrain from a detailed discussion and to refer the matter to the Procedure Committee for legal advice.

[8] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) supported the Director-General's proposal. He also suggested that the Procedure Committee should be invited to take a general decision on the interpretation to be given to Article XIII, and particularly to paragraph 2 of that Article.

[9] The proposals by the Director-General and Dr. Walker were *adopted*.

Draft Amendment to Item 19 of the Agenda presented by the Yugoslav delegation.

[10] The CHAIRMAN informed the General Committee that the Yugoslav delegation would like to see the names of Descartes and Giordano Bruno added to the list of personalities to be honoured this year by the General Conference. In accordance with Rule 36, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Procedure, it was for the General Committee to examine such an amendment to an item included in the Agenda of the Conference. The Italian Government and National Commission had organized, as part of the *Unesco Month*, a series of lectures and a concert as a tribute to Avicenna, Balzac, Confucius, Muratori and J. S. Bach. If the difficulty of rapidly organizing two additional lectures proved to be too great, a closing meeting could be envisaged in order to do homage to Descartes and Giordano Bruno.

[11] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) pointed to the complications which would ensue from this type of request, and foresaw that in the years to come such difficulties would be sure to grow. He proposed that the Italian National Commission be invited to examine the possibility of satisfying the Yugoslav delegation, and that the Executive Board should be informed of the question of principle. *Adopted*.

[12] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) said that his delega-

tion would like a lecture to be given on Iqbal, one of the founders of the new State of Pakistan.

Request by the Representative of the League of Red Cross Societies.

[13] The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure, the authorization of the General Committee was necessary to permit observers for international non-governmental organizations to speak at plenary meetings. He informed the General Committee that the authorization was asked for Dr. Vittorio Minnucci, Head of the Italian Junior Red Cross. He added that it was the first time that an observer had asked to be allowed to speak at a plenary meeting.

[14] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) said that such an authorization would create a precedent.

[15] It was *decided* to postpone the discussion until the next meeting of the General Committee.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Organization of the work of the Session (*continuation*).

[1] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL informed the Committee of his misgivings: whilst it was unlikely that the vote on the budget ceiling would involve lengthy discussion (since the amount of the budget had been more or less stabilized), there was nevertheless some uncertainty with regard to the actual budget of the Organization, for account had to be taken of the arrears of certain States in the payment of their contributions. Until that vital information was available, it would be impossible to carry out serious work. The Administrative Commission would need to settle this financial problem before the Programme and Budget Commission fixed the budget ceiling, especially as certain delegations would certainly suggest some curtailment of the 1951 programme in order to finance the fifty-odd new proposals which would mean a clear expansion of the programme.

It was *decided* to recommend to the Administrative Commission to place the question of financing the deficits at the head of its agenda.

[2] In reply to Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee), the DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed the opinion that the Administrative Commission's recommendations regarding the financing of the deficit should not go before the Budget Committee before submission to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[3] In accordance with the DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S suggestions, it was *decided* to recommend to the Programme and Budget Commission to conclude its consideration of the Basic Programme and the Statement of Methods before embarking on the general discussion of the 1951 programme and budget; however, the Commission should defer consideration of the section relating to international conventions until the Procedure Committee, which was then engaged on its discussion of the use of Spanish as a working language, could express its opinion.

[4] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) described the work of the Budget Committee, which was to submit a provisional report to the Programme and Budget Commission by 29 May; this would include general considerations, followed by annexes dealing with each of the chapters of the programme. Addenda would be prepared after the consideration of any fresh proposal that might be submitted to the Committee for its views. Lastly, once the budget ceiling was fixed by the Programme and Budget Commission, the Committee would give thorough consideration to the appropriation table for each of the programme chapters and would draft its final report, embodying its conclusions and its recommendations with regard

to the future procedure to be adopted by the Committee, in the light of experience.

[5] Replying to the DIRECTOR-GENERAL, Professor NIELSEN (Chairman, Procedure Committee) explained that his Committee had not submitted the question of the use of Spanish to the Budget Committee, because it had felt that all the budgetary implications involved were clearly set forth in the working paper [5C/PRO/5].

It was *decided* to recommend to the Procedure Committee to consider the question of international conventions at the earliest opportunity.

Professor NIELSEN (Chairman, Procedure Committee) promised to place that item on the agenda of the Procedure Committee immediately after the conclusion of the discussion on the use of Spanish, and to save time, he would suggest that the Procedure Committee should draft a special report on the matter.

[6] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) pointed out that the timetable of that Commission was further burdened by the great number of new draft proposals presented by delegations. Since 28 meetings would be required at the very least to complete this agenda, provision would have to be made for four or five evening meetings.

The Committee *approved* that suggestion, while stressing the need for a rigid application of the Rules of Procedure regarding the time-limit for speeches, which the Committee had fixed at ten minutes for plenary meetings and five minutes for the Commissions.

Telegram from the Committee for the Liberation of Istria.

[7] The CHAIRMAN read the following telegram received from Mr. Fragiocomo, Chairman of the Committee for the Liberation of Istria:

At a time when the world's leading representatives of culture are seeking to make their contribution to the consolidation of peace, by ensuring the dissemination of the enduring values of civilization, the National Committee for the Liberation of Istria would wish to gain a hearing for the claim of the peoples of Istria to that respect for human and national rights which is an essential condition for peace and the progress of civilization. The peoples of Istria ask Unesco to adopt a resolution ensuring the supremacy of human values wherever they are ignored or disputed in diplomatic dealings. The Istrian peoples who are the victims of these dealings appeal to Unesco to prevail upon the Governments of the Great Powers to recognize that right to free self-determination which is the basic condition for modern civilization.
[*Translated from the Italian.*]

The Chairman asked the Committee what action should be taken in the matter: should the telegram be merely filed or should it be communicated to the Conference? The simplest solution would perhaps be to authorize the President to transmit it to the Italian delegation, which might inform the Conference of its contents, without comment.

[8] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) thought that as the message merely claimed the right to free self-determination—a right that it was Unesco's duty to defend—there was no reason for withholding it from the Conference.

[9] While agreeing with that view, the CHAIRMAN cautioned the Committee against the danger of initiating a discussion incompatible with the spirit of Unesco.

[10] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) felt that Unesco should do its duty, regardless of the consequences.

[11] In view of the political implications of the message, Dr. BARALT Y ZACHARIE (Chairman, Official and External Relations Commission) suggested reading it at a subsequent plenary meeting of the General Conference, without calling for any decision on the matter.

[12] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) thought that, as it was an appeal from a minority group, Unesco could not be expected to take any action, its duty being to publicize the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and not to ensure its observance—a matter which was the responsibility of the United Nations.

[13] In support of that view, Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) quoted a passage from the Constitution of Unesco:

With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of this Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

[14] The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had three practical proposals before it: merely to file the message (Dr. Walker's proposal); to bring it to the notice of the Conference and even to permit its discussion (Taha Hussein Bey's proposal); and lastly to read it to the Conference without discussion (Dr. Baralt y Zacharie's proposal). This latter proposal coincided more or less with his own suggestion, which was to transmit the telegram to the Conference through the Italian delegation.

[15] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), referring to the precedent of the free Poles with their headquarters in Paris, thought it possible to settle

the matter merely by acknowledging receipt of the telegram, for it would be unwise to allow a discussion to take place that might give rise to political disputes; all could be notified of the acknowledgement of the telegram through notice in the *Journal of the Conference.*

[16] The CHAIRMAN mentioned another precedent—the appeal of the Sudan-Egyptian Committee, which had been ignored by the Beirut General Conference on 13 December 1948.

[17] Mr. DELBOS (France) approved the solution advocated by Mr. Hardman; care must be taken to avoid a political debate which might be a proper proceeding for the United Nations but certainly not for Unesco.

[18] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) said he would prefer the acknowledgement of receipt to indicate that the message had been transmitted to the United Nations as the competent authority, in order at least to give the impression that Unesco was defending human rights.

[19] Dr. Walker's proposal, to which the latter requested that Mr. Hardman's suggestion should be added (acknowledgement of the message without placing it on the agenda of the Conference), was *adopted* by 6 votes.

It was *decided* that the Chairman should draft the letter of acknowledgement.

[20] In compliance with the request of Taha Hussein Bey, Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) suggested recommending that the Director-General should transmit the text of the telegram to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, informing him that it had been acknowledged but not placed on the agenda of the General Conference.

This proposal was *adopted* by 8 votes.

Request by the Representative of the League of Red Cross Societies (*continuation*).

[21] At the request of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committees), it was *decided* that the text of the message should be embodied in the minutes of the meeting, but not in the survey published in the *Journal of the Conference.*

[22] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of the League of Red Cross Societies had signified his desire to address the General Conference; to avoid creating a precedent, the chairman had persuaded him to confine himself to addressing the Official and External Relations Commission.

It was *decided* to authorize him to address the Official and External Relations Commission accordingly.

Creation of a special committee to examine the reports of Member States.

[23] The CHAIRMAN announced that, during the discussion of item 4.2 of its agenda (*Future Policy of Unesco with regard to Annual Reports by Member States*), the Official and External Relations Commission had decided to recommend that the Conference set up an *ad hoc* committee to consider such reports; the Chairman of the Commission asked the General Committee to decide immediately what the membership of the *ad hoc* committee should be, and whether it should be appointed by the General Conference or by one of its commissions.

[24] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary) said that it would be most convenient if the committee were to consist of seven or eight members and hold one or two meetings after 1 June.

[25] At the suggestion of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee), it was *decided* to recommend that, by way of experiment, the Official and External Relations Commission should appoint a small committee and prescribe its terms of reference.

New proposals presented by delegations.

[26] In view of the large number of proposals, the CHAIRMAN requested the General Committee to make the Chairman responsible, in consultation with the Director-General, for distributing them among the various Commissions, referring to the General Committee only in border-line cases.

[27] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) agreed, provided that members of the Committee were informed in writing of how the proposals had been distributed.

That procedure was *adopted.*

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DAVID R. HARDMAN (United Kingdom)

Letter from the Italian National Association for the Preservation of the Countryside and Monuments of Artistic Value.

[1] In this letter, the Italian National Association for the Preservation of the Countryside and Monuments of Artistic Value expressed the wish that, in discussing the report under item 8.615 of the agenda, steps should also be taken for the protection of monuments of artistic value.

As this letter emanated from a national organization, it was *decided* to inform the Association that the Conference could receive such a proposed amendment only from a Member State.

Letter from the World Federation of United Nations Associations.

[2] In this letter, the Federation regretted that the budget estimates for 1951 made no provision to ensure future co-operation between Unesco and the Federation.

In accordance with Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure, it was *decided* that observers of this international non-governmental organization might make a statement on this subject before the Programme and Budget Commission, subject to the approval of the Chairman of that Commission.

Reference of Draft Resolutions and Amendments to Commissions and Committees of the Conference.

[3] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Secretary) stated that the list published in No. 7 of the *Journal of the Conference* (pages 66-68) contained all the proposals which had reached the General Committee by noon on Saturday, 27 May. Some twenty fresh proposals were being translated and a list of them would be given in the *Journal* on 30 May. An amendment presented by the Czechoslovak delegation had not, however, been included in the list, as the point raised in it was still under examination by the Credentials Committee.

[4] On the request of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) who pointed out that a certain number of proposals of a political nature had been referred to the Programme and Budget Commission, the Yugoslav draft resolution [document 5C/19] for the summoning of a Congress on Intellectual Co-operation for the purpose of combating the psychosis of war was read out.

[5] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) urged that draft resolutions and amendments should be examined in their normal place in the discussion of the Programme. However, in view of the large number of proposals, he suggested that the General Committee should recommend delegations to make a study of the list already published, with a view to amalgamating so far as possible those with similar aims.

Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) supported this suggestion.

[6] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) feared that this recommendation would remain a dead letter if the initiative for making this amalgamation were left to delegations. He would prefer the job to be done by the officers of the Programme and Budget Commission.

[7] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) adhered to his opinion. A decision by the officers of the Programme and Budget Commission would carry less weight with delegations than would a recommendation by the General Committee of the Conference.

Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) and Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) shared this opinion.

[8] At the suggestion of Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee), seconded by Dr. HASAN (Pakistan), it was *decided* to invite delegations which had submitted proposals on allied or similar subjects to meet and see whether it would not be possible to group these in a single resolution, and also to invite the officers of the Programme and Budget Commission to take all the necessary steps to this end.

The meeting rose at 10.15 a.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DAVID R. HARDMAN (United Kingdom)

Progress of the work of the Session (*continuation*).

[1] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) announced that his Committee had terminated its preliminary examination of the budget on Monday, 29 May, and that it hoped to report to the Programme and Budget Commission in the course of the day, or the following morning. The work of the Committee had been made particularly complicated, owing to the fact that delegations continued to submit new resolutions after the deadline of 25 May. The Committee still had some sixty resolutions to examine, and feared that it could not complete its work by the end of the week, so that it would be unable to start its detailed examination of the budget on Monday, 5 June. The Budget Committee intended to suggest in its report that, at future sessions of the General Conference, no resolutions might be submitted after the first two days of the session.

[2] In view of the time spent on the preliminary examination of the Budget, Dr. Bender doubted whether the Committee would be able to keep pace with the work of the Programme and Budget Commission. He pointed out that the Committee had already met several times in the morning and had held a number of night meetings. He requested Mr. Seydoux to indicate how the work of his Commission was progressing.

[3] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) stated that the Commission would hold its eighth meeting that day; the previous day, it had completed its examination of the Basic Resolutions, with the exception of one resolution. In the course of the day, it would consider the preambles and the general presentation of the Programme, and if it had time, the Statement of Methods. The Commission was behindhand with its schedule, and it was anticipated that, unless discussions of the 1951 Programme were accelerated, the twenty-eight meetings foreseen by Mr. Seydoux would not be sufficient.

[4] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) read Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure which provided that Commissions might appeal for assistance to the Executive Board. As the Budget Committee was confronted with resolutions whose cost was estimated at $650.000, he thought that it would be helpful if tne Board could examine those resolutions, indicating which, in its opinion, formed an essential part of the programme.

[5] While assuring the General Committee that members of the Board would wish to assist in any way possible, Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) expressed the opinion that it would be a disastrous procedure for the Board to resume its meetings in the middle of the Conference and to intervene in the discussions on the programme and budget. He hoped that the Budget Committee would continue its excellent work and give its preliminary view of the Director-General's provisional estimate of the cost of the new resolutions coming from delegations.

[6] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to three possible solutions of the difficult problem before the Committee: (1) the Executive Board could be requested to intervene; (2) the Conference could work on Saturday and Sunday, 3 and 4 June, in spite of the excursions arranged by the Italian Government; (3) the Conference could be lengthened by a few days. His own view was that the first solution would be the most satisfactory, as the Board had prepared a well-balanced and carefully thought-out programme for submission to the Conference, and it was therefore in the best position to judge how far the introduction of the new resolutions would upset the balance of the programme.

[7] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) proposed that, before appealing to the Board for assistance, the Chairman of the Board should be requested to call a small meeting of the Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Commissions and of the Budget Committee, requesting them to consider a new time-table for the rest of the Conference which, in Mr. Seydoux's opinion, should not continue after 18 June at the latest. The small meeting thus convened could make proposals to the

General Committee, which would then judge whether or not to call upon the Executive Board.

[8] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) asked Mr. Seydoux when he thought that the Programme and Budget Commission would discuss the total budget figure. In his view, the debate should take place as soon as possible, otherwise the discussions on the budgetary implications of the additional sixty resolutions would be purely academic.

[9] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) agreed with Dr. Walker, and proposed that the discussion of the total Budget figure should take place before the three days' break in the work of the Conference.

[10] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the total Budget figure could not be discussed until the Administrative Commission had presented its report on ways in which to make good the deficit caused by arrears in contributions.

[11] Taha HUSSEIN Bey (Egypt) proposed that consideration of all resolutions submitted after the agreed time-limit should be postponed until the next session of the General Conference.

[12] The CHAIRMAN recalled Mr. Seydoux's former proposal to ask the Chairman of the Board to call a meeting of the Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Commissions and of the Budget Committee. He himself was in favour of that solution.

[13] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) also supported Mr. Seydoux's proposal.

[14] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL still felt doubts regarding the wisdom of the proposal. He pointed out that the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen were all members of the General Committee, which had more authority than such a small committee. He did not think that the General Committee would be justified in asking the Chairman of the Board to assume that added responsibility.

[15] Referring to the proposal made by Taha Hussein Bey, the Director-General observed that many of the additional resolutions were not supposed to have budgetary implications; they could only be postponed if the Secretariat found that they had indeed budgetary implications. He therefore proposed that the Secretariat should make a rough estimate of the cost of the resolutions, submitting that estimate to the Executive Board which could then, through its Chairman, give advice to the Programme and Budget Commission. The Director-General did not see how the Programme and Budget Commission could change its schedule as, after considering the preambles, the Statement of Methods and the 1951 Programme, it had to consider the problem of Technical Aid before 6 June, when Mr. Adiseshiah was to leave for Lake Success to represent him at the Conference on Technical Assistance.

[16] In the light of the discussion, Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) agreed that it would be worth while convening a meeting of the Executive Board, provided that it could be held without delaying the work of the Programme and Budget and the Administrative Commissions. He hoped that the Secretariat would supply a provisional budget figure for each resolution.

[17] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) moved that the Board should meet the following morning, 1 June. *Adopted.*

[18] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) seconded by Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America), proposed that the General Committee should draw the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission to the Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, suggesting that any draft amendments should be submitted before 5 June at midnight. *Adopted.*

Draft Resolution submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation [document 5C/17].

[19] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that, although the Czechoslovak delegation had withdrawn from the Conference, there was no rule stipulating that a resolution could not be discussed in the absence of the mover; moreover, the Hungarian delegation had expressed the hope that the departure of the Czechoslovak delegates would not prevent the resolution from being discussed. He therefore proposed that the resolution be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission. *Agreed.*

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Progress of the work of the Session (*continuation*).

[1] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) recalled that the Programme and Budget Commission had been allotted 24 meetings, but that he had asked from the outset that there should be 28 in order to complete the very heavy agenda. He proposed, therefore, to have two meetings on Saturday, 10 June, and two on Tuesday, 13 June, as well as three night meetings, Wednesday, 7 June, Tuesday, 13 June and Wednesday, 14 June.

[2] He also asked for an accelerated procedure to handle some 222 resolutions for the 1951 Programme and some hundred amendments to new proposals. The Executive Board had already gone through the various proposals and new amendments, and it was proposed to ask its Chairman to present each new amendment as it came up and to give the Board's advice; the delegation submitting the amendment would be asked briefly to present its viewpoint. A vote would then be taken as to whether the Commission wished to discuss the draft amendment, or whether it should be postponed until the following year.

[3] Mr. DELBOS (France) proposed the parliamentary practice of having one speaker for, and one against, any amendments.

[4] Dr. CHAND (Chairman, Administrative Commission) said that the Administrative Commission would probably finish its work in the next two meetings. It had already sent its resolution on the budget to the Programme and Budget Commission, and it was for that Commission to fix the ceiling of the budget. However, whatever ceiling was arrived at, Dr. Chand pointed out that about 10 per cent of the assessed revenue would have to be taken as unrealizable. The Administrative Commission was also examining the question of local salary scales; it was possible that some saving might be effected there. The largest defaulting country was China, and the 7 per cent allotted to that country might be said to be unrealizable. There were also countries which had not paid since 1947.

[5] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) thought that, if the Administrative Commission could that afternoon let the Programme and Budget Commission have a further report on the matter, it might help the latter Commission to fix a total figure. The particular point on which he thought the Programme and Budget Commission had not been clear was this: If the full Programme of the Executive Board (for a budget of $8,200,000) was actually to be carried out, what total should Member States be asked to contribute? Was it $8,000,000, $9,000,000, $8,500,000?

[6] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) agreed with Sir John. But a second question to which the Programme and Budget Commission would like a reply was: if the total budget was fixed at $8,200,000, could the delegations be certain, in planning for 1951, that this sum would in fact be available? In practice, they knew that this was not so. If a ceiling of $8,200,000 were voted, it would be fictitious, since it was known that some $500,000 to $600,000 would be lacking. The Commission would have to discuss how the necessary sum could be found—it might be by increasing the contributions from Member States, it might be by saving here or there.

[7] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) agreed with Sir John that the Administrative Commission should submit its report that same afternoon. He also thought it desirable that that Commission make a provisional report regarding the savings that might be effected by adopting local salary scales.

[8] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was not very optimistic about the reductions to be effected by adopting local salary scales for certain grades in the Secretariat. It was a delicate and serious problem for the Organization.

[9] Three years previously, the Conference had fixed the salaries for personnel recruited in Paris: in his opinion they had at that time committed an error, for they had established a principle and not applied it. The result was that, for the past three years, the personnel in question—about 60

per cent of the Secretariat—had been receiving salaries equal to those paid by the United Nations in New York. Now reductions were asked for for that personnel. He had had long discussions with the Staff Association and he was now being asked to make too hard a decision, because it was inhuman.

[10] If the Conference decided to reduce those salaries, they would be inconsistent, since the argument for continuing to accept Nationalist China as a member of the Organization was that the Organization should not act before the United Nations had acted. In applying local salary scales, the Secretary-General of the United Nations had decided to apply them to new posts, but not to the existing personnel. Yet the present Conference was asking Unesco to go ahead of the United Nations. Such conflicting decisions weakened each other.

[11] The Director-General did not think that the savings, if effected, would be very considerable. That was why the Administrative Commission should say to the Programme and Budget Commission: "The figure of $8,200,000 cannot be a real budget figure, because there will be a deficit. You must vote for a ceiling of $8,500,000 in order to have a real figure of $8,200,000." To finance a budget of $8,500,000—or whatever the figure might be—they would either have to enlarge the Organization's reserve fund or ask Member States for a loan to cover the deficit. Those were the questions to which the Administrative Commission must reply.

[12] It should be remembered that each delegation formed an entity, and that the decisions of the other Commissions presumably would not greatly differ from those taken in the Administrative Commission. From the point of view of procedure, it was certainly correct for the General Committee to ask the Administrative Commission to convey their decision to the Programme and Budget Commission; in practice, however, the Director-General did not think the decisions of the Administrative Commission would be noticeably different from those of the Programme and Budget Commission. Their discussions on Natural Sciences, on Education and other points would remain ineffective as long as the total budget figure was not known.

[13] The CHAIRMAN asked the Chairman of the Administrative Commission to do his best to ensure that a decision on the budget figure be taken by the end of the afternoon's meeting.

[14] In view of what the Director-General had said regarding the proposed salary scales, Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) who was anxious to discuss the matter with the Administrative Commission, suggested that this question be made the subject of a second report; the decision on the budget figure should be made known first.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Dr. Walker.

[15] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) pointed out that, if the Programme and Budget Commission started to discuss the programme without having a ceiling for the budget, many delegations would feel that they were wasting their time. He asked for the General Committee's authorization to propose to the Programme and Budget Commission that the Budget be discussed on the basis of the document prepared by the Secretariat and in the light of the report of the Budget Committee. Should the final figure of the budget be different, the question would have to be reopened, *Agreed.*

[16] It was also *agreed* that the meeting of the Joint Commission—Programme and Budget, Official and External Relations should take place on Friday, 9 June.

Draft Amendment to Item 19 of the Agenda presented by the Yugoslav delegation (*continuation*).

[17] The CHAIRMAN remarked that the attendance at previous lectures had not so far been very remarkable, the audience consisting mostly of persons other than delegates or members of the Secretariat. It was *decided* not to pursue the Yugoslav proposal.

Communication from the President of the International Relief Union to the President of the Conference.

[18] It was *agreed* to refer this communication to the Director-General for study and examination.

Proposal of the Greek Delegation that Mrs. Montessori address the General Conference on the subject of children.

[19] It was *agreed* that a talk could be given by Mrs. Montessori, of not more than ten minutes duration.

Second Report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission [document 5C/ADM/19].

[20] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) did not think it would be possible for delegations to say before 15 June, by what date the Organization might expect to receive the balance of contributions due. He suggested that the Director-General write to Member States and inform them by what date contributions should be paid.

[21] The CHAIRMAN said he had just been informed by the Head of the External Relations Service that reminders had been sent out, and some answers received, concerning payment of contributions. Replies should be addressed to the Director-General.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Work of the Programme and Budget Commission.

[1] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) stated that, after fixing the provisional budget ceiling for 1951, the Programme and Budget Commission had completed its consideration of the programme for education and embarked on the chapter covering natural sciences. Only three questions relating to that chapter had been settled, since most of the technical experts were attending meetings at the Palazzo Vecchio, and Mr. Seydoux was therefore prepared to comply with the wishes of several delegations and to begin consideration of the whole chapter afresh; it could be completed that day, and the Commission could then begin on the social sciences chapter at an evening meeting and continue with it the following day. If the discussion progressed satisfactorily, the Commission would be able to complete its work by the evening of Tuesday, 13 June or by the morning of Wednesday, 14 June at the latest.

[2] Mr. Seydoux suggested holding the meeting of the Joint Commission—Official and External Relations, Programme and Budget in the afternoon of Thursday, 9 June; it was essential that representatives of the Allied High Commission should take part in the discussion of Unesco's activities in Germany and they were due to leave Florence in the evening of 9 June. The matter had already been discussed by a sub-committee of the Executive Board and would be taken up again by the Board itself on 8 June.

Establishment of closer contact between the Programme and Budget Commission and the Budget Committee.

[3] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought such contact essential. The day before, the Programme and Budget Commission had decided on the provisional budget ceiling, but had made it clear that the programme might be altered while being considered by the Commission; any changes would obviously involve either an increase or decrease in the budget estimates. Logically, the Secretariat should prepare the budget estimates for any addition to or reduction of the programme, submit them to the Budget Committee for return to the Programme and Budget Commission with exact figures for each proposed activity. The work of the Commission would be simplified and much time saved if closer co-operation could be established between the Programme and Budget Commission and the Budget Committee.

[4] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) said that his Committee had completed its preliminary consideration of the Budget and of the new proposals submitted by various delegations. His preliminary report had been communicated to the Programme and Budget Commission, and the Budget Committee was waiting for the resolutions to be approved by the Commission in order to consider in detail how the funds should be allocated to keep within the provisional budget ceiling of $8,200,000. If close liaison were established, as advocated by the Director-

General, it would be possible to give final consideration to the resolutions as each decision of the Programme and Budget Commission was taken, without waiting for them all to be referred together to the Budget Committee.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL emphasized that such co-operation was imperative and suggested:

(1) That the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission should again draw the Commission's attention to the fact that any resolution with budgetary implications should be referred to the Budget Committee (as a matter of principle);

(2) That the Rapporteur of the Budget Committee should attend all meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission.

[6] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL, who had kept in touch with the work of both Commissions, was afraid that some delegates were under the impression that when any item in the programme was approved, the Programme and Budget Commission simultaneously passed the corresponding budget appropriation. He thought it essential to remind delegates that, according to its terms of reference, the Budget Committee had first to consider the budgetary implications of any resolution approved by the Commission and then to submit its final report to the Conference through the Programme and Budget Commission.

[7] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) explained that the Programme and Budget Commission's vote was in fact a provisional decision, the Budget Committee being responsible for preparing the final budget appropriation corresponding to each resolution.

[8] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed, but thought that the Programme and Budget Commission should be told that the General Committee had discussed the problem and endorsed the Budget Committee's terms of reference; any recommendation that a particular activity should be further developed would necessarily compel the Secretariat to submit a corresponding budget estimate to the Budget Committee.

[9] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) supported the view of the Director-General. Whenever the Programme and Budget Commission added a new item to the programme, it should realize that the budget was affected; any proposal for an expansion of the programme should be accompanied by an exact budget estimate. He therefore seconded all the Director-General's suggestions. The Budget Committee's Rapporteur had followed the meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission but had never spoken at them. Sir John suggested that the Rapporteur of the Budget Committee should be formally invited by the Chairman of the Commission to give an opinion at the end of the discussion of each section of the programme.

[10] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) mentioned that only $5,500,000 out of a total budget of $8,200,000 were allotted to programme activities. The Committee had other problems to solve with regard to portions of the budget that were not affected by resolutions, and, in its anxiety to secure a proper balance, might sometimes feel it necessary to reject certain draft resolutions.

The procedure recommended by the Director-General was *approved*.

Time-Table of work for the Conference.

[11] The CHAIRMAN mentioned that, as plenary meetings were to be resumed on Thursday, 15 June, the Conference would have in all only seven meetings (including one evening meeting) in which to complete its work; it would therefore be necessary to take drastic steps to limit the length of speeches. Meetings might be called for 9 a.m., so as to be sure that it would be possible to begin work at 9.30. To avoid moving from one building to another, with the consequent loss of time, it was suggested that the plenary meetings should be held at the Pitti Palace in the Sala Bianca, which would be re-arranged for the purpose.

The meeting in the morning of Thursday, 15 June might be devoted to the election of the members of the Executive Board, on the proposal of the Nominations Committee, which would be able to meet in the afternoon of Wednesday, 14 June. After the election of the members of the Board, the Conference would be able to decide on the seat of the Sixth Session and to begin discussing any reports of Commissions that might be ready. Provision had been made for a plenary meeting one evening for the tributes to Avicenna, Bach, Balzac, Confucius and Muratori; that evening meeting might be held on 15, 16 or 17 June, as the other evenings were already occupied.

[12] After a discussion concerning the number of speakers and the length of speeches, it was *decided* that no more than three speakers should be scheduled for each of these commemorative tributes, the average length of speeches to be between ten and fifteen minutes.

[13] Mr. DÉSY (Chairman, Credentials Committee) suggested that any speeches which the Conference had not time to hear should be

published, but the DIRECTOR-GENERAL doubted whether this would be satisfactory so far as the tribute to Avicenna was concerned; many delegations were extremely interested in it and, in that case, provision might be made for some more flexible procedure.

Unesco reception.

[14] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded the Committee that it was customary to give a reception at the end of the Conference; he had been informed of a request, submitted by the students attending the Seminar organized by the World Federation of United Nations Associations, that, instead of holding a Unesco reception, the sum which would have been spent on it should be used for some cultural charity, such as a children's village or a rehabilitation centre for children who had been crippled in the war. He would be glad to have the General Committee's opinion on that point; while it was difficult not to comply with the suggestion, it would be hard to cut out the reception, which was a gesture of politeness and gratitude for the warm welcome Florence had given the Conference. A third possible solution would be to give the reception and arrange for a collection for some Italian charity.

[15] The General Committee, recognizing the significance of such a gesture, *decided* that, on 16 June 1950, a reception should be given as usual by the President of the Conference, the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General.

[16] With regard to the proposed collection, it was *decided* to publish in the *Journal of the Conference* of 8 June an appeal to delegations and members of the Secretariat, and to appoint one or two members of the General Committee to collect the money in conjunction with the Comptroller.

Seat of the Seventh Session of the General Conference.

[17] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL informed the General Committee of the invitation from the Government of Uruguay to hold the Seventh Session of the General Conference at Montevideo or in any other town of Uruguay according to the needs and convenience of the Conference. The General Committee was not required to take a decision, but Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure obliged the Director-General to inform the Conference of the invitation received.

Communication from the Polish Embassy in Rome.

[18] The CHAIRMAN communicated the text of a letter addressed on 6 June 1950 to the President of the Conference by the Polish Embassy in Rome.

I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Poland protests against the admission of the Kuomintang delegate to Unesco's Conference and states that in consequence Poland will not consider herself bound by decisions taken at the present Session. (*Signed*) Wladislaw Tykocinski, Acting Chargé d'Affaires.

This appeared to be a mere codicil to the statements of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian delegations, and the Chairman proposed that the Committee should take note of this letter, without bringing it before the Conference.

This procedure, seconded by Professor NIELSEN (Chairman, Procedure Committee) and Mr. DÉSY (Chairman, Credentials Committee), was *approved.*

Telegram to the Director-General from the One World Committee.

[19] The CHAIRMAN read a telegram which the Director-General had received from the One World Committee (of 12 East 46 Street, New York), as follows:

Committee deeply interested in Yugoslav proposal for World Conference of Peace Fighters. Our Committee holding One World Meeting in San Remo 22 to 28 August 1950 with Oswaldo Aranha Herbert Agar Senator McMahon Count Carlo Sforza Gunnar Myrdal Einstein and many others as speakers and co-operation of many Non-Governmental Organizations including WFUNA and participation by communities in many lands. Purpose to find out concrete way these organizations and communities can work on and support peace projects. You personally and members of Conference invited to One World Meeting. Appreciate you communicate this invitation to Conference.

It was *decided* to publish this next in the *Journal of the Conference.*

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

NINTH MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Communications.

[1] The CHAIRMAN read out three communications:

(1) A telegram from the Women's Permanent Peace Delegation, stating that the association was in sympathy with Unesco's ideals and was following the work of the Conference with great interest.

(2) A request from the Head of the delegation of Israel, mentioning that his delegation was anxious to be associated with the tribute to Avicenna at a plenary meeting of the General Conference.

(3) A letter from the Swiss League for Human Rights in support of two appeals relating to exiles, refugees and political *émigrés*, addressed to Unesco by the Central Committee of the Italian branches of the International League for the Defence of Human Rights and by the International Committee of the Red Cross respectively; the letter also supported the claims put forward by the meeting of the eleven committees of exiles, held in Rome on 5 March.

It was *decided* that the General Committee should consider the question again when it had received the appeals in question.

Draft Regulations relating to the approval by the Conference of recommendations to Member States and of international conventions.

[2] The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the General Committee had referred item 10.81 of the Agenda (Draft Regulations relating to the approval by the General Conference of recommendations to Member States and of international conventions) to the Procedure Committee for study. As the Procedure Committee had considered the question in detail, it seemed unnecessary to refer it to the Official and External Relations Commission.

With the approval of Dr. BARALT Y ZACHARIE (Chairman, Official and External Relations Commission), it was *decided* that the Procedure Committee should report direct to the General Conference.

Election of six members of the Executive Board.

[3] The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the Nominations Committee would meet on Wednesday, 14 June, in preparation for the election of six new members of the Executive Board. He pointed out that only candidates proposed by the Nominations Committee or by two delegations were eligible for appointment. So far he had received only one nomination, submitted by two delegations.

Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) stated that he had also received one nomination.

Work of the Programme and Budget Commission (*continuation*).

[4] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) explained that his Commission had finished discussing the *Social Sciences* chapter and was beginning its examination of *Cultural Activities*. Mr. Seydoux was allowing for three or four meetings to discuss *Cultural Activities*; one meeting for *Relief Assistance* and *Exchange of Persons;* two meetings for *Mass Communication*; and four meetings for all the other items. He therefore thought it necessary for the Commission to hold evening meetings on Monday, 12, Tuesday, 13 and Wednesday, 14 June.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it would be better to hold the first of those meetings on the evening of 9 June and the other two on the Monday and Tuesday, keeping Wednesday evening free for preparations for the plenary meetings.

This suggestion, seconded by Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America), was *adopted*.

Collection for the Italian organization for aid to child victims of the war.

[6] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) reported that, in accordance with the

General Committee's decision, he had made arrangements for the collection for child victims of the war in Italy. A notice had been inserted in the *Journal of the Conference*, and a table had been placed at the entrance to the meeting rooms so that contributions could be collected by a voluntary worker for an hour in the mornings and an hour in the afternoons.

The meeting rose at 10.20 a.m.

TENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Work of the Programme and Budget Commission (*continuation*).

[1] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) stated that the Commission had completed its consideration of the *Mass Communications* chapter the previous evening and that, with the discussion of the work of the *Relief Assistance Services*, consideration of all programme resolutions would be concluded that morning. The Commission would then turn its attention to an Egyptian motion and various other resolutions. The afternoon meeting would deal with important resolutions on peace, which might give rise to a lengthy discussion, and with resolutions concerning Human Rights, publications and the general work of the Conference. It would also be necessary to consider how to deal with certain resolutions or certain parts of the programme once the Budget Committee had provided estimates for the new proposals submitted to it; it was already to be anticipated that the total budget figure would exceed the stipulated ceiling of $8,200,000.

[2] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL also thought that the budget ceiling would be exceeded by some 300,000 dollars, and feared that the Programme and Budget Commission would be unable to reach any decision at the few remaining meetings with regard to the necessary reductions. He suggested the setting up of a small committee, to be assisted by the Chairman of the Executive Board and himself, and by the Chairmen of the Programme and Budget Commission and of the Budget Committee; it would be instructed to lay down an order of priority for resolutions and to suggest the deletion of certain projects for which no budgetary provision could be made, in the light of the Programme and Budget Commission's recommendation that larger funds should be allocated to the most valuable projects.

The Director-General thought that this work could be completed in two meetings, for the discussion could be restricted to certain specific points instead of covering the whole programme.

[3] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated that he, too, had considered the need for singling out the items that were really worth incorporating in the programme and of deleting the less important resolutions. Such action was essential in order to keep within the $8,200,000 limit. Sir John feared that if all suggestions for such changes were to originate from the Budget Committee, they would give rise to discussions that could not be completed in the very limited time the Programme and Budget Commission still had before it. He therefore considered the Director-General's suggestion to establish the committee most helpful; in his opinion, the new body might be regarded as a joint committee of the Programme and Budget Commission and of the Budget Committee, since the chairmen of both bodies would be serving on it. Sir John also suggested that the Chairman of the Administrative Commission should be a member of the proposed committee, which seemed to be the only body competent to submit a programme of work that could be covered by the fixed Budget and was likely to be acceptable to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[4] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) acknowledged that the final responsibility for the necessary cuts rested with the Programme and Budget Commission rather than with the Budget Committee. He was not against the establish-

ment of a committee to undertake that task, but he wondered when such a committee could meet, as a heavy time-table of meetings had already been arranged.

[5] Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) approved the Director-General's suggestion and agreed with Dr. Bender that the difficulty was to find time for the committee to meet. He thought such a committee should be regarded primarily as an offshoot of the Programme and Budget Commission, especially appointed to deal with a matter that could not be considered in plenary meeting because the Commission had too large a membership.

[6] The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Director-General, but felt it necessary to avoid giving the impression that the Committee would supersede the Programme and Budget Commission; like Mr. Seydoux, the Chairman thought the Committee should be responsible to the Programme and Budget Commission, to which it should report.

[7] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that this had been his intention in putting forward his proposal. Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) also supported that view.

[8] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested that the Programme and Budget Commission might cancel the evening meeting scheduled for that day, to make room for a meeting of the new committee.

[9] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) thought it would be better to wait until the Budget Committee had finished its work before holding a meeting of the new committee. Since the Budget Committee was to meet for the last time the following afternoon, he suggested that the committee proposed by the Director-General should meet the following evening.

[10] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America), made a similar comment with regard to the Programme and Budget Commission, advising delay until that Commission had completed its work, so that no doubts should remain.

[11] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL admitted the cogency of these arguments, and suggested that the evening of the following day should be set aside for a meeting of the new committee; if it did not finish its work, one of the plenary meetings should be cancelled so that the committee's second meeting might be held. The discussion at the plenary meeting could be considerably shortened if the committee in question were able to submit a clear and concise report.

[12] Dr. WALKER (Chairman, Nominations Committee) thought that the committee would be able to complete its work in one meeting, for it could only make general proposals for a kind of summary execution, without embarking on any detailed discussion.

[13] Hamed ZAKI Bey (Egypt) was in favour of establishing the committee in question, but thought that it should confine itself to eliminating less important matters, without attempting to fix priorities.

[14] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested that the committee should consist of the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, India, Brazil and Iraq (the delegation which had suggested that such a committee should be established), together with a Scandinavian and a Spanish-speaking delegate.

[15] At the suggestion of Professor NIELSEN (Chairman, Procedure Committee) and Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela), Sweden and Cuba were chosen for these last two places.

[16] It was *decided* to submit the proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission and to suggest that the Committee should meet the following evening, arrangements being made for an additional meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission on Thursday afternoon (in place of a plenary meeting) to consider the findings of the new committee.

Communications.

[17] The CHAIRMAN read a letter dated 9 June addressed to the Fifth Session of the Conference by representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Federation of Teachers' Unions: the letter dealt with the failure to carry out resolutions 33.5 to 33.523, passed by the Fourth Session, concerning the participation of labour in Unesco's activities. The Chairman proposed that the letter should be referred to the Official and External Relations Commission.

[18] Dr. BARALT Y ZACHARIE (Chairman, Official and External Relations Commission) pointed out that the Commission had finished its work, its only remaining business being to consider the report it was to submit to the General Conference. He suggested that the Rapporteur of that Commission should be asked to mention the question in the report without any preliminary discussion. *Agreed.*

[19] The CHAIRMAN then read a communication from the observers representing the World Federation of Trade Unions about the expulsion of eight teachers in New York for their political

opinions. As this matter had already been considered (it had been decided that Unesco was not competent to take any action as it was a question of the domestic policy of a Member State), the Chairman thought that the General Committee should merely take note of the communication. *Agreed.*

[20] The CHAIRMAN announced that the President of the Syrian Republic had sent a telegram, dated 10 June, instructing Mr. Wadji Mallat to represent Syria for the purpose of electing the members of the Executive Board. As that country had stated that it would not be represented at the current session, the Credentials Committee would have to meet as soon as possible to consider Mr. Wadji Mallat's credentials and to submit a report to the plenary meeting on Thursday morning, before the election of the members of the Executive Board.

It was *decided* that a meeting of the Credentials Committee should be held at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 14 June.

[21] The CHAIRMAN read a registered letter, dated 7 June, from the President of the Union of Slovene Cultural Associations, making certain complaints against the Italian Government on the subject of the status and syllabuses of Slovene schools in Italy, and asking Unesco to forward the communications to the United Nations to secure the observance of all the clauses of the peace treaty. The Chairman recalled that the General Committee had discussed a similar question at its fourth meeting and had decided to acknowledge receipt of the request without putting it on the agenda, and to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the action taken.

It was *decided* to follow the same procedure.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Friday, 16 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Count STEFANO JACINI (Italy)

Appropriation Resolution.

[1] Dr. BENDER (Chairman of the Budget Committee) understood that an appropriation resolution, submitted by the United States delegation to the Programme and Budget Commission, had been adopted. He expressed a certain astonishment that the resolution had not been submitted in the first instance to the Budget Committee.

[2] In the absence of a satisfactory explanation, Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) pointed out that, whatever had happened, it was quite clear that the Appropriation Table was for the Budget Committee to draft and present to the General Conference. *Agreed.*

Method of work during the last two days of the Session.

[3] The CHAIRMAN observed that the main questions considered by the three Commissions were to come before the plenary meetings that day and the following day. He foresaw two dangers; firstly, that detailed discussions might take place which would be very lengthy and might annul the work done by the three Commissions; secondly, that, on the contrary, the Conference might simply take note of the conclusions of the Commissions, without any discussion of the substance of their reports. He therefore proposed the following procedure:

(*a*) That the Rapporteurs should present their reports without being limited to any length of time.

(*b*) That delegates who agreed with the conclusions of the Rapporteurs should not request to speak.

(*c*) That delegates who disagreed with any points in the reports and had amendments to present should state their position, their speeches being limited to a given number of minutes.

(*d*) That the Rapporteurs should reply to the points raised.

(*e*) That a vote should be taken without further discussion.

[4] Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom) pointed out that certain matters would be referred to the plenary session for decisions; for example, the Administrative Commission had taken no decision on the United States proposal regarding the problem of bridging the gap between the estimated revenue of $7,600,000 for 1951 and the provisional total budget figure of $8,200,000 approved by the Programme and Budget Commission. The matter was therefore being referred to the plenary session for a decision.

[5] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) thought that it would not be out of keeping with the procedure proposed by the Chairman if there were a free debate on matters upon which the three Commissions had arrived at no conclusion. The Budget Committee, in its final consolidated report, would then have to take account of any such decisions taken by the plenary session.

[6] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) pointed out that the Budget Committee did not intend to submit a consolidated report. It had already submitted an interim report, a final report was being prepared, and it would also submit an appropriation resolution and an appropriation table.

[7] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) proposed that the plenary session should hear the report of the Administrative Commission before that of the Programme and Budget Commission, while Dr. CHAND (Chairman, Administrative Commission) and Mr. SEYDOUX (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) were in favour of the inverse procedure.

[8] On the other hand, Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) agreed with Sir John Maud that it would be more appropriate for the plenary session to hear the Report of the Administrative Commission on the income which could reasonably be expected in 1951 and its suggestions for finding additionnal funds to arrive at the provisional budget total of $8,200,000 before it considered the programme as proposed in the report of the Programme and Budget Commission.

Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) recalled that the Administrative Commission had not contested the provisional budget total of $8,200,000 adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, but that the disagreement of several delegations to the proposed methods of financing that budget had crystallized, so that it had been felt necessary to refer the matter to the plenary session.

[9] Dr. CHAND (Chairman, Administrative Commission) observed that, if the plenary session first adopted the budget total of $8,200,000, then the first recommendation of the Administrative Commission to base the total budget for 1951 on the figure of $7,600,000 would be eliminated; but its suggestions regarding certain measures which could be taken to implement a budget of $8,200,000 would still be operative. He therefore did not see any real difficulty, and suggested that the plenary session should first consider the report of the Progamme and Budget Commission, which would mean that the provisional figure of $8,200,000 would be converted into a final figure.

[10] It was *agreed* that the report of the Programme and Budget Commission should be submitted to the plenary session before that of the Administrative Commission.

[11] The General Committee then fixed the programme of work for 16 and 17 June.

The meeting rose at 11. a.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

FIRST MEETING

Friday, 26 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France)

Opening of the meeting.

[1] The CHAIRMAN opened the session with a tribute to his predecessors, Sir John Maud, Dr. Beeby and Professor Carneiro.

Election of Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur.

[2] The following were elected:

Vice-Chairmen: Dr. C. E. Beeby (New Zealand) Dr. Tevfik Saglam (Turkey).

Rapporteur: Mr. Marcel Florkin (Belgium).

Adoption of the Agenda [document 5C/1 (Rev.), Part III].

[3] The agenda was adopted with the following amendments:

(1) Under item 8.4, the deletion of the words "and of the Statement of Methods of the Organization";

(2) Consideration under item 8.8 of draft resolution 5C/12 (Presentation of the Annual Programme and Budget of the Organization);

(3) Consideration of the comments presented by the Executive Board in documents 5C/OXR/4 and 5C/OXR/5 (items 10.5.1 and 10.5.2 of the Agenda);

(4) Inclusion of a new item 8.10.1: Consideration and discussion of questions relating to the problem of peace.

Establishment of a Drafting Committee.

[4] The CHAIRMAN suggested the immediate establishment of a Drafting Committee under the chairmanship of the Rapporteur and consisting of the delegates of the following countries: United States of America, France, Mexico, and the United Kingdom. *Agreed.*

Presentation of the Basic Programme by the Chairman of the Executive Board [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part I].

[5] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated that the Basic Programme was one for which the Board took entire responsibility. The Board's view was that it was possible and indeed desirable to present to the Fifth Session of the General Conference a programme in two parts: a Basic Programme and an Annual Programme. He would describe the Basic Programme as a statement of the foundations of the work which the Board thought Unesco could and should do for the next few years.

Summarizing the questions which the Commission should answer, Sir John asked:

(1) Whether a Basic Programme was wanted at all;

(2) If there was to be a Basic Programme, whether it should be a mixture of resolutions and preambles;

(3) If so, under what chapter, headings and sub-headings the mixture of resolutions and preambles ought to be grouped;

(4) If the Commission thought it could improve on the work of the Executive Board, how it considered that could best be done.

[6] The CHAIRMAN thanked Sir John for his explanations and expressed his admiration for the clarity and objectivity of the proposed Programme, the presentation of which was a considerable improvement on the corresponding documents of previous years.

Discussion of the Basic Programme.

[7] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation wished to congratulate the Board on the new form of presentation. With certain alterations, the Programme in that form could become a valuable link between Unesco and its general public. However, from a detailed drafting point of view, the United Kingdom delegation would, in due course, suggest certain changes, intended to make the Basic Programme shorter, clearer, more logical, more attractive to read, and more capable of making an impact on the public.

[8] The CHAIRMAN thought that the Drafting Committee could properly be called upon to polish the style and revise the translations; however, it was for the Commission to consider the general form of the document and to determine whether it was unduly long or unbalanced.

[9] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) associated himself with Dr. Huxley's remarks, and proposed that the Commission should merely approve the preambles and submit them to the Drafting Committee for revision and improvement, on the understanding that they would come before the Commission again.

[10] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) observed that the work done on the Basic Programme was tremendously appreciated by his delegation; it showed a fundamental change of great importance. However, while fully approving the intention behind that change, it considered that the result was unsatisfactory. There was an enormous amount of repetition, absence of any real meaning, and the whole document was far too long. There were preambles and sub-preambles, redundant resolutions or statements of intentions, and resolutions or sub-resolutions which repeated in detail the proposals in the main statements. It seemed to the New Zealand delegation that the preambles should be obliterated completely, with one possible exception—the preamble to Mass Communications, which seemed very good; but the delegation would really prefer to see all the preambles completely discarded or, if the meeting was opposed to that idea, referred to a drafting committee for careful, radical redrafting. That harsh criticism, however, was an attempt to meet the proposals of the Board with the serious consideration which it obviously expected and for which it had so clearly and so generously asked.

[11] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that objections of that kind had been anticipated when the document was being considered by the Executive Board. He emphasized that it was the result of a great deal of work on the part of all members of the Board; they had considered and discussed at length the whole programme, which had finally been adopted in its present form for the following reasons. Under its Constitution, Unesco was required to appeal to the general public, but a numbered programme could be of no interest to the man in the street; in such a form it could not fire the imagination of the public, for which purpose it was necessary to show the connexion between the proposed activities and the aim in view. The more formal a text, the more limited its appeal. The Drafting Committee could perhaps frame a better text, but it would be inadvisable to discard the preambles, whose interest for the general reader should not be discounted.

The Director-General thought it necessary to begin with a consideration of the resolutions, after which it could be seen whether the preambles were necessary; the Drafting Committee should be relied upon to prepare the final text.

[12] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) suggested the immediate discussion of each individual resolution, after which some decision could be reached regarding the necessary deletions.

[13] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) admitted that anyone reading the Programme for the first time might well be confused; nevertheless, it was an excellent document in that it provided a clear view of the desired aims, while giving a concise account of Unesco's work. It was perhaps not an ideal document (the terminology might be made more uniform), but its general outline should be preserved as it satisfied the demands both of the Cartesian mind (in the preambles) and of the experimental mind (in the actual resolutions).

[14] The CHAIRMAN explained that both the English and French versions were original drafts, so that neither could be called a translation.

Mr. Photiades' proposal that the Commission should begin by considering the resolutions, after which it could turn its attention to the preambles, was supported by ten delegations and *adopted*.

A. Education.

1. IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION THROUGH EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.

Item A.1.

[15] Professor CALÒ (Italy) explained that his delegation's intention, in presenting the amendment (document 5C/68), was to urge Unesco to

take advantage of the co-operation of all private bodies.

[16] The CHAIRMAN considered that the resolution would be more appropriate in the Statement of Methods (document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part V), a suggestion which Professor CALÒ (Italy) accepted.

Item A.1 was therefore *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item A.11.

[17] In reply to a remark made by Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), the DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that the document before the meeting was a *basic* programme for Unesco's future action, and that all financial matters would be discussed when the Programme *for 1951* came under review.

[18] On a point of order, Dr. STODDARD (United States of America), supported by Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt), proposed that the Commission should move directly from the general statements in the Preamble and the Basic Programme to the consideration of the corresponding items in the 1951 Programme.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought that Dr. Stoddard's motion arose out of a confusion: the resolution read "promote by means of financial aid", but that did not imply any immediate allocation of funds. For the time being, only the principle involved had to be discussed, and the question would come before the Commission again when it was a matter of implementing the resolution.

The motion of the delegate of the United States of America was *rejected* by 22 votes to 5.

[19] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) having enquired whether the action contemplated under item A.11 did not overlap with that being carried out by the International Bureau of Education, Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) observed that the work of the International Bureau of Education was fully co-ordinated with that of Unesco; close collaboration had been established between the organizations.

Item A.11 was *adopted* without change.[2]

Items A.12 to A.15.

Adopted without comment.[3]

2. EXTENSION OF EDUCATION.

Item A.2.

[20] Miss PARKINSON (United Kingdom) suggested the following amendment: "develop *educational systems especially in the fields of fundamental education*". *Adopted.*[1]

[21] Mrs. ROSS (Denmark) referred to the meeting held in December 1949 at Unesco House in connexion with the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women and the discrimination still exercised against them in some fields. She stressed the extreme interest taken by women all over the world in that part of Unesco's Programme, and asked the Secretariat to bear her observations in mind when a resolution affecting it was taken.

Items A.21 and A.24.

[22] Miss PARKINSON (United Kingdom) proposed that, in items A.21 and A.24, the words "where appropriate, offer" should be replaced by "make available on request to". *Adopted.*[2]

Item A.211.

[23] Mr. LOURENÇO-FILHO (Brazil) having suggested the deletion of the words "the setting up of . . . centres", the DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it preferable to amend the text to read as follows: "encourage the training of staff and the production of material for fundamental education, and, in particular, the establishment of centres to this end". *Adopted.*[3]

Item A.22.

Adopted without discussion.[4]

Item A.23.

[24] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) proposed the following amendment: "co-operate with universities, colleges and other institutions of higher learning in the various Member States"; Mr. ABRAHAM (France) preferred: "Collaborate with universities and educationists in general", while Professor CALO (Italy) requested the inclusion of scientific institutions.

On the CHAIRMAN's proposal, the following text was *adopted*: "Collaborate with universities, scientific institutions and educationists in general".[5]

Item A.231.

[25] Various amendments to item A.231, proposed respectively by ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), Senator PECSON (Philippines), Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) and Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela), were *rejected.*

1. In final form: Resol. A.1.
2. In final form: Resol. A.11.
3. In final form: Resol. A.12 to A.13, A.132, A.14 and A.15.

1. In final form: Resol. A.2.
2. In final form: Resol. A.21 and A.24.
3. In final form: Resol. A.211.
4. In final form: Resol. A.22.
5. In final form: Resol. A.23.

At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, the following wording was *adopted*: "in the initiation of research into the most appropriate methods of fundamental education".[1]

Item A.232.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item A.24.

Adopted without further change.[3]

Item A.25.

[26] Professor CALÒ (Italy) suggested the addition. after the word "improvement", of "and the more effective organization".

That proposal was supported by Mr. LOURENÇO-FILHO (Brazil), Mr. ABRAHAM (France), ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), Professor VERNIERS (Belgium), Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) and Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) and *adopted*, subject to revision by the Drafting Committee.[4]

Item A.26.

Adopted without discussion.[5]

Items A.27 to A.273.

[27] Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) asked to what extent the activities under "Education for Handicapped Children" were the concern of WHO and the Department of Social Affairs of the United Nations, and asked for an assurance that Unesco would not be working in the same field.

[28] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that Unesco and the other Specialized Agencies had collaborated to very good purpose over the past few months. Unesco's Draft Programme had been communicated to the various Specialized Agencies, which had made no comment on that particular point.

[29] Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela) was of the opinion that the programme should be expanded to cover normal children as well, and suggested the following sub-heading: "Education for Handicapped and Normal Children".

[30] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought that the problem of maladjusted children was of prime importance in connexion with education for peace.

[31] There followed a discussion between Mr. LOURENÇO-FILHO (Brazil), Mr. PIÑEROS CORPAS (Colombia), Miss PARKINSON (United Kingdom), Professor CALÒ (Italy), Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) and Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela).

[32] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the whole chapter was thus at stake, he asked Dr. Plaza to submit a resolution on the matter at a later date if he so desired.

[33] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) considered it desirable to keep to the heading as it stood, as that proposed by Dr. Plaza would cover all types of children and would be equivalent to "Education of Children".

It was *decided*, by 15 votes to 1, to maintain the original heading ("Education for Handicapped Children").

Items A.27 to A.273 inclusive were *adopted* by 18 votes to 2.[1]

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. A.231.
2. In final form: Resol. A.232.
3. In final form: Resol. A.24.
4. In final form: Resol. A.25.
5. In final form: Resol. A.26.

1. In final form: Resol. A.27 to A.273.

SECOND MEETING

Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

[1] The CHAIRMAN stated that, in accordance with a decision of the General Committee, the problem of financing the Budget would be examined by the Administrative Commission, without whose conclusions the Programme and Budget Commission could take no decision regarding the total budget figure.

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), rev.].

[2] The CHAIRMAN clarified a few points concerning the scope of the Basic Programme resolutions. It was a long-term programme, and the adoption of the resolutions embodied therein did not mean that those resolutions would necessarily be implemented the following year. Consequently, they had no budgetary implications. However, they provided an authority for the Annual Programme resolutions, which was the reason why the long-term programme was called the "Basic" Programme.

[3] All the resolutions included in the draft Programme for 1951 were covered by the resolutions in the draft Basic Programme, and the numbers of the resolutions showed the relationship between the two. Funds had to be authorized for all Annual Programme resolutions, and the Budget Estimates submitted by the Secretariat represented the Executive Board's estimate of the funds required for the draft Programme for 1951. The Budget Committee was engaged on a technical study of the estimates, and its preliminary report on the matter would shortly be communicated to the Commission.

[4] New proposals presented by delegations were immediately referred to the Budget Committee, which would refer them back, with its budgetary conclusions, to the Programme and Budget Commission. The latter could then come to a decision regarding them, from the point of view of the programme and the budget.

[5] Finally, the Chairman reminded the meeting that the preambles, on which the Commission's decision had been reserved, had no legal force; their sole purpose was to give the public a clear idea of the guiding principles behind the Basic Programme resolutions.

A. Education (*continued*).

2. EXTENSION OF EDUCATION (*concluded*).

Items A.271 to A.273.

[6] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) reverted to these items, remarking that they covered substantially the same ground: A.271 and A.272 dealt with children, and A.273 with their teachers. He therefore proposed that items A.271 and A.272 should be combined, to read: "encourage the development and application of specialized educational techniques for maladjusted children".

[7] Professor CALÒ (Italy) would have liked some mention to be made in the resolution of medical assistance. With regard to readjustment, it was necessary to bear in mind not only present social conditions but also the supreme ideals, pointing towards the future, on which the progress of mankind depended. Professor Calò hoped that boarding schools would be included among the institutions whose establishment was contemplated in item A.271. He suggested amending that item to read: "and of special schools, experimental classes and cultural centres for the use of families".

[8] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) could not agree with certain delegates who had advocated amalgamating the three items A.271, A.272 and A.273. The whole project was far clearer if those three items were differentiated, each referring to one particular field: organization of educational services, preventive education and the training of teachers.

[9] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) merely wished to substitute a comprehensive text for items A.271 and A.272, without modifying item A.273. He observed at the same time that points covered in A.271 and A.272 also occurred in the Programme for 1951.

[10] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) suggested that the difference of opinion

arose from a discrepancy between the English and French texts: the point at issue would be clearer from the French text. Item A.271 concerned remedial education for children already maladjusted, whereas item A.272 dealt with preventive education for normal children.

[11] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) did not see the necessity for the maintenance of items A.271 and A.272 as separate resolutions, and moved the adoption of his substitute text.

The motion, seconded by Professor DÜRING (Sweden), was *rejected* by 27 votes to 7.

[12] The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the delegate of Italy that any mention of medical assistance would be likely to cause some anxiety to the World Health Organization, whereupon Professor CALÒ (Italy) withdrew his draft amendment.

Items A.271 to A.273 were therefore *adopted* without amendment.[1]

3. Education for International Understanding.

Item A.3.

[13] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) thought that the words "Member States" were restrictive: quoting as examples items A.23 and A.26, he noted that Unesco should be free to assist all bodies working for the same ends. He accordingly proposed the insertion of "and other countries", wherever appropriate throughout Section 3.

[14] Mgr. BORGONGINI DUCCA (Observer from the Vatican) was gratified that Unesco had included in its programme the development of international understanding—an essential task in a divided world. However, he felt that the Organization would fall short in its efforts if it failed to make it clear that tolerance did not mean indifference; he would prefer the preamble to stress the need for "seeking to unite all men not only through tolerance, which may at times lead to scepticism, but also through the earnest, single-minded pursuit of those truths which may unite them".

[15] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) supported Dr. Siddiqui's proposal. As the text stood, the section would prove more restrictive than the programme approved at Paris and Beirut, which had already extended Unesco's activities to Germany and Japan. He fully realized that the General Conference was at liberty to modify previous decisions, but would like to take the opportunity to refer to his remarks made the previous day.

[16] Mr. WILLEMS (Belgium) thought that Dr. Stoddard was supporting Dr. Siddiqui's amendment for reasons that seemed to depart somewhat from the spirit of that amendment. While Dr. Siddiqui wished merely to prevent Unesco from restricting its co-operation to the public bodies of Member States, and to extend that co-operation to organizations concerned with education in other countries, Dr. Stoddard, on the other hand, apparently wished Unesco's activities not to be confined to Member States only, but to be extended as far as possible to countries not members of the Organization. Mr. Willems nevertheless thought that some form of words might be found to reconcile the two proposals, along some such lines as "Unesco's activities should be extended to cover all countries in collaboration with all public and private organizations concerned with education for international understanding".

[17] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, when Member States were mentioned in the document, that term referred not only to the government of those States, but also to all their competent organizations. He warned the Commission that the adoption of such an amendment would involve the recasting of the whole programme, as the same remarks was applicable to a great many other resolutions.

While appreciating the high motives behind the suggestion put forward by the United States delegate, the Director-General pointed out that such an extension of Unesco's field of action might raise budgetary problems which it would probably be difficult to solve in existing circumstances. It should be remembered that the General Conference in Mexico had adopted a resolution on that subject, and the Commission would do well to refer to it before taking any decision.

[18] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) appreciated the point of view of the Director-General but expressed his concern for the consistency of the text. He thought that Unesco should be above considerations of membership and should make its influence felt wherever possible, both in Member, and non-Member States.

[19] The CHAIRMAN shared the misgivings of the Director-General: the Conference should not shut its eyes to the difficulties that would confront Unesco if its field of action were to be expanded at a time when all countries were urging a concentration of its activities.

[20] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) wished to maintain his motion and asked that it should be put to the vote.

[21] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) thought it irrational to restrict certain activities to Member States, when their extension to

1. In final form: Resol. A.271 to A.273.

Germany and Japan had already been followed by resolutions and budgetary action. He was aware of the need for "concentrating" the programme. But surely concentration should not be practised on the substance of international understanding, on the re-education of German youth teachers and democratic cultural leaders.

[22] The CHAIRMAN read the resolution adopted by the General Conference in Mexico:

The General Conference decides that no State which, while eligible for membership in Unesco, has not applied for such membership should be offered opportunities to participate in the execution of Unesco's programme to the extent that such participation would give it benefits and privileges enjoyed by Member States.

[23] There was, of course, nothing to prevent the present Session of the General Conference from modifying that decision, but it was a matter for the Conference to decide in plenary meeting, on the recommendation of the Programme and Budget Commission.

The Chairman further pointed out that Germany and Japan were covered by a special programme embodying the activities under discussion; the United States delegate need therefore have no anxiety on that score.

[24] Professor CALÒ (Italy) was prepared to support Dr. Stoddard's proposal as he did not consider it to be at variance with the resolution adopted in Mexico: assisting non-member countries was not necessarily the same as conferring rights on them.

[25] The CHAIRMAN suggested referring the matter to the Procedure Committee for its opinion, and resuming the discussion on receipt of that opinion.

That proposal was seconded by the delegates of Greece, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Austria.

[26] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) did not think it necessary to refer the matter to the Procedure Committee. He wished to make it clear that he did not intend any extension of policy or voting powers to non-Member States or non-governmental organizations, but only the regularization of action already taken and followed by the appropriate financial measures, as, for example, decisions taken in Mexico City.

[27] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) seconded the United States motion: limitation of a programme for international understanding to Member States seemed paradoxical. He thought that it would be in order to proceed to a decision without reference to the Procedure Committee.

[28] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) thought that the considerations applicable to items A.23 and A.26 (the scope of which had been extended) should also apply to item A.3.

[29] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) emphasized the universality of Unesco's objectives and agreed with the delegates of Pakistan and the United States. He observed, however, that not all countries were accessible, and suggested the addition of the words "and all accessible areas outside the Member States".

[30] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought it should be possible to solve the problem without reference to the Procedure Committee. He drew attention to the following sentence in the preamble to section 3: "Unesco must help Member States and the competent organizations and institutions in promoting education. . ." As mention was there made, not only of Member States, but also of competent organizations and institutions, it was to be presumed that the following items were likewise applicable to organizations and institutions in other countries.

[31] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that, whatever the General Conference decided about work in Germany and Japan when considering the 1951 programme, the Basic Programme resolutions should be consistent.

The meeting might note that an amendment or addition to the Basic Programme would be necessary to cover at least whatever work was contemplated in Germany for 1951. But for the time being there should be no insertion to cover work in Germany or Japan.

Sir John approved the suggestion by the Chairman that there was some need for further advice, as the wording proposed by Dr. Siddiqui would extend the Programme beyond Germany and Japan. However, if the Chairman wished to test the sense of the meeting on the Pakistan resolution, he would have no objection. He would only stress the importance of their not extending the Programme without realizing the full scope of the wording suggested by Dr. Siddiqui. For his own part, Sir John was satisfied that it did, in fact, extend the scope of Unesco as defined in the Basic Programme.

[32] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was prepared to adopt Sir John's views regarding the programme for Germany and Japan which was already covered by a resolution adopted by the Fourth Session of the General Conference. He was, however, disturbed at the French delegate's advocacy of an unlimited extension of the Basic Programme: such action would be quite impracticable in view of the stringency of the budget, which totalled only $8,150,000, and which there was no prospect of

increasing in 1951 or 1952. The Director-General once again warned the Commission against the danger of presenting Unesco with a programme out of all proportion to the funds available. He added that a legal problem was also involved, namely, how Unesco could extend its activities to non-Member States, and whether it should be at the latter's request, or whether Unesco should open negotiations on the subject.

[33] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) thought that Sir John Maud had made very helpful suggestions. He also acknowledged the Director-General's call for realism. There had certainly been no intention on the part of the United States delegation of extending work to countries not members of Unesco, unless such extension had been previously sanctioned by the General Conference. He had only wished to bring the text into line with work already planned.

He suggested that resolution A.3 should be finally drafted consistently with the Programme voted for 1951; that would allow for the preparation of a permissive text without reference to the Procedure Committee.

[34] The CHAIRMAN asked the delegates of Pakistan and the United States to prepare jointly a draft for later consideration by the Commission. *Agreed.*

[35] The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Commission was in favour of including in the Basic Programme a special resolution covering Unesco's activities in Germany and Japan.

[36] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) distinguished between the immediate programme and the long-term programme. The latter did not necessarily cover the cases of Germany and Japan, which might prove temporary, whereas he considered that Unesco should make its influence felt wherever possible.

[37] The CHAIRMAN observed that he had already replied to that question in calling upon the delegates of Pakistan and the United States of America to prepare a draft resolution.

[38] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) hoped that special reference would be made to that important matter in the resolution to be drafted jointly by the delegates of Pakistan and the United States of America.

It was *decided* that Professor Piaget should assist the delegates of Pakistan and the United States in preparing the resolution.

[39] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) withdrew a suggested amendment to item A.3, on the Chairman's assurance that the item already covered the maintenance of peace within the social framework of the country concerned.

Item A.31.

[40] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) suggested the following amendment, in order to give greater freedom of application: "Assist the educational authorities and teachers in Member States to devise, for primary and secondary schools, examples of syllabuses and methods designed to increase international understanding". Unesco should not impose a syllabus or method, but should help teachers to evolve their own.

In that connexion, the United Kingdom delegation regretted the inclusion of the words "to inculcate in classroom and textbook" in the first sentence of the preamble, as this might prove a limiting factor: the teaching and study of the United Nations organization was of little use, unless the boys and girls understood what contributions they could make to the improvement of world society.

Mr. Thompson held a more hopeful view of the progress made in education in world citizenship, and of that which would be made through Unesco, than was implied in the last sentence of the preamble.

[41] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) was of the opinion that item A.31 might lead to a biased presentation of historical and scientific facts to suit current political trends. He would prefer that item to put forward explicitly the principle that teachers should always bear in mind the impartiality of facts and avoid any distortion of truth, even if the object of such distortion were to foster friendlier relations between peoples. He accordingly suggested adding to the end of item A.31 the following: "without distorting scientific truth" or "without prejudice".

[42] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) suggested mentioning literature in fields between geography and civics.

[43] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) drew attention to the reference to "Member States", which, in his opinion, should be taken to mean all public or private organizations concerned with education in the Member States.

[44] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL confirmed Mr. de Visscher's interpretation of item A.3: in speaking of "Member States", Unesco meant all public or private organizations concerned with education and culture.

[45] Mr. MOHR (Norway) referred to the difficulty of adapting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to the requirements of children. The United Nations Association of Norway had published a pamphlet entitled "Equal Rights for All" which had emphasized that human rights were as important in the life of children as in

adult society. The principle of the application of the Declaration to the life of children should be formulated. It was necessary to interest youth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, if they were to appreciate the value of international understanding.

[46] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) drew attention to a difference between the French and English texts, which made it very difficult to follow the discussion.

[47] The CHAIRMAN noted that the English version of item A.31 required complete revision. He again read the amendment proposed by Mr. Thompson.

[48] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) also supported that draft amendment which was preferable, in that it emphasized that methods designed to increase international understanding were not yet perfect, and called upon members of the teachnig profession to assist in devising such methods.

[49] The United Kingdom draft amendment, supported by the delegates of NORWAY, NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM, AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA and THAILAND, was *adopted* by 29 votes.

[50] At the suggestion of Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium), a drafting amendment to the French text of item A.31 was *adopted* without discussion.

[51] The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the amendment to item A.31 proposed by the delegation of Afghanistan.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland), seconded by Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) suggested the following wording: "methods designed to increase international understanding *and a sense of objectivity*", so as to bring out the necessity of not distorting history.

The amendment was *adopted* by 21 votes.

[52] The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the amendment submitted by the Persian delegate, to mention literature.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) also wanted modern languages, on which a seminar was shortly to be held, to be mentioned.

The amendment presented by the delegation of Persia and amplified by Mr. Abraham was *adopted.*

[53] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Norwegian suggestion should be considered during the discussion on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *Agreed.*

[54] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) having enquired how the various amendments were to be fitted into the text, Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) suggested connecting them by the deletion of the word "particularly" whereupon Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that that word was meant to imply that it was not an exhaustive list and that other subjects might be included in the resolution.

It was *decided* to entrust the final wording to the Drafting Committee.[1]

Item A.32.

[55] Senator PECSON (Philippines) pointed out that, although the aims might be highly commendable, they might prove unattainable if the teaching were not of a high standard. She therefore suggested the following wording: "Encourage the training of teachers, and the improvement of textbooks and teaching materials, etc.". The item would thus be in line with the last sentence of the preamble. Item A.35 could even be deleted, since it had become part of the Annual Programme.

The amendment to item A.32 was supported by the delegate of Austria and *adopted* by 26 votes.[2]

Item A.33.

[56] Professor CALÒ (Italy) was of opinion that the idea of the interaction of cultures and civilizations was not brought out forcibly enough in the words "international relations"; he therefore suggested adding: "and the interpenetration of the various cultures and the various civilizations".

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) considered that this was indeed a task which should be shouldered by higher educational establishment, and he suggested the following wording: "and the interaction of the various cultures and the various civilizations".

This proposal, seconded by the delegates of PERSIA, BELGIUM, AFGHANISTAN, MEXICO, VENEZUELA and AUSTRIA, was *adopted.*[3]

Item A.34.

[57] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) called for some mention of enquiries into propaganda against international understanding.

Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) enquired whether experimental research was to be encouraged on international or national levels, or both.

Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that experimental research had been initiated both by Member States and at the international level.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) agreed with Mgr. Maroun,

1. In final form: Resol. A.31.
2. In final form: Resol. A.32.
3. In final form: Resol. A.33.

but suggested that a separate resolution might be framed.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) considered the Lebanese proposal excellent, but feared that it was over-specialized; he suggested adding merely "the obstacles that stand in its way"; such a draft would include propaganda against international understanding.

Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) approved that formula, and Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) withdrew his proposal.

The text proposed by Professor Piaget was *adopted* by 28 votes.[1]

Item A.35

[58] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegate of the Philippines had suggested the deletion of that item.

[59] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) recalled that item A.35 was the outcome of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations and of a specific mandate from the Economic and Social Council. He failed to see how the General Conference could ignore that consideration.

[60] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) stressed the importance of item A.35. In the opinion of his delegation, no means should be spared to remind men that the lack of understanding between peoples had been the cause of conflict and terrible catastrophes. All countries should join together in seeking grounds for international understanding in science, education and culture.

As childhood was the most receptive time of life, schools should be the centres of campaigns of instruction on the aims of the United Nations. In that way, a basis would be provided on which groups of people could ultimately harmonize their own national interests with those of Unesco and all mankind.

Dr. Troncoso Sánchez would therefore have welcomed a more explicit drafting of the text providing for instruction in primary and secondary schools on the bases, aims and functions of the United Nations, its subsidiary bodies, and the Specialized Agencies. International understanding would be further strengthened if two annual seminars were to be held, instead of one. The preparation of texts and programmes on the subjects studied should be entrusted to Unesco experts. Any text could then be adapted by the various countries to prevailing conditions.

[61] In consequence, he moved that item A.35 should be amended as followed: "Assist in extending and improving teaching about the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, more particularly through the preparation of programmes and school-texts for the establishment of regular courses in schools". In view of the importance of the subject, he considered that the course should last for several years, instead of the one year contemplated in the 1951 Programme.

The amendment was not supported and *lapsed.*

[62] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) was not in favour of deleting item A.35 which, in his opinion, was very valuable. He drew attention to the work carried out by the World Federation of United Nations Associations, which he personally had found to be most successful in publicizing and promoting Unesco's ideals. In the 1951 Budget, the World Federation was the only non-governmental organization having a formal agreement with Unesco for which no grant-in-aid was provided.

Mr. Sadighi suggested referring item A.35 to the Budget Committee, with the following recommendation: "The Commission recommends a grant-in-aid of $10,000 in 1951 to the World Federation of United Nations Associations, to enable it to continue its work in consultation with Unesco's Department of Education. It calls for immediate consideration of the present recommendation by the Budget Committee."

[63] In view of the twofold aspect (programme and budget) of that question, the CHAIRMAN considered it preferable to reconsider it when the 1951 Programme came up for discussion.

Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) would agree if he were assured that it would not then be too late to discuss the matter.

[64] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) suggested adopting the text as it stood in document 5C/5 (I) Rev., which seemed to him sufficiently flexible; any definition of procedure would restrict rather than amplify the proposed resolution.

[65] Senator PECSON (Philippines) explained that, in proposing the deletion of item A.35, she had not intended to belittle in any way the value of teaching on the United Nations and Specialized Agencies. The Philippines had been honoured by the choice of General Romulo to preside over the General Assembly of the United Nations. But, referring to items A.31 and A.33, she had thought the reference to the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies superfluous from a teaching point of view. However, since the meeting felt that such reference was necessary, she had no objection to withdrawing her motion.

Item A.35 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. A.34.

1. In final form: Resol. A.35.

Item A.36.

[66] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) suggested adding: "particularly in international camps and other forms of community life". A link would thus be formed with the corresponding activities of the Relief Assistance Services and, in future, such a definition would cover a wider field than the reconstruction camps, which were to be discontinued after a certain time.

[67] The CHAIRMAN observed that the question of youth camps was dealt with in the Basic Programme under Relief Assistance Services, whereupon Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) withdrew his proposal.

[68] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) submitted that the methods suggested in the Basic Programme were valuable but subject to modification, and proposed that the original text should stand. *Agreed.*[1]

New item.

[69] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) thought that the importance of teaching the principles of human rights had not been stressed sufficiently, and suggested adding to the end of Section 3 an item to the effect that the teaching of such principles should be encouraged.

[70] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that item F.3 [document 5C/5 (1) Rev., page 25] instructed the Organization to disseminate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as widely as possible. The proposal of the Afghan delegate could be reconsidered when item F.3 was discussed.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) provisionally concurred.

[71] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE [New Zealand] wanted to make sure that the measures adopted would not lead to duplication of work in the Secretariat or among those working on projects. He quoted, as an example, possible overlapping which might occur between the Departments of Social Sciences in their studies of social tensions, and the Department of Education in the application of item A.34 as amended.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. A.37.

THIRD MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev.].

A. Education (*continued*).

Items A.3, A.31 and A.33.

[1] The CHAIRMAN suggested re-considering the proposal presented by the delegation of Pakistan at the previous meeting.

Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) proposed the deletion of the words "Member States" in items A.3, A.31 and A.33, so that the misunderstanding in the minds of some of the delegates, that Unesco would confine itself only to Member States, would be removed.

The proposal, supported by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, AUSTRIA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, FRANCE, IRAQ, ITALY, SWEDEN and SWITZERLAND, was *adopted.*[1]

New item (continued).

[2] The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegate of Afghanistan had submitted a resolution for inclusion in the Basic Programme: "Encourage the teaching, by appropriate methods, of the principles of human rights and their application."

[3] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) remarked that the programme made no mention of teaching about human rights, which should be the basis of education for democracy and might be very

1. In final form: Resol. A.3, A.31 and A.33.

effective in education for international understanding and the education of maladjusted children.

All that could be done in that direction with the assistance of the Press, radio and films was chiefly of interest to adults. The actual text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was beyond the grasp of school-children; it had to be explained to them, after which the various stages in its drafting had to be retraced, so as to make the children more aware of the import of human rights.

The proposed resolution might be added to the Basic Programme either under a separate heading or as a new item, A.37.

That proposal was supported by the delegates of FRANCE, IRAQ, LEBANON, LIBERIA, MONACO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC and PAKISTAN.

[4] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) wondered whether the new item would not overlap with item A.3.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought not: item A.3 dealt with the implementation of one of the articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but it was not superfluous to add that teaching should be given about the principles on which the Declaration was founded.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) observed that item A.3 laid down a principle which was merely explained in the following items. It would therefore be preferable to make the new resolution item A.36, while the old item A.36 would be re-numbered A.37.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) having accepted that suggestion, his delegation's proposal was *adopted*.[1]

B. Natural Sciences.

1. Development of International Scientific Cooperation.

Items B.1, B.11 and B.12.

[5] *Adopted* without discussion.[2]

Items B.13 and B.14.

[6] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) understood that the Commission wished to keep the Basic Programme as simple as possible, and not to go into details of method in connexion with it. He therefore proposed that the text of both items B.13 and B.14 should be in conformity with the similar items in the preceding chapter, *Social Sciences*, B.13 stopping at the word "publications", and B.14 at the words "languages of the world".

The proposal, supported by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BRAZIL, CANADA, EGYPT, ECUADOR, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, PHILIPPINES, PAKISTAN, URUGUAY and UNITED KINGDOM, was *adopted*.[1]

Item B.15.

[7] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) wished to make this item more general, in accordance with the existing practice of the Field Science Cooperation Offices, by adding the words "and the application of their results". *Agreed*.[2]

2. Assistance to Research for the Improvement of the Living Conditions of Mankind.

[8] Dr. KRISHNAN (India) understood that, in addition to the encouragement of research to improve the living conditions of mankind, item B.2 was intended to cover, and in practice did cover, assistance to scientific research in general, including research in the basic sciences. Since the title did not suggest it, and was liable to be misunderstood as excluding the encouragement of research in the basic sciences, he proposed that it should be amended to read: "Assistance to Scientific Research especially Research for the Improvement ... etc." The assistance was of course confined to institutions, laboratories and organizations that were international in character.

The proposal, seconded by the delegates of FRANCE and the UNITED STATES of AMERICA, was *adopted*.

Item B.2.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item B.21.

[9] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) thought that, instead of referring to "international work of this type" in item B.21, it would be better to refer to "regional work of this type", because that type of enquiry probably referred to a particular region of the globe. His proposal would read: "encourage institutes and laboratories working in regional areas on topics of interest to more than one country".

[10] Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) would have preferred to add the adjective "national" before "institutes and laboratories" and to substitute "general" for "international", so as to

1. In final form: Resol. A.36.
2. In final form: Resol. B.1, B.11 and B.12.

1 In final form: Resol. B.13 and B.14.
2. In final form: Resol. B.15.
3. In final form: Resol. B.2.

direct Unesco's work towards the encouragement of international institutes and laboratories.

[11] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) thought it also necessary to replace "institutes and laboratories" by "research centres and co-ordination bodies".

[12] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) saw no objection to the proposal of the Australian delegate, provided that it referred only to an addition to the text under discussion and not to an amendment. On the other hand, as far as national institutes and research laboratories were concerned, he thought caution should be exercised; personally, he would be opposed to deleting the word "international" and incorporating a reference to national institutes. There had on earlier occasions been recourse to a form of words which could be used in such cases and which did not completely prevent Unesco from supporting national institutes, provided such action was recommended by the International Council of Scientific Unions of the Unions concerned.

[13] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) supported almost everything said by Professor Nielsen. However, the Marine Biological Laboratory at Naples and the High Altitude Research Station on the Jungfraujoch should not be excluded. The statement "institutes and laboratories engaged in international work" was a general one and did not exclude national institutes when they were doing international work. Dr. Huxley proposed the words: "engaged in international and regional work of this kind", possibly with a refinement of definition as proposed by the delegate of Australia.

Mr. PAGE (Canada) seconded Mr. Huxley's proposal.

[14] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) thought that both points might be met by saying: "encourage laboratories engaged in regional or international work".

[15] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was prepared to accept the amendment suggested by the delegate of Italy, as long as "international" was replaced by "regional or international interest".

[16] Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) and Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) withdrew their respective draft amendments.

[17] The CHAIRMAN read the resolution as amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Italian delegate and the Director-General:

Encourage and assist research centres and co-ordinating bodies engaged in work of this type of international or regional interest.

That resolution was supported by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, ITALY, IRAQ, SWEDEN and URUGUAY.

[18] Mr. CAIN (France) asked what would be the consequence of the addition of the word "regional" to the resolution.

Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought no difficulties would be raised by the insertion of that word. He referred to the Jungfraujoch laboratory, which was obviously of international importance, but chiefly of regional interest.

[19] Mr. CAIN (France) wondered whether this addition meant taking a stand which might affect other activities as well.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that it was a question of wording. The term "international", also covered "regional", but its main implication was "on a world scale". Unesco could not restrict its assistance to institutions of world standing; if work were being carried out at the regional level, there was surely no reason for not encouraging it.

[20] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) imagined that the greater part of such aid would be in the form of subsidies granted through international non-governmental organizations, so that Unesco's existing practice would not be altered at all. Unesco trusted the international non-governmental organizations to tell it which activities, whether strictly regional or international, were in the Organization's interests. Dr. Huxley was therefore entirely in favour of the word "regional".

The proposal of the Italian delegate, as amended by the Director-General, was *adopted*.[1]

Item B.22.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

3. Teaching and Popularization of Science.

Item B.3.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item B.31.

[21] Mr. PAGE (Canada) said that his delegation approved the wording of item B.31, but considered that, at the level suggested by the Basic Programme, natural science studies were a part of the general field of endeavour of the Department of Education and might better be dealt with

1. In final form: Resol. B.21.
2. In final form: Resol. B.22.
3. In final form: Resol. B.3.

by them, together with the other subjects normally included in the primary and secondary school curricula. Mr. Page therefore moved that item B.31 should be deleted, on the understanding that the activities involved would be normally handled by the Department of Education.

Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) seconded the motion.

[22] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) assumed that the item had been transferred from Education to Natural Sciences for some technical reason. He hoped it would not just be deleted and that, if any change were made, the item would be transferred to Education. In the United Kingdom, there was need for studying the whole problem of the content and method of teaching science as a matter of general education.

[23] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) agreed with Dr. Huxley. In his opinion, the words "in conjunction with the Department of Education" should be added after "study".

[24] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded the meeting that the document under review was the *Basic* Programme, which should not contain any reference to the structure of the Secretariat. The implementation of that programme would obviously require the co-operation of all Departments.

[25] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) observed that the problem should be considered from two points of view: (1) in relation to the programme, which was the responsibility of the Department of Natural Sciences; (2) in relation to educational methods and techniques, which went beyond the scope of science teaching. He therefore advocated the drafting of two resolutions, one to appear in the chapter *Education*, and the other in the chapter *Natural Sciences*. He felt it necessary to include both complementary resolutions.

The first resolution, which would form a new item A.132, would be worded: "study suitable methods for the teaching of science and their general educational value".

That proposal was supported by the delegates of CANADA, DENMARK, FRANCE, AFGHANISTAN, ITALY, IRAQ, BRAZIL, UNITED KINGDOM and UNITED STATES of AMERICA.

[26] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that, if details under general education had to be mentioned, they should be more specific and include natural sciences and social sciences, as well as other subjects.

[27] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought that more importance was attached to educational methods in the teaching of science than in other fields. That was his reason for pressing the point. He then read the second draft, which would form a new resolution under item B.31:

Study the content of science syllabuses at the various levels of school and university teaching, and recommend any appropriate action.

[28] With regard to the first resolution (item A.132), Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) noted that Professor Piaget had said that this was a most urgent educational problem; but he wondered whether is was not covered by item A.13: "encourage enquiries and study on the most urgent educational problems . . ."

[29] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that remark very much to the point: the drawing of fine distinctions in the Basic Programme was defeating the very purpose of that programme.

[30] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) urged the maintenance of that differentiation which, in his opinion, was necessary under the new system of education.

[31] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) supported Professor Piaget's proposal. There was a very real distinction between the content and the methods. He supported Professor Piaget also regarding the need for specifying that problem in other parts of the Programme.

[32] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that if the first draft suggested by Professor Piaget were to become item A.132, it would be necessary to recast items A.14 and A.15 in the same section.

On the CHAIRMAN'S suggestion, it was *agreed* that the final wording of that section should be left to the Drafting Committee.

The two drafts suggested by Professor Piaget were *adopted*, the first by 17 votes to 7 and the second by 20 votes to 1.[1]

Item B.32.

[33] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) thought that, in keeping with his previous remarks, item B.3 could be simplified by adding to item B.32 the words: "activities likely to promote a further appreciation of science", and deleting the remaining five items. He moved his proposal as an amendment.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed to the amendment.

[34] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) suggested that, in order to carry out item B.3, a slightly

1. In final form: Resol. A.1.131 and B.31.

different form of words from that proposed by Mr. Fletcher was needed in B.32, and he proposed adding: "and technology and their role in society". One of the most important things the Department of Natural Sciences was doing was not merely popularizing science but inculcating a better understanding of the interaction between science and society.

Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) had moved his amendment in as few words as possible, because he took it that the introduction would still be written. If this were not so, Dr. Huxley's proposal would be excellent; but in view of the preamble, he did not think it altogether necessary, although he would not oppose it.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that Mr. Fletcher's remark was not really an objection of substance. There was a difference of both quality and emphasis between the preambles and resolutions.

[35] The Australian proposal, as amended by Dr. Huxley, was seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, DENMARK, FRANCE, ITALY, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, IRAQ, LEBANON, SWEDEN, VENEZUELA, YUGOSLAVIA and BRAZIL, and *adopted*.[1]

C. Social Sciences.

1. Aid to International Scientific Collaboration.

Item C.1.

[36] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) thought that, for the sake of simplicity, all the words after "the Social Sciences" should be deleted.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered it necessary to preserve the wording of item C.1 so as to keep in harmony with item B.1.

Item C.1 was *adopted* in its original form.[2]

Item C.11.

[37] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) thought that item C.11 could be simplified without infringing harmony. The statement referred to "international scientific co-operation" (line 3), which seemed rather too wide in the light of the fact that the section dealt only with Social Sciences. He wondered whether it would not be better to keep to "international co-operation in the Social Sciences". He also thought that the words following "contribution" (line 5) should be deleted.

[38] Professor VITO (Italy) called for the addition of the words "and the development" after "establishment" in item C. 11.

[39] The proposals of Dr. Beaglehole and Professor Vito, seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM, CANADA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, ECUADOR, PERSIA and URUGUAY, were *adopted*.[1]

Item C.12.

[40] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) proposed replacing the words "scientific documentation" by "social sciences documentation ".

Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) thought it preferable to add the words "in connexion with the social sciences" in the heading of Section 1.

[41] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL doubted the wisdom of altering the heading, as it would imply that aid to international scientific collaboration would be given exclusively for the social sciences, whereupon Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) withdrew his proposed amendment.

Dr. Beaglehole's proposal was *adopted*.[2]

Item C.13.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item C.14.

[42] Professor VITO (Italy) drew attention to the diversity of methods followed by the different countries in connexion with the social sciences; that diversity had to be respected for fear of impeding the development of methods.

[43] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) considered that all questions of information, documentation and the improvement of methods should, as in the case of the natural sciences, be included in the programme relating to Education.

[44] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL feared that the too frequent repetition of such details might burden the programme and irritate the reader. Natural and social science specialists could not assist in the work of the Clearing-house for Education. He requested Mr. François to defer his proposal until the Commission had decided on Professor Piaget's proposal concerning the natural sciences.

[45] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) pointed out that there was a difference between the position of the social sciences and that of the

1. In final form: Resol. B.32.
2. In final form: Resol. C.1.

1. In final form: Resol. C.11.
2. In final form: Resol. C.12.
3. In final form: Resol. C.13.

natural sciences. The latter were taught in primary and secondary schools, whereas the social sciences were taught only at the university level. He agreed with the delegate of Italy that methods differed in each country. But the wording proposed by the Executive Board did not take this fact into account.

[46] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) and Professor VITO (Italy) withdrew their proposed amendments.

The original text, seconded by the delegates of the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, PERSIA, PHILIPPINES, BRAZIL, BELGIUM, ECUADOR, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND, UNITED KINGDOM, CANADA and AFGHANISTAN, was *adopted*.[1]

Item C.15.

[47] Professor VITO (Italy) thought the term "laboratory" incorrect and preferred the word "institute".

[48] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked the Secretariat to explain what was meant by item C.15; if "institutes" were necessary, he would clarify the text by saying "... for research into the Social Sciences".

[49] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the item concerning laboratories was written because the Economic and Social Council had been considering a proposal for a number of scientific laboratories, one of which would be a social science laboratory. Dr. Angell had seen the draft of Ecosoc, which used the word "laboratories" and, in brackets, "institutes"; but the document was only provisional at the moment.

[50] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) thought that, in view of differences in outlook in the field of social sciences, the chief need was to encourage international meetings, exchanges of views and discussions. In his opinion, it would be better to delete item C.15.

[51] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) thought, from his experience in another capacity, that he could clarify part of the question asked. Ecosoc had taken the initiative in suggesting that a certain number of United Nations international laboratories might be created. Unesco, together with many other Specialized Agencies and organizations, had participated in the preliminary enquiries and, in Dr. Huxley's opinion, provided the fullest report. It was then decided to set up a committee of experts, which had, he believed, met in 1949 to decide on priorities. Three laboratories were selected for high priority: one which would come up later in the work plan of Natural Sciences, would be a computation centre: the second, still being investigated in detail, would be a laboratory to study certain aspects of the human brain; and the third, which was even less advanced, a kind of laboratory, centre or institute to be set up in some field of the social sciences. That priority had already been established, and Dr. Huxley hoped that Unesco, as an organization dealing with the social sciences, would continue to participate in any discussion on the establishment of the last named laboratory, centre or institute. The language used must be clarified: it was unfortunate to speak of a laboratory in the social sciences and, wherever the word "laboratories" occurred, the words "or research centres" should be added.

[52] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) was anxious to keep to the term "laboratories" in that section.

[53] Mr. OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) confirmed that Unesco, in co-operation with the United Nations, had convened a committee of experts in Paris the previous year to consider the establishment of international laboratories; it had been obliged to give priority to a very limited number of laboratories and had recommended, as an initial step, the establishment of three laboratories (for computation, the human brain and social sciences).

[54] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed the following formula: "active participation, as regards the social sciences, in the establishment and operation of United Nations research centres or laboratories".

[55] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) thought that the Commission was not in agreement regarding the scope of the term "social sciences". If geography, education, anthropology, etc. were included, then there should certainly be laboratories. He therefore agreed with the Director-General's proposal.

[56] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) stated that the Director-General's proposal made what he was about to say less important. If the Commission accepted the Director-General's draft for the purposes of the Social Sciences, that same draft, suitably amended, would also be suitable for the Natural Sciences; Mr. Fletcher was not certain that Ecosoc had yet taken any decision on the question of policy for those institutes, laboratories or research centres. He assumed, from the wording of both resolutions, that Unesco's activity was contingent on a United Nations decision on policy.

[57] The CHAIRMAN called on the represen-

1. In final form: Resol. C.14.

tative of the United Nations to reply to the latter question. As regards the former, it related to a resolution on which a decision had already been taken, and he therefore thought that the Commission could not discuss the matter.

[58] Mr. LAUGIER (United Nations) stated that the United Nations, through the Economic and Social Council, had decided to give an important place to international scientific research in certain fields. The subjects in question would be those necessitating elaborate equipment, subjects of international concern (meteorology and astronomy), problems requiring the establishment of laboratories in particular areas and lastly, problems calling for a very large contribution from all countries.

In its report, the Economic and Social Council had granted priority to the establishment of the three institutes advocated by the committee of experts, which had met the previous year in Paris. He drew attention to the fact that the United Nations had used the term "institutes" and not "laboratories".

Those were schemes whose execution required further preliminary study. The collaboration of Unesco was essential to the United Nations in pursuing such studies.

[59] Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) strongly advocated the substitution of "institutes" for "laboratories". With that reservation, he endorsed the Director-General's remarks.

[60] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) supported the form of words introduced by the Director-General, but not the substitution of the word "institutes" for the term "laboratories and research centres", as it was necessary to keep the implication of "research" in item C.15.

[61] He asked the Chairman whether the question of consequential alterations in resolutions already passed—use of the words "or research centres" in item B.22 of *Natural Sciences*—could be referred to the Drafting Committee, since there were certain natural science institutions which were not laboratories. Dr. Huxley further thought that item B.22 should, like item C.15, speak of and not merely of "participation".

[62] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested a new draft for item C.15 which, with an addition proposed by Mr. CAIN (France), would read as follows:

Study, as regards the social sciences, Unesco's active participation in the establishment and operation of United Nations research centres or laboratories.

That resolutions was *adopted* by 31 votes.[1]

New item C.16.

[63] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested the addition of a further item, C.16, to correspond to item B.15.

Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) supposed that the Director-General meant not a repetition, but a supplementary statement which would read: "to associate social science activities in the existing Field Science Co-operation Offices"; if so, the New Zealand delegation supported his proposal, and would ask the Commission to refer the precise form of words to the Drafting Committee.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished item C.16 to be worded exactly like item B.15.

Mr. CAIN (France) agreed with the Director-General, as he thought it important that there should be a harmony between the various activities.

[64] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) presented a draft resolution worded in accordance with the Director-General's suggestion:

C.16. Develop field science co-operation offices to facilitate, in the field of the social sciences, the spread of knowledge, the co-ordination of research and the application of their results.

The proposal was *adopted.*[2]

New item.

[65] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) proposed adding a new item C.17, as follows:

Promote the organization of international meetings for the purpose of discussing and studying problems in connexion with the social sciences.

The CHAIRMAN thought the matter had already been covered by item C.1.

Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) pointed out that there was no mention of meetings in item C.1.

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) agreed with the Chairman that the new item was not necessary: there was nothing to that effect in the *Natural Sciences* chapter, although that Department did encourage many such meetings. That was a technical matter which should be left to the work-plan and not inserted in the Basic Programme. *Agreed.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. C.15.
2. In final form: Resol. C.16.

FOURTH MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev.].

C. Social Sciences (*continued*).

2. STUDIES OF SOCIAL TENSIONS.

Item C.2.

[1] The CHAIRMAN read a motion submitted by the Belgian delegation to amend item C.2 as follows:

Unesco shall contribute to researches bearing on the social problems of our time liable to influence the international understanding and social equilibrium of the nations.

Professor VITO (Italy) and Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) seconded the motion.

[2] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom), while expressing general sympathy with the intentions of the Belgian delegation, thought that, in view of the history of Unesco, some of the terms of the motion might lead to some confusion. Such terms were:

(1) "International understanding", which was generally associated with education and had been discussed at previous meetings in connexion with Chapter A;

(2) "Social tensions that threaten peace", was the phrase adopted throughout two years of work.

It would be unfortunate if such accredited terms were extended to include other problems. He therefore suggested a wording both to strengthen and to limit the text:

Unesco shall study methods for reducing social tensions that threaten peace.

[3] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that Unesco did not limit its work to the study of social problems; that was clear from the Programme for 1951, which included under social sciences problems of race, population and technique.

The misunderstanding arose from the preamble and would probably be obviated by the insertion of the words "of situations and" before "mass mental attitudes". He suggested that the matter be referred to the Drafting Committee.

[4] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) recommended the insertion, not in the preamble but in the actual resolution C/2, of a phrase to make it clear that the research would cover both psychological and social problems.

The CHAIRMAN asked him whether he wished to maintain his amendment, whereupon Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) said he would be ready to withdraw it if the idea could be expressed in another form in the item in question.

[5] Mr. CAIN (France) also thought that the wording of the preamble and of item C.2 might cause confusion; the Drafting Committee should therefore be made responsible for re-wording both, using a clearer expression than "social tensions".

[6] Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) attached great importance to the study of social tensions. The draft in document 5C/5 (I) Rev. seemed to take into account only mass mental attitudes, whereas the economic and social conditions that bred such mental attitudes should also be considered.

[7] The CHAIRMAN thought the Drafting Committee would be able to deal with the matter, as there seemed to be substantial agreement between the representatives of Belgium, France and the Secretariat on the aims of item C.2.

[8] It was *agreed* to refer item C.2 to the Drafting Committee, on the understanding that Dr. Huxley's motion would also be taken into account.

[9] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested deleting the words "in accordance with decisions taken by the General Conference", as they seemed to him redundant in the paragraph preceding item C.21. *Agreed.*

Items C.21 to C.23.

[10] Professor VITO (Italy) thought that, as certain social tensions could not be reduced in a short time, efforts should be devoted to attenuating their consequences. To that end, he suggested

that item C.21 should read: " . . . Research into the nature, origins *and effects* of such tensions. . ."

. . . Research into the nature, origins *and effects* of such tensions . . .

That proposal was supported by Safik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt), Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) and Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) and *adopted.*

[11] Reverting to the suggestion he had put forward previously, Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) suggested amending item 21 to read:

Promote and facilitate research into the nature and origins of such tensions, *in particular into their economic and social causes*, and into the ways of remedying them.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), seconded by Professor VITO (Italy), felt that the amendment was superfluous, as its substance was included in Professor Vito's amendment.

Dr. AUNG (Burma), Dr. SADIGHI (Persia) and Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) seconded the Yugoslav motion.

[12] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) thought there was no point in adding details which were mostly included in the general text; since it was agreed that in the whole section the term "social" also covered "economic", there was no reason to make special mention of it in connexion with item C.21.

[13] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) opposed the motion because it was at once superfluous and restrictive. He considered the economic and psychological aspects equally important.

[14] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) supported the Yugoslav proposal, as he felt that insufficient importance was often attached to economic factors; he thought it advisable to bring out clearly their relationship with other factors affecting tensions.

[15] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with the delegate of Belgium that the economic factor was already covered in the introduction. Nevertheless, he saw no objection to emphasizing the point, as proposed by the delegate of Yugoslavia. He reminded the meeting that, as the Basic Programme was an informative document, it might be advisable to use more explicit wording in the interests of the general public and, more particularly, of certain social scientists who had criticized Unesco for embarking on unrealistic activities that did not take the economic and social causes of tensions sufficiently into account.

[16] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) remarked that the work hitherto carried out by Unesco had been mainly in connexion with psychological and mental attitudes. He thought it essential to the maintenance of peace to bear in mind the economic and social factors liable to produce tensions and he would be very glad if Unesco would in future concentrate more on those problems; the Yugoslav delegation would be submitting several amendments along those lines to the 1951 Programme.

[17] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) suggested that a compromise might be reached if the words "in particular" were replaced by "including". Population problems would thus be covered without receiving exclusive emphasis.

[18] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) was not prepared to accept that suggestion, as such a wording might convey the impression that the economic factor was merely a secondary cause, whereas in his opinion it was of fundamental importance and should be stressed.

[19] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) maintained his position; he did not think that economic and social causes should be stressed.

[20] Senator PECSON (Philippines) agreed both with Director-General and with Professor Uvalic; the motion might prove more acceptable if it were slightly amended to read: ". . . such tensions, and *in particular* economic, etc. . ."

Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) agreed to this alteration of his amendment.

[21] Mr. CAIN (France) suggested referring the three items C.21, C.22 and C.23 to the Drafting Committee, which had been instructed to find a clearer definition for the tensions referred to in item C.2. He felt sure that the Drafting Committee would be able to draft a resolution which would bring out the importance of economic and social factors.

Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) accepted that solution, and the delegates of AUSTRIA, EGYPT and URUGUAY supported M. Cain's proposal.

[22] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) could not accept Mr. Cain's solution, as all aspects of the problem were of equal importance. Nor could he accept the compromise wording suggested by Senator Pecson: he was willing to see special attention drawn to the social causes by the use of the word "including", but not by "in particular".

[23] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) pointed out that the resolution should be general in scope, as it was part of the Basic (long-term) Programme.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) opposed referral to the Drafting Committee.

Finally, it was *decided* to refer items C.21, C.22 and C.23 to the Drafting Committee.[1]

3. STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION.

Item C.3.

[24] Professor VITO (Italy) thought that item C.3 assumed that the principles of international co-operation were known and accepted. He was not sure that this was so, and moved that item C.3 should read as follows:

Unesco shall promote and facilitate research into the *principles*, media and techniques of international co-operation with a view to increasing their effectiveness.

The motion, seconded by Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) and Mr. AKVERDI (Turkey), was *adopted.*[2]

Items C.31 and C.32.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

D. Cultural Activities.

1. INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION.

Item D.1.

Adopted without discussion.[4]

Items D.11 and D.12.

[25] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) wished to shorten the text of items D.11 and D.12 as follows:

D.11: Facilitate the establishment of associations for international intellectual co-operation and assist, by means of financial aid or services, existing organizations.

D.12: Encourage the exchange of ideas between thinkers, scholars, writers and artists and facilitate the publication of their work.

[26] Mr. CAIN (France), referring to a previous statement by the Director-General to the effect that some mention of the improvement of bibliographical services should be included in the chapter on Natural Sciences, suggested inserting a similar mention in the chapter on Cultural Activities; it might become item D.12 and be worded as follows:

Assist in improving bibliographical, abstracting and indexing services in the field of humanistic studies.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL saw no objection to this addition.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to ask the Drafting Committee to frame a resolution on the lines of item B.12.

The proposal, supported by the delegates of SWITZERLAND, CHILE, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, PAKISTAN and URUGUAY, was *adopted.*

[27] Referring to Mr. Thompson's proposal, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it inadvisable to amend item D.12, the wording of which had been carefully weighed by the Executive Board; the Basic Programme, while covering as much ground as possible, should yet be kept within certain limits. He was also in favour of maintaining, under item D.11, the reference to "international associations able to make a significant contribution to international intellectual co-operation"; Unesco, far from wishing to set up as many organizations as possible—a charge sometimes brought against it—wished to encourage only those genuinely capable of helping it to achieve its objects. On the other hand, the Director-General would approve the deletion of the end of item D.11.

[28] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) moved that his amendments should be referred to the Drafting Committee, indicating that he was willing to see the words "able to make a significant contribution" maintained, if the Director-General thought they would facilitate his work.

[29] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was not in favour of ignoring the "international" character of the organizations considered under item A.11. Failing greater precision, Unesco might be obliged to facilitate the establishment of purely national organizations as well, and thus to extend its activities unduly.

[30] Mr. CAIN (France) suggested deletion of the word "contemporary" in item D.12; an organization concerned with the development of culture, science and education could not contemplate restricting its attention to contemporary civilization alone.

[31] The CHAIRMAN proposed that items D.11 and D.12, together with the wordings suggested by the United Kingdom delegate and the proposed deletion of the word "contemporary" in item D.12, be referred to the Drafting Committee. *Agreed.*

The RAPPORTEUR hoped that the Commission would give specific instructions to the Drafting Committee, whose duties must be limited to

1. In final form: Resol. C.2.
2. In final form: Resol. C.3.
3. In final form: Resol. C.31 and C.32.
4. In final form: Resol. D.1.

drafting questions and should not involve a selection between several points of view.

The CHAIRMAN felt that the difference was a matter of words.

Mr. SENEVIRATNE (Ceylon) disagreed with the Chairman and pointed out that the Director-General had seen a distinct difference of substance.

The RAPPORTEUR said that the Drafting Committee would undertake such a task at the express request of the Commission.

It was *decided* accordingly.[1]

2. PROTECTION OF CREATIVE WORK AND ITS AUTHORS.

[32] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) considered that Section 2 was a false category which, in fact, covered two forms of activity:

(1) measures to protect and preserve the material heritage of the past, and

(2) measures to ensure to contemporary and living artists suitable conditions for work.

In his opinion, Section 2 should be subdivided. On the one hand, under the heading "Preservation of Material Heritage", would come items D.2 (up to "mankind") and D.21 to D.24; on the other, under the heading "Protection of the Artist", should appear the second half of item D.2 and items D.25 and D.26. as well as an additional item on the following lines:

Unesco shall encourage Member States to render their cultural heritage readily accessible and available to the public of their own and other countries.

[33] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he would consider the proposal in writing before expressing the Secretariat's views on it.

Mr. CAIN (France) saw no point in a lengthy discussion of the British proposal; it did not alter the substance of the section, but merely introduced a heading which would clarify the whole of Section 2. He suggested referring the text to the Drafting Committee.

It was *decided* to accept the principle of the subdivision of Section 2 and to refer the details to the Drafting Committee.

[34] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) thought that, in item D.2, the phrase "through technical and legal measures" was misleading. It was for the Member States and not for Unesco to take legal measures. He suggested that a clearer wording would be: "through technical measures and legislation".

[35] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the idea was for Unesco, by technical measures (such as the exchange of information or technical missions) or by legal measures (international agreements or conventions), to assist Member States in conserving and protecting monuments, documents and works of art.

[36] The CHAIRMAN assured Dr. Beaglehole that the French text was explicit on this point.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) agreed with Dr. Beaglehole that the English text was not clear, but suggested that the matter should not be referred to the Drafting Committee.

Mr. SENEVIRATNE (Ceylon) proposed replacing "legal" by "legislative".

Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) called for some explanation of the expression "legal measures" as applied to Unesco: he wondered what legal measures could be taken in that connexion by Unesco and not by Member States.

Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that two draft conventions were then under consideration.

Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) tentatively suggested the use of "by juridical agreement".

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegates of the PHILIPPINES, BELGIUM, AUSTRIA and the NETHERLANDS, moved the deletion of the words "through technical and legal measures", which he considered inappropriate in a basic programme.

Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) opposed the deletion on the grounds that it might widen the scope of assistance rendered by Unesco under item D.22 and involve the Organization in additional expenditure.

[37] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL advised caution with regard to a basic programme, which should be self-explanatory: he asked how Unesco could take action except through technical and legal measures. The French version was sufficiently clear in that respect, while the Drafting Committee might find a more suitable wording of the English version.

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) maintained his motion for the deletion: he felt that the words "through technical and legal measures" were restrictive and that the possibility of financial aid should be left open.

[38] Mr. WILLEMS (Belgium), supported by the delegates of FRANCE, NEW ZEALAND, YUGOSLAVIA, ISRAEL, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC and NETHERLANDS, suggested the phrase "by all appropriate measures".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL saw no great difference in the suggested amendment; he was more

1. In final form: Resol. D.11 and D.12.

inclined to favour the deletion proposed by the British delegation.

Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) suggested the wording "through technical measures and by juridical agreements", on the understanding that "juridical agreements" were those valid in law.

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) wished to be assured that the wording adopted would not exclude the possibility of subventions and measures of other types, such as education campaigns.

Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) thought it preferable merely to say "assist Member States to ensure the conservation. . .".

[39] Mr. CAIN (France), wishing to reconcile the Director-General's desire for precision with the views of the previous speakers, suggested the phrase: "assist, through technical and legal measures and by all appropriate means. . .".

That wording was accepted by Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) and Mr. WILLEMS (Belgium) and item D.2 was *adopted* with that amendment.[1]

Items D.11, D. 212 and D.22.

[40] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America), supported by Professors DÜRING (Sweden) and PIAGET (Switzerland), moved the deletion of items D.211, D.212 and D.22, not because he disregarded the value of historical monuments, but because he felt that priority should be given to the work of preventing destruction of existing monuments.

[41] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) opposed the motion. In his country and in others of the Middle East, the preservation of historical sites was of the highest importance. The buildings, unlike those of Europe, were of mud and bricks and had to be protected not so much from the destruction wrought by man, as from the weather. Such countries often found it necessary to ask for assistance, both archaeological and financial.

[42] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) agreed with Anas Khan and thought that item D.212, at least, should be retained. However he also sympathized with the intentions of Dr. Stoddard and, like him, had been deeply moved at the sight of the destruction in Florence. He thought that archaeological excavation, though of great importance, did not hold so high a priority.

[43] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) was in favour of retaining items D.111, D.212 and D.22; time and the elements should also be counted as factors in the destruction of monuments, the restoration of which was essential.

[44] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) thanked Anas Khan for expressing the point of view of countries of the Middle East. Iraq had done much for the preservation of historical sites, but would welcome any assistance from Unesco.

[45] Mr. CAIN (France) did not think that Unesco should neglect in a long-term basic programme such an important consideration as the preservation of historic works. On the other hand, when the 1951 Programme came up for discussion, he would agree, if necessary, to making reservations with regard to certain items, after receipt of the Budget Committee's conclusions.

He had fully sympathized with the arguments of the previous speakers particularly those of the Afghan delegate. He agreed that countries with a specially rich artistic heritage had grave responsibilities. There was obviously no question of Unesco's instituting a fund on which various countries could draw; but, as with all other work relating to culture, science and education, some method of international co-operation had to be devised by bringing together experts, more particularly those who were fully informed on a complex problem which was of concern to many countries.

Mr. Cain referred to the work carried out before the war by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, which had convened a number of experts in Cairo and had been responsible for the conclusion of a convention relating to excavation and the preservation of documents.

He closed with a request that the United States delegation should reconsider the problem.

[46] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL approved the French delegate's suggestion that some order of priority for the resolutions should be established when the time came to discuss the 1951 Programme.

[47] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) endorsed the opinions expressed by Mr. Cain and Dr. Jamali: he would oppose the deletion of items D.211, D.212 and D.22, in view of their importance to countries whose historical monuments were not of durable materials.

[48] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) drew attention to the ravages to historic monuments that were caused by time and not merely by war; many States, even those with the financial capacity, still did not believe in the need for taking measures to avert such destruction. It was Unesco's duty to impress upon States that their monuments should be preserved at all costs, for, though situated on their territory, they belonged to all mankind; it

1. In final form: Resol. D.2.

should place technical facilities at the disposal of certain Member States to assist them in preserving their monuments. The speaker accordingly associated himself with Mr. Cain in requesting the United States delegation to reconsider its attitude.

[49] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) was of the same opinion: the items under review were essential for the defence of culture and could not be deleted without prejudice to Unesco's aims.

[50] Senator PECSON (Philippines) opposed Dr. Stoddard's motion for deletion. She stressed the importance of D.211, in particular to countries which had lost much through the ravages of war and the elements. She also emphasized the importance of financial assistance to those countries, not only because such historical monuments and sites were the cultural heritage of all peoples, but because they were the heritage of the children of the future. She appealed to Dr. Stoddard to reconsider his motion.

[51] Professor BRANCA (Italy) joined Senator Pecson in her appeal. Summarizing what had been proposed and discussed by various delegates, he announced that the Italian delegation had waited so far to take part in the discussion because it might have seemed that Italy had too direct an interest in the question. But, at the same time, the Italian delegation dared to assume that the Conference had deeply felt the fascination of the artistic environment in which its work had taken place, and therefore rejected the United States proposal.

[52] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) whose country still possessed relics of the pre-Columbian era, supported Mr. Cain's views.

[53] Mr. MARTÍNEZ DURÁN (Guatemala) also endorsed the French argument: historical and artistic monuments were not merely the property of the country in which they were situated, but were the joint heritage of mankind. Accordingly, he thought it necessary to retain those three essential items in the programme..

[54] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) maintained his motion because it was one of principle, based on the clauses of the Constitution (which established the priority of considerations of peace and security) and on the necessity of action for peace expressed in the report of the Director-General. National Commissions should be responsible for giving instructions on the importance of restoration.

The United States motion was *rejected* by 24 votes to 4.

Items D.211 and D.212 were *adopted.*[1]

Item D.213.

[55] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) raised the point of Unesco's role in "carrying out" excavation, which would prove an additional burden on the Organization: the need for assistance remained, but Unesco should not be called upon to initiate.

[56] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) thought that item D.213 was too detailed. He failed to see what Unesco could do in regard to the "carrying out" of excavation, the more so as the reports of archaeologists were universally available. He therefore moved the deletion of the item.

Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) seconded the motion.

[57] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) felt that Unesco could assist the carrying out of excavation by co-ordinating excavations in progress at the same time in neighbouring countries. Unesco could also help in matters of policy and in facilitating the free flow of information. He therefore opposed Professor Düring's motion.

The motion was *rejected* by 20 votes to 3.

Item D.213 was *adopted* in its original form.[2]

Item D.214.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item D.22.

[58] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa), seconded by Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), moved the insertion of "by means of technical advice" at the beginning of item D.22.

Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) gathered from the preceding speakers that it was a question of technical assistance. He suggested the deletion of the words "de leur côté" in the French text.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that reference to "technical advice" did not preclude financial assistance; the technical character of the assistance granted did not imply that it would be given free of charge; some provision should be made for a financial contribution by States.

The amendment proposed by Mr. Stewart was *adopted.*

Item D.22 was *adopted*, subject to that amendment.[4]

---

1. In final form: Resol. D.211 and D.212.
2. In final form: Resol. D.213.
3. In final form: Resol. D.214.
4. In final form: Resol. D.22.

New item.

[59] The CHAIRMAN recalled that, during the discussion of item D.2, Dr. Huxley (United Kingdom) had proposed adding a new item:

> Unesco shall encourage Member States to render their cultural heritage readily accessible and available to the public of their own and other countries.

The motion, seconded by Dr. WALKER (Australia), was *adopted.*[1]

Items D.23 and D.24.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item D.25.

[60] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) proposed the extension to scientists of the privileges accorded to writers and artists.

The motion, seconded by the delegates of PAKISTAN, BRAZIL and FRANCE, was *adopted.*

[61] Mr. CAIN (France) thought that, since scientists were to be mentioned in future, it would be necessary to substitute "branches of study" for "arts".

Item D.25 was *adopted* with that amendment.[3]

Item D. 26.

[62] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) suggested the deletion at the end of item D.26 of the phrase "and, in particular, the conclusion of a universal convention". He considered such a term referring to methods to be out of place in a basic programme. The idea of concluding a convention was in any case implicit in the resolution and there was no need to make special mention of it. The Basic Programme should merely refer to the permanent aims of Unesco without mentioning specific matters that might cease to be pertinent at any moment.

The delegates of PERSIA, AUSTRIA, EGYPT, YUGOSLAVIA, AFGHANISTAN and ECUADOR supported the proposal.

[63] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon), referring to Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, pointed out that author's rights were by no means protected to the same extent in all countries, hence, guarantees for authors were not equally effective in all countries. Mgr. Maroun thought it was Unesco's duty to remedy the situation by encouraging the adoption and application of universal regulations on copyright.

[64] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) held that Unesco was not entitled to reconcile national legislations on copyright and should not attempt to do so. The united efforts of the competent over a period of years had only given a minimum basis to which most of the countries had been able to accede. He would therefore suggest the reading: "encourage and assist the adoption of a universal copyright convention."

[65] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) was against Professor Piaget's proposal, as its consequence would be to leave an important problem unsolved. Two systems were at present in force, the Berne Convention and the system applied in the American States; it seemed to be Unesco's duty to reconcile both systems with a view to the preparation of a universal convention. Those views had been approved by the General Conference in Mexico and confirmed in Beirut and later in Paris; meetings of experts had been convened to assist Unesco in the framing of such a convention. It would be a retrogression to drop all reference to the convention.

[66] While seeing the point of Professor Piaget's arguments, Mr. CAIN (France) could not endorse his view. He feared lest the deletion requested might convey the impression that Unesco had lost interest in the preparation of a convention, which France, although it subscribed to the Berne Convention, had for several years been helping to frame. It was to be noted that the Basic Programme contained many other references to methods, and there seemed no point in omitting such mention in that instance, since the resolution dealt with work already carried out for the sole purpose of framing a universal convention.

[67] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) entirely agreed with the French proposal. He also approved Mr. Thompson's proposal that the first part of the text submitted by the Executive Board be suppressed. He would suggest the following wording:

> Encourage new and more effective international agreements in the field of copyright with a view to facilitating the adoption of a universal copyright convention.

[68] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) suggested the following insertion: "of such a nature that it would not hamper the free flow of ideas and information".

Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) opposed the latter motion.

[69] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) assumed that the Swiss delegate had meant that any mention in the permanent Basic

1. In final form: Resol. D.24.
2. In final form: Resol. D.23 and D.25.
3. In final form: Resol. D.31.

Programme of the preparation of an international convention might give the impression that such work would be continued indefinitely, and that it was a mere possibility which might never become reality.

[70] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) said he had no intention of discussing the question of principle: his draft amendment was merely concerned with the wording of item D. 26. Nevertheless, since the question of principle had been raised, he urged that Unesco's sole object should be to ensure the best possible protection for authors; the question was whether the conclusion of a universal convention would really be an improvement. At the moment there were wide discrepancies in the legislation of different countries and the International Bureau of Intellectual Property at Berne had solved the problem by adopting a reciprocal system, whereby maximum rights were granted wherever possible and minimum rights where the maximum could not be obtained. In view of the differences in prevailing practices, a universal convention should be limited to the granting of minimum rights and its result would be to restrict authors' rights in a number of countries, particularly in those where those rights mattered to authors most. He therefore thought it essential to consult authors' societies on the subject. That was why he had suggested deferring discussion of that problem until the time came to consider the Programme for 1951.

[71] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) emphasized that the problem had been most carefully considered for several years. In point of fact, it had been first raised at the Preparatory Conference of Unesco. He pointed out that item D.26 of the Basic Programme was the outcome of full consultations with governmental and non-governmental organizations and of the findings of an international committee of experts set up in accordance with the recommendation of the General Conference. Mr. Thomas felt that the deletion suggested by Professor Piaget might give the impression that Unesco was taking a step backwards and thus would disappoint all who were following its work in that field.

The amendment presented by Professor Piaget was *rejected* by 20 votes to 9.

It was *decided* to resume discussion of the other draft amendments to item D.26 at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) (document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part. I).

D. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

2. Protection of Creative Works and its Authors (*continued*).

Item D.26. (continued).

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that two amendments to item D.26 remained to be discussed:

(1) The United Kingdom delegation had proposed replacing the present text by the words: "encourage and assist the adoption of a universal copyright convention".

(2) The Swiss delegation had proposed completing the text by adding at the end: ". . . to perfect the protection of such right."

As the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation was not seconded, it lapsed.

[2] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) asked whether his proposal had been noted, i.e., to add, after "universal convention", the words: "of such a nature that it would not hamper the free flow of ideas and information." He explained the purpose of his amendment: there were books written in foreign languages which his people could not understand and which had never been translated into his language. It could hardly be expected that those books would be translated, since their

circulation would be very small, and it was a great pity that they should remain unknown to the public in Thailand because the authors preserved the sole rights and were not going to publish. Thailand was a signatory to the Berne Convention, but that Convention was becoming out of date. Thailand had a great thirst for knowledge and a wish to increase access to it. He hoped therefore that a means would be found of clearing away all existing barriers. On the other hand, there was no intention of encroaching upon authors' rights; it was intended to translate by government enterprise what the authors could not publish, and sell direct to students and teachers at no profit.

[3] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported Mr. Jumsai's proposal: in countries like Thailand and Iraq, there were no facilities for the free flow of knowledge from foreign languages.

[4] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was not opposed to the substance of the proposal, but thought it wiser to retain the original text of item D.26, which might perhaps be completed as desired by the Swiss delegation. It was not for the Commission to decide what the universal copyright convention should be.

The Thailand amendment was *rejected* by 15 votes to 6.

[5] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) pointed out that a universal convention was not necessarily in itself a good thing unless it led to an improvement in the existing state of affairs. The amendment proposed by the Swiss delegation aimed at obtaining public support for the idea of a universal copyright convention.

[6] Mr. CAIN (France), who had opposed amendment on these lines the previous day, now pronounced in its favour.

The amendment was seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BRAZIL, LIBERIA, NETHERLANDS, PANAMA, PERSIA and URUGUAY.

[7] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) thought that the motion, if passed, would lead to difficulties because Unesco had to try and reconcile two apparently opposing interests: those of authors in the greatest amount of protection for their work, and that of Unesco in the free flow of information. Obviously that free flow could not be achieved without a considerable amount of protection for the authors. It seemed to Dr. Stoddard that the Conference should not prejudice the work of the copyright experts and the work of governments, who would send delegations to the intergovernmental conference which was planned for 1952, by laying down any such general purposes or directive. The United States Government would strongly oppose such a step, since it would seriously interfere with their hopes that that conference would arrive at fruitful results. One of the essential problems of copyright was that the Berne Union did not include in its membership any countries of the American continent (except Brazil and Canada) and did not include some of the other great countries of the world. The purpose of the Convention proposed in item D.26 should be to bring those countries as near to the standards of the Berne Union as possible, and it was not going to be possible to gain their acceptance for the principle stated in the Swiss amendment. It the amendment were approved, Dr. Stoddard assured the meeting that it would jeopardize very seriously Unesco's possibilities of doing fruitful work in the field of copyright.

[8] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) found in the words of the United States delegate confirmation of his own fears concerning the inadequacy of the protection afforded by copyright, and an additional argument in support of his own view.

[9] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) entirely shared the view of the United States delegate: Unesco should concentrate on working out an international copyright convention, but Professor Piaget's amendment rendered ambiguous a problem that should be concrete.

Speaking as an expert, Dr. Chediak believed that the solution required was the drawing up of a universal copyright convention which would cover all continents and provide authors with certain minimum rights. The Berne Convention did not apply in all countries and, consequently, authors belonging to certain European countries enjoyed no protection in America. An author himself, Dr. Chediak considered present guarantees inadequate, so that writers were denied the full reward of their work.

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked the meeting not to embark on a discussion of substance, and pointed out to the delegate of Switzerland how difficult it was for the Commission to decide on a new text. The text presented by the Executive Board had been studied at length, and it would be better to abide by it and avoid a fruitless debate.

The CHAIRMAN supported this observation.

[11] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) was surprised that the proposal of a universal convention should not involve as a necessary corollary the addition of the text he had suggested. He had thought that in making that suggestion, he was voicing a unanimous opinion: however, since the question had turned out to be very complex and

raised delicate problems, he was willing to withdraw his amendment.

The original text of item D.26 was *adopted* by 24 votes.[1]

3. DISSEMINATION OF CULTURE.

Item D.3.

[12] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) pointed out a mistake in the Spanish translation of item D.3.

Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) remarked that the word "in" had been omitted in the English text, between the word "States" and the word "promoting".

The CHAIRMAN agreed that this omission should be rectified.

Item D.3 was *adopted* without further comment.[2]

Item D.31.

[13] The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Kingdom delegation proposed amending item D.31 as follows: "encourage in Member States the development and improvement of teaching concerning the arts."

[14] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said his delegation had a number of amendments to make to the section as a whole, which was considered to be too long and too restrictive in that it went into rather too much detail in respect of individual projects which Unesco was undertaking. The particular amendment he would now present would be directed towards making the section more general. It was thought that the present form of words might inhibit the Secretariat from planning various activities (such as conferences, meetings and seminars) which would perhaps be more effective in the circumstances for developing and improving teaching in the arts, whereas the object of the amendment was to propose a more general form of words which would leave the Executive Board and the General Conference with a freer hand in planning the best type of technique for promoting the object behind this items.

[15] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) agreed with Sir George Thomson. They were discussing a basic programme and, coming to projects and methods, he thought that the ones mentioned under D.3 et seq. restricted the choice altogether too much. He suggested the addition of "inter alia" after the words "To this end, it will"; this would give freer scope for various other methods to be used as time went on.

[16] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the United Kingdom delegate's proposal a very interesting one. It would certainly broaden the programme, and, in a basic programme, that was bound to be an improvement.

In his opinion, the Commission could adopt two methods of work; they could either amend the text of resolutions or combine certain resolutions into a wider whole which would be both easier to read and more in accordance with the aims in view.

Sir George Thomson's amendment was *adopted* by 21 votes to 2.[1]

Item D.32.

[17] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) proposed an amendment to item D.32:

> Arrange for the publication of works designed to provide increased understanding of the diverse cultures of the world, including those not yet sufficiently known in their historical, scientific and artistic aspects.

The object of the amendment was the same as that of the amendment to the previous item. In the section under discussion, there were two or three items which appertained to the same basic objective, namely, that of publishing works which would enable people better to understand the cultures of other peoples in all their aspects. The amendment would cover items D.32, D.33 and D.342; Sir George therefore proposed the deletion of these items and the adoption of his amendment to replace the existing item D.32.

[18] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) supported the United Kingdom delegation's amendment, as it would tend to bring together the various cultures of the East and the West.

[19] While appreciating the anxiety for precision shown by the United Kingdom delegation, Mr. CAIN (France) disagreed with this proposal.

The Basic Programme constituted a whole; some of it had already been adopted in the form of separate resolutions setting out the tasks which would devolve on Unesco. They were not dealing here with details—these would be studied with the Programme for 1951—but with precise and separate projects which had already been examined by a committee of experts. It would be a pity, for example, if resolution D.32 disappeared altogether, since it had been under consideration for three years. The proposed

1. In final form: Resol. D.32.
2. In final form: Resol. D.4.

1. In final form: Resol. D.41.

amendment would only lead to lack of precision and would be a step backwards.

[20] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) was in favour of the amendment because in item D.32, mention was made of certain scientific and cultural aspects of the history of mankind, on which there were more detailed plans, just referred to by the delegate of France. On the other hand, under item 8.611 of the Agenda, there was the report on the plan for a scientific and cultural history of mankind, and the Danish delegation, which had given much thought to the question, had serious doubts whether that plan as it stood was to be recommended. He reserved the right to speak on that point when item 8.6 was reached, but he feared lest the Commission should commit itself in some way or another by adopting item D.32 as it stood.

[21] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) favoured the maintenance of the separate resolutions, in particular of D.32.

If the plan envisaged for a scientific and cultural history of mankind did not seem to be entirely suitable, it could always be amended; but that was no reason to suppress item D.32, the more so, since there had been immediate agreement on the principle of publication. The suppression of this resolution would cause much disappointment.

[22] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) agreed with the delegate of France in considering that the text should be maintained. In his view, the proposed cut would involve the loss of certain very interesting points, for example, the project for the publication of an international art review.

[23] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) seconded the British proposal. It seemed to him very difficult at the present time to write a history of mankind, and he thought it preferable to undertake historic research at the national level.

[24] Mrs. SAMBRANO (Guatemala), like the delegate of France, feared that the proposed simplification would lead to the suppression of certain essential items. In particular, she thought the history of mankind was of great importance for the development of an understanding of facts and for the training of the historical mind. She therefore asked that all the resolutions should be maintained.

[25] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) said that his delegation fully shared the desire of the delegate of the United Kingdom to substitute general terms for those existing in item D.32. It should be remembered, however, that there was some danger in making the objective too general. In his opinion, the qualifying phrase in D.32 "showing the interdependence of peoples and cultures" was valuable and gave the precise direction needed for the writers of the history. Similarly, in D.33 ". . . to contribute to the intellectual and artistic heritage of mankind" was too valuable a detail to be omitted, because, unless it were preserved in the Basic Programme, no precise directive would be given to the writers of the history. Dr. Majumdar therefore proposed that the text should be maintained.

[26] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) stated that his delegation supported the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation, in the belief that the new wording would not restrict projects later to be considered in greater detail in the 1951 Programme. The rewording proposed by the United Kingdom delegation emphasized the major objective in the Programme of Unesco more clearly than the succession of items that it was intended to replace.

[27] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) remarked that the Indian delegate's intervention called for an observation from him, as it appeared to stress the importance of the last phrase in D.32: "showing the interdependence . . . etc.". That was exactly one of the points about which the Danish delegation had doubts and why it was opposed to the plan as it stood. Of course, any attempt at a history of mankind would in many respects show the interdependence of peoples and cultures, but the Danish delegation thought that the history should be written by the best scientists and historians and men of culture that could be found and, in Professor Nielsen's opinion, it was directly contrary to the spirit of science to let any scientist engage on a work in which he was given beforehand the theory he was going to prove.

[28] To clarify the discussion, Mr. CAIN (France) proposed that the word "interdependence" should be suppressed. The text submitted by the Executive Board had been prepared by two committees of experts; the study recommended was supposed to make a comparison between the various civilizations and to contribute new matter for reflection. That was in fact the aim which Unesco desired to achieve. The delegate of Yugoslavia had seemed to suggest that such efforts would be useless. To drop item D.32 would be a confession of impotence.

[29] The amendment proposed by the British delegation was *rejected* by 18 votes to 15.

[30] Mr. CAIN (France) proposed replacing the words "showing the interdependence of peoples and cultures" by "showing the development of,

and the mutual influences exercised by, different cultures".

This proposal, seconded by the delegates of BRAZIL, ECUADOR, IRAQ, ITALY, PERSIA, PHILIPPINES, TURKEY and URUGUAY, was *adopted.*[1]

Item D.33.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Items D.34, D.341 and D.343.

[31] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation proposed the following wording in substitution for items D.34, D.341 and D.343.

Encourage and facilitate the circulation of artistic and literacy works within and between Member States and promote the preparation of reproductions, translations, recordings and documentary films.

As in its previous resolutions, the United Kingdom delegation had wished to pick out and delimit certain major activities and interests which Unesco wished to claim for itself. The general category of activity mentioned in item D.34, involving the freer circulation between States of works of art, either in their original form in the shape of exhibitions, or in reproduction form, whether they were literary works or works belonging to the visual arts or music, could be covered by a single resolution.

[32] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that any attempt to obtain more precise wording would be well received. The British proposal, which had the advantage of brevity, did not appear to him to create any obstacle to generalized activity.

[33] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's object in presenting its series of amendments was not to diminish by one inch the territory into which Unesco was moving through the Basic Programme, but merely to render that part of the Basic Programme crisper and easier to read. They believed that the Basic Programme had two fundamental purposes, one to establish landmarks in certain territories for Unesco to delineate the areas in which it was interested, and the other to provide a means of putting that Programme over to the public in a more effective way. The United Kingdom delegation believed that the resolutions they were proposing would do that more effectively and would not diminish in any way the activities which the Secretariat and the Executive Board had placed before the Conference.

[34] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) thought that Unesco should not over-enlarge its sphere of activities since this might lead to mistakes and to the neglect of basic matters. He asked for an order of priorities to be established after careful study between the various activities.

[35] Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) proposed that the words "and scientific" should be added at the end of item D.34.

That proposal, seconded by the delegates of URUGUAY, AUSTRIA, NETHERLANDS, AUSTRALIA, BURMA, FRANCE and BRAZIL, was *adopted.*[1]

The British proposal was seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, COLOMBIA, LIBERIA, PANAMA, TURKEY, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, URUGUAY and YUGOSLAVIA.

[36] Mr. CAIN (France) asked for the maintenance of resolution D.343 concerning the translations of classics or contemporary works.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with Mr. Cain.

Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the considerations put forward, his delegation would have no objection to the specification of the translation project in the Basic Programme.

The United Kingdom amendment, modified on the lines proposed by Mr. Cain, was *adopted* by 17 votes to 1.[2]

Item D.342.

[37] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) observed that the English text merely referred to an "international review". He enquired as to the nature of the review, its aim, who was to edit and publish it, and whether it was the same as the art journal about which the Commission had heard. If it was the same, there were one or two considerations to be borne in mind. If it was to be a popular review, it was not needed, as it would have to compete with other popular reviews. If it was to be a review destined for intellectuals, then it could play a very useful role indeed, as long as it was outstanding in content. If it aimed at something between the popular and the intellectual, without any clear idea of policy, then Dr. Beaglehole thought it must inevitably fail.

[38] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) recalled that this was not a new project: it had been adopted at the Paris General Conference of 1949. This review of the arts, for which a wide distribution was envisaged,

1. In final form: Resol. D.42.
2. In final form: Resol. D.43.

1. In final form: Resol. D.44.
2. In final form: Resol. D.45.

would be prepared by the Secretariat with help from outside and published in France, the United States, the United Kingdom and Switzerland in French, English and German. The work plan for 1951 included further details on this subject.

[39] Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) having pointed out that the English text, unlike the French text, did not mention that an art review was under consideration, Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) said that the inclusion of the word "art" in the English text would answer his questions and clear up his doubts.

[40] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that the exchange of views he had just heard illustrated one of the dangers of being too specific in considering the Basic Programme. It seemed to his delegation that item D.342 was essentially one which should belong to the Annual Programme; it was not an end in itself to publish an international art review; it subserved the aims of Unesco, which were adequately stated in other items in the section under discussion. In one of the earlier amendments which his delegation had put forward, and which had not been accepted, the deletion of item D.342 had been proposed. Sir George once again moved the deletion of that item.

This proposal was supported by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, COLOMBIA, IRAQ, LIBERIA and YUGOSLAVIA.

[41] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it was not the intention of the British delegation to prejudge the importance of the review. The details of its publication were to be discussed in connexion with the 1951 Programme. There might be an advantage in deleting from the Basic Programme details relating to restricted activities, and in taking them up again in the working programme.

The British proposal was *rejected* by 21 votes to 18.

[42] Item D.342 was *adopted* in its original form.[1]

Items D.344 and D.345.

[43] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said he would read out the text of a new wording for D.344 and following items, because the amendments suggested were purely verbal and merely sought to make the text shorter and clearer:

Encourage and facilitate the circulation, exchange, loan and purchase of books and publications between Member States, and in particular: (1) the development of bibliographies, documentation services and select lists of best books; (2) the dissemination of information concerning methods of reproducing documents; (3) the creation and development of public libraries; (4) the operation of an international coupon scheme to enable soft-currency countries to buy publications and materials in other countries.

Sir George did not think that there was any amendment of substance; the question was to provide a draft which would be both clear and easy to read, and capable of being put to the public in the best possible way.

[44] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported the United Kingdom amendment, except that scientific and cultural material had been omitted from the coupon scheme.

Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) re-read out the fourth paragraph, and thought that the delegate of Iraq would find that his point had been met.

[45] Mr. CAIN (France) thought that the system of combining several resolutions did not help to clarify the programme. The proposal of the United Kingdom delegation tended to mix activities at different levels, such as the Unesco coupons and bibliography.

Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) was of the same opinion. The original text seemed to him preferable to the proposed amendment.

[46] Professor DUSHKIN (Israel), referring to the United Kingdom delegation's proposal, thought that the elimination of the words "institutions and individuals" from item D.35 might give the impression that the scheme was only applicable to the official governmental agencies in soft-currency countries.

[47] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation has chiefly aimed at making the resolution more general. If both institutions and individuals were specified, nothing would be left. With regard to the observations by the delegates of France and Switzerland, he pointed out that the draft resolution proposed was followed by a numbered series of sub-resolutions. When the Drafting Committee came to put those drafts into shape, Sir George had no doubt that the sub-resolutions would be specified in the digital system employed by the Secretariat.

[48] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) agreed with the delegate of France that the proposed modifications would only complicate the text, and that it would be better to maintain separate items for separate questions, particularly for bibliography and documentation.

Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) agreed with the delegates of France and Switzerland.

Mr. WILLEMS (Belgium) admitted that the

1. In final form: Resol. D.441.

proposal of the United Kingdom delegation did not affect the substance of the matter, but detailed alterations in these carefully prepared texts should be avoided if the Commission's work was to remain effective.

The United Kingdom proposal, not being seconded, could not be put to the vote.

Items D.344 and D.345 were *adopted* without modification.[1]

Item D.351.

[49] Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt) said his delegation would like to add the words "and manuscripts" after "documents"; and the words "and facilitate the exchange of such reproductions" after "microfilm".

This proposal was seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BRAZIL, CANADA, CUBA, ECUADOR and FRANCE.

[50] Mr. CAIN (France) also supported the amendment, apart from the word "manuscripts" which was already covered by "documents".

The second part of the Egyptian proposal was *adopted.*[2]

Item D.346.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item D.35.

[51] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) wondered whether the words "institutions and individuals" meant that Unesco had enough resources to extend the scheme to individuals; that would mean an unlimited number of coupons.

Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that it was always the Member States which decided on the use of the coupons.

Item D.35 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

New items.

[52] Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) proposed adding two items to section 3:

(1) Following D.345:

Encourage the preparation and publication of special international bibliographies by establishing regular contacts between the various institutions and organizations interested in this work;

(2) Following D.36:

Encourage and facilitate the professional training of librarians, bibliographers and compilers of documents.

Mr. Bourgeois believed it was essential that these items schould appear in the Basic Programme.

The first item, seconded by the delegates of FRANCE, IRAQ, ITALY, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, VENEZUELA and YUGOSLAVIA was *adopted.*[2]

The second item, seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BURMA, ITALY, NETHERLANDS and YUGOSLAVIA, was also *adopted.*[3]

The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee would insert these texts at suitable places in the Programme.

[53] Mr. VAGO (Italy), Secretary-General of the International Union of Architects, expressed the hope that a place would at last be found for architecture in Unesco's programme, in connexion with the draft resolution of the Italian delegation for discussion along with the 1951 Programme.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. D.46 and D.47.
2. In final form: Resol. D.471.
3. In final form: Resol. D. 48.

1. In final form: Resol. D.49.
2. In final form: Resol. D.482.
3. In final form: Resol. D.481.

SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 6.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part. I].

E. Exchange of Persons.

1. CLEARING-HOUSE.

[1] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, CANADA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA and NEW ZEALAND, moved the adoption of the whole Section. *Adopted.*[1]

2. PROMOTION.

[2] Replying to a question from Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the point of item E.21 was that, in the course of its research work, the Secretariat was aiming to perfect the ways by which public and private international organizations could find out exactly what was needed in the way of study grants, etc.

[3] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM and the UNITED STATES of AMERICA, moved that the first words of item E.21 be amended to read: "Determine the needs for study abroad." *Adopted.*

On the proposal of Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Section 2 as a whole was *adopted.*[2]

3. FELLOWSHIP ADMINISTRATION.

[4] On the proposal of Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, CANADA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, NORWAY and NEW ZEALAND, the whole of Section 3 was *adopted.*[3]

F. Mass Communication.

1. IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATION.

[5] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) suggested that there was some loose drafting and confusion as to the media of mass communication. In both the preamble to Section 1 and in Section 3, only the press, cinema and radio were mentioned, whereas several other means of mass communication existed. He therefore proposed including in each case the words "... and other means of mass communication ...".

On the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, it was *agreed* to refer the texts in question to the Drafting Committee.

[6] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked that the whole English text should be considerably tightened up on the same occasion. He agreed to the CHAIRMAN's suggestion that he should submit specific proposals in writing.

2. REDUCTION OF OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION.

[7] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) suggested the inclusion in item F.23 of the words "... and other countries" after "Member States".

In reply to Mr. DAVIES (Australia), the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there could be no question of a recommendation to other countries, as this was a recommendation to Member States.

Dr. Majumdar's amendment was not seconded and lapsed.

The whole of Section 2 was *adopted.*[1]

3. ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO.

After a short discussion, the whole of Section 3 was *adopted.*[2]

New item F.33.

[8] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) proposed adding the following text as a new resolution F.33:

Recommend to the governments of Member States and to National Commissions that they refuse to allow the press, films or radio, to propagate national, racial and religious hatred, or false information likely to give rise to a war psychosis.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) supported this proposal,

1. In final form: Resol. E.1 to E.14.
2. In final form: Resol. E.2 to E.23.
3. In final form: Resol. E.3 to E.312.

1. In final form: Resol. F.2 to F.26.
2. In final form: Resol. F.3, F.31, F.32.

which he thought would tend to fulfil one of Unesco's main aims, namely peace.

[9] Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom) regretted that, while in full sympathy with the proposal, his delegation felt it impossible to restrict the means of mass communication to this extent, since it would mean a virtual ban on the free flow of ideas.

[10] Mr. RUTTENBERG (United States of America) said that, while his delegation considered that the concept of the resolution was a worthy one, the fact that the opposition to any information liable to develop a war psychosis was specifically directed at Member States raised delicate problems, and the United States Government could therefore not support the resolution.

[11] Mr. WILLEMS (Belgium) having asked the delegate of Yugoslavia to explain what methods he envisaged using to enable his idea to be realized, Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) considered that it was the duty of Unesco, of all the Governments and of all the National Commissions to fight against a war psychosis: if Unesco refused to conduct that fight, all its endeavours would come to very little.

[12] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) expressed the agreement of the French delegation with the substance of the Yugoslav proposal. Nevertheless he expressed doubts as to the possibility of applying it, since, in most of the democracies, the governments did not dispose of the necessary machinery. He proposed that the principle of the Yugoslav amendment should be adopted, and that the Drafting Committee be instructed to prepare a new text.

[13] The CHAIRMAN considered that more was at issue than the form of the amendment. The Drafting Committee did not know the attitude of the various delegations and would not be able to draw up a text.

[14] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) proposed a new resolution as follows:

Recommend to Member States to use the means available within the framework of their national legislations to oppose the propagation, by the press, the cinema or the radio, of national, racial or religious hatred.

He emphasized that the Yugoslav proposal could not be carried out by Member States. Moreover, it had a negative aspect, while Unesco's task was to promote positive action and to combat a war psychosis by active measures. Mr. Sedar Senghor added that the French counter- amendment would suppress the second part of the Yugoslav resolution, which in fact only repeated the first part.

[15] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) proposed inserting in the French amendment the words "and of the Universal Dcelaration of Human Rights" after "within the framework of their national legislations".

Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) accepted this amendment.

[16] Mr. RUTTENBERG (United States of America) said that, in view of the position of Congress, he would suggest eliminating the words "within the framework of their national legislations".

[17] It was *agreed* to postpone further discussion of this proposal until the text of the two amendments was available in both languages.

G. Relief Assistance Services.

[18] Mr. HOWELL (United States of America) announced that his delegation was opposed to this chapter in so far as it extended Unesco's programme to a new sphere, namely, to the victims of natural calamities. The United States had been among the most vigorous supporters of reconstruction in the post-war period and were very anxious that Unesco's work in this field should be completed, but they were opposed to its extension.

Mr. Howell therefore proposed that sections 1, 2 and 3 should be redrafted to exclude the reference to this new area of work, and that section 4 (International Voluntary Work Camps) should be transferred to Chapter A (Education). In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, he added that there was no question of deleting the activities outlined under sections 1-3 in so far as they applied to calamities resulting from wars. He objected only to the new emphasis on permanent relief services.

[19] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that the Executive Board had proposed replacing the term "reconstruction" by "relief assistance services". It had seemed that a section for reconstruction had no place within the framework of a permanent programme, but in fact reconstruction was not restricted to the ravages of war. Thus during the Fourth Session of the General Conference, Unesco's help had been enlisted by the Government of Ecuador, whose country had just been laid waste by a natural disaster. Similarly, the Secretariat had only recently received a telegram from the Chairman of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, drawing

Unesco's attention to the destruction caused by an earthquake at Cuzco (Peru). The Director-General recalled that at the beginning of the current Session he had emphasized that Unesco's work in the sphere of education, science and culture would be of no avail unless an appeal was made to the generosity of Member States. It was important that the less favoured peoples should have tangible proof that the world solidarity called for in the Preamble to Unesco's Constitution was a reality.

Within the framework of the Technical Assistance Plan for economic development, it was important that Unesco should carry out a long-term task. It was not enough to send missions to study technical problems on the spot and to give advice to the authorities concerned; they must also provide concrete assistance. In accordance with the Constitution, it was for the Organization to establish a relief assistance service which would be permanently at the disposal of countries laid waste both by war and by natural disasters. No doubt Unesco's budget was inadequate to carry out a programme of this kind; but it was for the Organization to conduct campaigns and to use its influence in the collection of funds which would enable a relief assistance programme to be financed.

The Director-General concluded by underlining that provision for such a service would have to be made in the Basic Programme, since it concerned Unesco's whole future.

[20] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation associated itself completely with the views expressed by the Director-General. They had concurred in the resolution, passed at an earlier session of the Conference, recommending the gradual transfer of activities from work of reconstruction to construction; but they thought that there must be some unit which could bring relief to countries devastated by contemporary disasters other than war.

As to the second proposal by the delegate of the United States, namely to transfer section 4 to the Chapter on Education, he fully supported it.

[21] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) thought the relief assistance service should be one of the essential planks in Unesco's programme. Youth movements should be associated with this task, and the Commission should concentrate not so much on a detailed programme as on concrete and immediate activities.

Mr. François seconded the amendment of the United States delegation transferring section 4 to the Chapter on Education.

[22] Professor CALÒ (Italy) also supported the United States amendment. He insisted, however, that the question of international voluntary work camps should be separately considered during the debate on the 1951 Programme.

Sections 1 (Information on Needs), 2 (Direct Assistance) and 3 (Voluntary Assistance Campaigns) were *adopted*.[1]

[23] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that section 4 was better suited to the Chapter on Education; he therefore suggested altering item A.37 by adding the words: "and in particular, the international voluntary work camps".

[24] Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland) thought it desirable to maintain section 4 within the relief assistance services. Apart from international camps, civilian services also needed help. He had no objection to the alteration to item A.37 proposed by the Director-General.

[25] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) favoured adding a phrase to item A.37 on the lines suggested by the Director-General, but would have preferred the word "including", instead of "in particular".

As regards the remarks of the Swiss delegate, he noted that item A.37 already included the words "encourage the activities of youth movements and adult education organizations", and he therefore moved the addition of: "... including international voluntary work camps".

[26] Mr. MARIČ (Yugoslavia) thought the international work camp movement had a big future. A separate place should therefore be kept for it in the Programme, and section 4 be maintained as it stood.

[27] The United Kingdom amendment, seconded by the delegations of AUSTRLIA, BELGIUM, LEBANON, LIBERIA and NETHERLANDS, was *adopted* by 17 votes to 2.[2]

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. G.1, G.2 and G.3.
2. In final form: Resol. A.37.

SEVENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part. I].

A. Education (*continued*).

2. II. Education for Maladjusted Children (*continued*).

Items A.272 and A.273.

[1] Mr. FLORKIN (Rapporteur) announced that the Drafting Committee had agreed to propose that the French wording be maintained, and to submit new wordings for the English texts which would be closer to the French. He read the English texts of items A.272 and A.273.

[2] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) suggested that, while item A.272 dealt with preventive education at school and in the family, item A.273 dealt only with the training of personnel concerned with education. Such a provision did not cover the persons most important in the training of children—the parents. If provision were made for the training of parents, there would be no need to specify education in the family in item A.272. Item A.273 should, for preference, read: "Help to improve the training of parents, teachers and others concerned with preventive education..."

[3] The CHAIRMAN replied that it was not the Commissions task to revise the substance of a text that had already been adopted.

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) expressed entire approval of the English texts read by the Rapporteur, and proposed their adoption. *Adopted.*[1]

Italian draft resolution on the co-operation with public and private organization concerned with education [document 5C/68].

[4] Professor CALÒ (Italy) said it was above all a question of financial contributions. The cost of the Technical Assistance Programme was continually rising. Several delegations had asked the United States of America to increase their contribution to the Specialized Agencies and the United States seemed willing to accede to this request. Everyone was grateful to them for accepting a burden heavier than that which would normally follow from the principles adopted at the Beirut Conference. On the other hand, although Unesco had to recognize that in all fairness the United States contribution should be reduced, it was not to be forgotten that Unesco's budget already showed a deficit for the financial year 1950.

[5] The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the Italian amendment to the Basic Programme of the Department of Education:

In giving effect to its programme in the sphere of education, Unesco will take special care to co-operate closely with all public and private organizations concerned with education.

This amendment was seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, BRAZIL, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, GREECE, LEBANON, LIBERIA, PAKISTAN, PANAMA and VENEZUELA.

[6] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) opposed the adoption of the draft resolution on the grounds that it would introduce into a general document a specific resolution on that special subject.

[7] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) suggested that the word "special" had lost meaning as a result of the use of "all" in the same sentence. He would prefer the reading: "all appropriate public and private organizations...", deleting the word "special".

[8] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) declared that the Italian proposal, which arose out of what Professor Calò had said, could only meet with sympathy. Nevertheless, this was a general statement which would be better placed in the preamble. Besides, the close co-operation advocated with "all public and private organizations" was too broad a formula. Since there were certain organizations of doubtful use, it was essential that the Secretariat should be free to discriminate.

1. In final form: Resol. A.272 and A.273.

[9] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) considered the proposed text somewhat ambiguous. Were they being asked to co-operate with private organizations whose general activities related to education? Such co-operation was self-evident; it was governed by a fundamental Unesco principle and was already operating. Or were they raising the problem of private schools? That would involve considerable difficulties in a large number of countries, and Unesco should avoid doing that.

[10] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) supported the view expressed by Sir Ronald Adam and Mr. Sedar Senghor. He felt that reference to a special field would lead to other references and impair the very sound work of the Director-General and his Secretariat.

[11] The CHAIRMAN was under the impression that the Commission recognized the importance of the question raised by Professor Calò and incorporated in the Italian amendment. The only remaining question, therefore, was the choice of an appropriate place in which to insert that amendment. The only remaining question, therefore, was the choice of an appropriate place in which to insert that amendment. Would the Italian delegation agree to its discussion when the preamble to the *Education* chapter came up for examination?

[12] Professor CALÒ (Italy) had no objection. He agreed with the French delegation that the Secretariat should be free to discriminate in choosing the organizations with which it wished to co-operate. He was anxious to reassure the Swiss delegation: the amendment was not intended to raise the question of private schools.

It was *decided* to revert to the Italian amendment in connexion with the preamble to the chapter on *Education*.

F. Mass Communication (*continued*).

3. Action through Press, Film and Radio (*continued*).

New item F.33 (continued).

[13] The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting the Yugoslav delegation had presented an amendment (document 5C/84) to be inserted as a new resolution F.33, and that the French delegation had proposed a counter-amendment, slightly modified by the Belgian delegation.

[14] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) agreed with the authors of the various amendments on the need to cure a dangerous and widespread ill. Unfortunately, its causes, its means of propagation and correct treatment were little known, and many governments were liable to be bad doctors. The remedies they applied might turn out to be dangerous in other vitally important spheres. Unfortunately, nothing was easier than to slip from a free regime to one of dictatorial censorship. So difficult was it to diagnose a war psychosis accurately that the proposed amendments might endanger freedom of thought.

[15] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) withdrew his support of the Yugoslav draft amendment in favour of the French amendment, on the grounds that the latter excluded the possibility of attempts being made to limit the freedom of information and communication and would accord with Section 15 of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Liberia for the prevention of such attempts.

[16] Mr. MAMELI (Italy) announced that his delegation shared the concern of the Yugoslav and French delegations; nevertheless, he recognized that it was both difficult and dangerous to draw up legal sanctions against any activity liable to lead to a war psychosis. How indeed could they arrive at an accurate legal definition of a war psychosis without the risk of dangerous casuistry and intolerable abuse? It seemed to him that the Commission should be content for the time being with a more general formula, which might, for example, consist in calling on Member States to oppose by all legal means at their disposal, propaganda which was contrary to the fundamental aims of the United Nations.

It was however obvious that it would one day be necessary to enshrine in every legislation the general principle of sanctions against any propaganda which ran counter to truth. Much political propaganda was a flagrant violation of the peoples' right to the truth, and a disgraceful example of the enslavement of the mind to untruth.

[17] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) thought that it would be difficult to apply the measures suggested by Yugoslavia. It was easy for the State to interfere in countries where the radio was State-owned. The press and films, however, were subject only to criminal law in most countries. The French proposal would, in his opinion, be more acceptable.

[18] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) opposed both the French and Yugoslav amendments. Of the two, the French amendment seemed to him to be the more acceptable. He felt that a case might arise in which a country's laws were not in conformity with the general

principles laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That was a potential source of danger. The Yugoslav text did not specify, in case of such conflict, which was to prevail.

[19] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) agreed with Dr. Beaglehole. In the United States, erroneous information in the press and criticism, however malicious, were subject only to the laws of libel and slander. If he were to support the wording "to combat", he would go beyond the laws of his country.

There was the additional difficulty of choosing a judge. In countries subject to dictatorship, the dictator was the judge. Thus the amendment might, in practice, sanction censorship.

[20] Professor BOGDANOVIČ (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the question of principle raised by his amendment was precisely the same as Unesco's basic principles. He was, however, prepared to accept the French counter-amendment which forestalled all the reservations concerning liberty of the press.

[21] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) recalled that the methods envisaged in the amendments under discussion would be studied later by the General Conference, in connexion with the 1951 programme. For the moment they had only to state objectives in the form of simple recommendations. Governments were merely being invited to apply such resolutions within the framework of their national legislations, without having to undertake any revision of such legislation. They could already begin to take positive action with whatever legislation was available to combat all hate propaganda in schools, on the official radio, etc.

These amendments, moreover, accorded with Unesco's basic principles. They went much less far than the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the San Francisco Charter. It would do the General credit to adopt them.

[22] The CHAIRMAN closed the general discussion; in accordance with the rules, he first put the Italian amendment to the vote.

Mr. MAMELI (Italy) seconded the French proposal.

Before the Commission voted, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL emphasized the importance of that vote. They were seeking a remedy for the acute anxiety caused throughout the world by a campaign of incitement to hatred. This draft resolution, attenuated by the French delegation, in no way endangered the liberty of the nations. If the Commission did not adopt this text, it would give the impression of all-round impotence.

The French counter-amendment, seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, COLOMBIA, DENMARK, INDIA, IRAQ, LIBERIA, NETHERLANDS, PERSIA, PHILIPPINES und URUGUAY, was *adopted* by 22 votes to 8.[1]

Preamble to the Basic Programme.

[23] The CHAIRMAN remarked that the preamble to the Basic Programme fully set out the objectives of Unesco's general mission and what had been accomplished in the different fields of the Organization's work. While the Commission was not supposed to adopt this text formally, they had nevertheless to take a stand on the questions raised by the Chairman of the Executive Board: (1) Did the Commission want a preamble? (2) If so, in what form? (3) How should the basic resolutions be divided?

[24] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought that the preamble raised an almost insoluble problem, since it was easier to reach agreement on a basic programme than on the general aims of an organization. If these were to be more narrowly defined, it would first be necessary to give uniformity to the various mental attitudes of the delegations. If they tried to pick out what they had in common, the result would be an empty banality. Professor Piaget therefore suggested that the preamble be studied in a spirit of eclectecism: he could well imagine that, if they adapted themselves on the one hand to the characteristics of the Latin mind, and on the other to those of the Anglo-Saxon mind, the French text would be maintained and the English text suppressed. He could also imagine the adoption of different texts in French and in English, or even that the English text be published separately. He therefore proposed that the Commission should not discuss the text in detail, but should merely decide on the principle of whether it favoured the same text or two different texts, and whether these should be inserted in the Programme or published separately. Once this question of principle had been settled, the final draft could be left to the Secretariat and to the Executive Board.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that this was precisely the procedure they should adopt.

[25] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) also considered that the preamble really set out objectives. The Basic Programme resolutions had to be introduced in some form. Once the question of principle had been settled, the final drafting would have to be left to the Executive Board and the Secretariat. It would then be for the various

1. In final form: Resol. F.33.

National Commissions to use the preamble as they thought best for the presentation of the Basic Programme.

[26] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) thought it desirable to retain the various preambles at this stage, suggesting that they might be improved and shortened. To that end he would suggest the formation of a special drafting committee on preambles to consider the problem in general and any written amendments which might be submitted.

He entirely approved the course suggested by Professor Piaget, and hoped that the possibility of differences between the English and French texts of the preambles would not be excluded, except as regarded matters of principle.

[27] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought this the wisest solution. He therefore asked the Commission to say whether it would agree to the following procedure: the preamble would be preceded by a statement that it consisted of general considerations submitted by the Executive Board. As to the Basic Programme resolutions, a note would explain that they represented the texts adopted by the General Conference. Finally, the National Commissions would be informed that they were free to use the preamble as they thought best.

[28] Professor CALÒ (Italy) hoped that the text of the preambles would be made more liberal; at present they were too detailed. At the same time they should not become so general that they lost their relationship with the text. He thought there was substantial agreement on the basic principles involved, but did not see how it would be possible to avoid giving some general illustration. The proposal by the Director-General was acceptable, but Professor Calò was firmly convinced that preambles in some form were necessary.

[29] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) suggested that the Director-General's proposal be followed and the preambles be published separately from the resolutions.

He gave notice of a proposal (document 5C/97), which would be available later and which bore on the discussion in progress. He read the relevant parts of the document, and suggested that the United States draft and any others be referred to the Drafting Committee.

[30] In view of the importance of this document, it was *decided*, on the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, seconded by Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom), Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) and Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon), to adjourn discussion until the next meeting, so that delegates might study the text at leisure.

Statement of Methods [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part V].

[31] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) reminded the meeting of the suggestion made at the 1948 General Conference that a draft code of policies should be framed. A draft code was prepared and Member States were then invited to suggest improvements. The 1949 General Conference suggested that some statement of standing directives might be necessary.

In this connexion the Executive Board had come to the conclusion that it was as yet too early to frame a statement of standing directives. Accordingly, the Board had drawn up a Statement of Methods, because it considered the time had come to make some statement which should not be binding on the Director-General or the Executive Board, but which could give some information on the methods by which Unesco carried out its work in the light of the experience of the previous four years. Such a statement would be useful:

1. To the General Conference, which in considering any resolutions would, by reference to the Statement of Methods, be able to ascertain easily whether or not such resolutions would call for pioneering methods. If so, the General Conference could note that some amendment to the Statement of Methods would ensue. In this way, it would save the time of the General Conference, by obviating the necessity for any discussion of the methods by which a resolution should be implemented, and reduce the length of the annual Programme by making any reference to methods superfluous.

2. To Member States; the Director-General and the Secretariat, in explaining the work and methods of Unesco to the public, had emphasized that the Statement of Methods was not intended to restrict the freedom of the Director-General or the Secretariat in any way. It was less definitive than the resolutions of the Basic Programme or of the Annual Programme. The Board intended it to be one of Unesco's basic documents which would provide continuing guidance for the General Conference and do for methods what the Basic Programme did for the work of Unesco.

[32] The CHAIRMAN threw the matter open to general discussion, mentioning that items 13 and 14 on pages 80 and 81—then being studied by the Administrative Commission—were reserved.

[33] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) maintained that it was necessary to have a concrete statement of the manner in which Unesco carried out its work and the relationship of that work to the Constitution. Therefore, on the understanding that the Director-General would be left entirely free to act as he thought fit when new methods were called for, he moved the adoption of the Statement of Methods.

[34] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Yugoslav delegation had filed an amendment (document 5C/93) to *item 12* (International Conferences).

[35] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that his delegation agreed on the general lines of the present wording of item 12. They merely wished the essential aims of international conferences to be formulated more precisely.

[36] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) remarked that item 12 set out the various types of international conference. The Yugoslav amendment should therefore be examined when the Commission came to study the preamble.

The Yugoslav amendment not being seconded, it could not be put to the vote.

A second Yugoslav amendment (document 5C/92) was postponed, since it bore on item 14, which was reserved for later discussion.

[37] The Statement of Methods was *adopted* by 32 votes, with the exception of items 13 and 14, which were reserved for later discussion.[1]

Unesco's Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance for Economic Development [document 5C/PRG/16].

[38] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) acknowledged the assistance of the Director-General and his collaborators. Referring to Mr. Truman's speech on the technical assistance scheme, he thought that the record of Unesco over the previous eighteen months had been a fine one. He drew attention to the resolutions on pages 3, 4 and 5 of document 5C/PRG/16 - Annex III in particular, as having received the full approval of the Executive Board.

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that document 5C/PRG/16 was a report asked for by the General Conference in Paris. So far Unesco had received requests for technical assistance from about fifteen Member States, among them Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Ecuador, Persia, Iraq, Venezuela and Bolivia. Unesco had had to set up a special section under Mr. Adiseshiah, helped by a deputy and three assistants, with a small budget of $23,000.

Annex I of document 5C/PRG/16 summarized the Report sent out on 12 May to all Member States. The Commission was now asked to decide on the second part of the Report (Annex III, page 3). In this way they would contribute to the meeting to be held at Lake Success on 12 June, by giving to Unesco's representative a more closely defined and surer freedom of action.

[40] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) assured the meeting that it was the intention of the Netherlands to participate to the fullest in the technical assistance scheme and referred to a similar assurance given by his country to the Economic and Social Council.

Unfortunately, the Netherlands contribution (1.4 per cent, according to the rate of assessment for contribution to the United Nations) had to be paid in non-convertible florins. The Netherlands was intending to furnish certain services to make good its contributions, as follows:

1. Facilities for students and scholars to study in educational establishments in the Netherlands (a commission was already carrying out the necessary structural changes);
2. Experts in the scientific, technical and social fields for under-developed countries;
3. Creation of international scientific centres;
4. Creation of an international scientific documentation centre.

He hoped that such a suggestion would meet with the approval of Unesco, as it had already secured that of the United Nations.

He noted with satisfaction the clarity of the summary given and the forms which technical assistance was to take. He would only stress the importance of integration, with regard to the missions already sent under the technical assistance plan to the Philippines, Thailand and Afghanistan, and hoped that there would be no duplication with the Department of Education. He likewise emphasized the value of the collaboration of other Specialized Agencies—in particular, FAO and WHO.

[41] Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) approved all the resolutions and the rest of the document, which he found in complete accord with the resolutions adopted in Paris. It gave the Director-General the opportunity to act, and he hoped that much could be done in this field.

[42] Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) wished to thank the Director-General for having created a special section of the Secretariat for putting the technical assistance scheme into effect. The Lebanese

1. In final form: Section II, Eighth Part.

Ministry of Education was prepared to give any assistance within its powers. To this end it had set up an institute of technology with the task of training technical staff.

[43] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) regretted his inability to give any detailed information regarding the participation of Denmark, but said that it would take a form similar to that indicated by the delegate of the Netherlands.

[44] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) entirely endorsed the view of Mr. Ward, it being understood that resolution 1.22 should not involve any budgetary liabilities other than those approved by the Budget Committee.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) fully approved the technical assistance plan and assured the Commission that the Government of Liberia would co-operate to the full.

[45] Section 1.1 (document 5C/PRG/16, Annex III) was *adopted* by 31 votes.[1]

Section 1.2 of the same document was also *adopted*.[2]

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

1. In final form: Section II, Seventh Part, Resol. VII.1 to VII.16.
2. In final form: Section II, Seventh Part, Resol. VII.2 to VII.24.

EIGHTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France)

Presentation of the Programme for 1951 by the Chairman of the Executive Board [documents 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II, and 5C/5 (I), Rev.-Addendum].

[1] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) announced that, after presenting the Basic Programme (which defined the fields of Unesco's work over a period of years), the Board was about to present the Annual Programme (which defined the work to be carried out within the twelve-month period of 1951). It was appropriate that the Director-General should immediately afterwards introduce the Budget for the Financial Year 1951, since all along the Board had closely collaborated in the preparatory work and the budgetary aspect of the Programme was an integral part of it.

[2] The Draft Programme for 1951 was in the form of resolutions, each of which—in so far as it involved expenditure from the Organization's central funds—had a corresponding item in the Budget. All the Annual Programme resolutions were addressed exclusively to the Director-General; but, in order that the general public and Member States might not take it to mean that the Secretariat alone was responsible for the execution of the Programme, the Board was also presenting a second document, 5C/5 (I) Rev., Addendum, containing a number of new resolutions which it proposed should be included in document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II forming an integral part of it. Although every point submitted in the Annual Programme was meant to be a project on which the Director-General was authorized to spend money, such projects could be fruitful only if Member States collaborated both with each other and with the Secretariat. They were asked to contribute not only to the matters contained in the Addendum to document 5C/5 (I) Rev., but to the whole Programme.

[3] With regard to the size of the Programme, the Board had found it impossible to decide on this without considering the cost in the light of the Director-General's budgetary estimates. The total of rather more than $8,000,000 contained in the Budget would have to be slightly increased by two projects considered during the last session of the Executive Board, namely the teaching of indigenous languages and a system of international Braille.

[4] The statement of the Executive Board concerning the Programme (Part VI of document 5C/5 (I) Rev. referred to the problem of safeguarding peace in the immediate, rather than

the remote future, and Sir John wanted delegates to ask themselves whether they should not seek to do more in 1951 than heretofore, in order to increase their immediate and direct contribution to peace. Thus he invited them to consider what other possible projects should be included with that end in view.

[5] The second question of which Sir John invited serious consideration was whether the order of priorities worked out by the Executive Board was correct. If delegates felt that any item proposed by the Board should be postponed, he suggested that it was their bounden duty to propose the amputation of that limb, and he recalled that the addition of other limbs, involving a cost of some $700,000, had already been proposed since the completion of the Board's report.

[6] Lastly, there was the question of balance. The Draft Programme for 1951 constituted a reasonable, coherent and logical whole, and Sir John hoped that delegates would pay particular attention to this point in making additional recommendations.

Presentation by the Director-General of the Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1951 [document 5C/5 (II)].

[7] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL presented the Budget Estimates for the financial year 1951, stating that they totalled $8,149,985; this represented an increase of $150,000 over the total budget for the current financial year. This sum of $8,149,985 was but a small contribution by fifty-nine States to the promotion of peace and security through education, science and culture.

[8] Many speakers had emphasized the discrepancy between Unesco's aims and the means for their attainment placed at its disposal. Therefore, in studying the Budget Estimates, the delegates should not confine themselves to considering them in relation to the Programme of the Executive Board and to the comments of the Budget Committee, but should also consider them in relation to the programme which would be entrusted to Unesco for the year 1951. If the budget were examined in this spirit, the General Conference would be likely to grant the Organization a budget sufficient to put into effect a programme commensurate with the tasks undertaken by Unesco.

[9] The Director-General pointed out that Unesco must not be considered merely as a secretariat, but as an instrument for collective action by Member States whose efforts should merely be stimulated and co-ordinated by the Secretariat. Governments and National Commissions must be encouraged to take effective measures which would enable Unesco to establish contact with every people, to make education available to greater numbers, to win acceptance for a more humane conception of science's part in the service of peace, and finally to secure a fuller appreciation of the cultural values of civilization. Hence it was essential to develop energetically the National Commissions of all Member States. At the present time, however, National Commissions were not in general sufficiently developed to permit the Organization to pass on to them the execution of the programme to the extent that was desirable. If, in a large number of States, there was no National Commission capable of taking part in any particular project, that project would be deprived of its necessary international basis.

It was above all this inadequacy which restricted the budget to its present size. The important thing was to guarantee the continuity of Unesco's task until such time as the intensification of the part played in the programme by Member States would enable the financial burden now resting on the Secretariat to be reduced. Such continuity required that a minimum of services, and consequently of resources, be ensured. The Budget Estimates were in the neighbourhood of that minimum, taking into account the draft programme to which they referred. The Director-General believed that a big reduction in the budget would tend to compromise either the efficiency or the continuity of Unesco's work.

[10] He recalled that the advance draft of the budget presented by him to the Executive Board in February 1950 had amounted to $9,500,000. The Executive Board, believing this figure to be too high, had decided to suppress a whole series of activities, among them certain projects adopted in November 1949. Those eliminations had been dictated by a wish to concentrate the programme. In that connexion, the Director-General read out the following passage from his Introduction to the Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1951 (document 5C/5 (II), pages VII and VII):

I quite understand the difficulties which Member States are experiencing. But I should be less than frank if I did not point out that, without this additional effort on the part of Member States, the maintenance of the Organization's budget at a figure only a little higher than that for the present financial year will in fact mean a considerable reduction in its activities, and that it is impossible to restrict the development of an Organization in its early days without the risk of seriously compromising its future.

I use the word reduction—not stabilization—since,

while the budget remains at approximately the same level, our general expenses are continually and inevitably increasing as the Organization grows older . . .

. . . I earnestly beg the General Conference to consider carefully the situation which has arisen owing to the non-payment of Member States' contributions. If we have the ideals of Unesco at heart, we must be prepared to look facts in the face. The Organization cannot become a vital and constructive force in the world unless it has the means necessary to achieve the objects it has been set. The first thing to do is to make up the deficit for past years. But it is also necessary to find a solution for the future which will enable us to proceed confidently once appropriations have been approved by the General Conference.

[11] Continuing his statement, the Director-General emphasized that, if the General Conference were to decide to reduce the budget ceiling proposed by the Secretariat, and if it were to decide against the proposed financial system, the Secretariat would be in a very difficult position. If it were provided with a merely fictitious budget—resulting from non-payment by Member States—or even with a real budget that was lower than the budget for 1950, the Director-General could not accept responsibility for carrying out an extensive programme.

[12] Before being asked to decide on the budget ceiling, the Programme and Budget Commission would have before it the Report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission; it would then have to decide either on an increase in the ceiling figure or on a reduction of the programme; the latter had already been severely pruned.

[13] Dr. BENDER (Chairman of the Budget Committee) informed the Commission that the adoption of the sixty or so additional resolutions submitted by delegates would involve an additional cost of some $600,000 to $700,000. He suggested that the Rapporteur of the Budget Committee should be present during the Commission's deliberations to give information on the consequences of any decisions that might be taken.

General discussion of the Programme and Budget for 1951 [documents 5C/5 (I) Rev. and 5C/5 (II)].

[14] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) wished to consider document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum apart from its budgetary implications. He agreed with the Executive Board and the Director-General that Member States should be encouraged and stimulated to play a still larger part in the work of the Organization. In principle, and subject to amendments, his delegation accepted the conclusions and resolutions presented by the Executive Board, but with the following provisos:

(*a*) the mention of specific projects should not be taken to imply that Member States were not heavily responsible for the whole programme of Unesco, to the execution of which they were fully pledged, and he hoped that both the Director-General and the Executive Board would continue to draw attention to this point.

(*b*) in future more attention should be given to planning projects so as to ensure explicitly, by the language in which the resolutions were framed, the participation of Member States.

[15] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the *Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies* [document 5C/OXR/4], and especially to Annexes I, II, III and IV.

[16] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) thought that the United Nations resolutions strengthened what had already been affirmed in the Commission and by the heads of delegations.

Basing himself on the first resolution of the General Assembly [document 5C/OXR/4, Annex I], resolving "to urge Member States to refrain from initiating new projects other than those which are urgently required and which can be effectively carried out", Dr. Stoddard suggested that Unesco should adopt the same criterion. If this were done, his Government would agree to raising the ceiling of the Unesco budget, although he was not yet prepared to say by how much, nor to present a motion to that effect. If projects were well conceived, concentrated and likely to further the aims of Unesco, he thought the activities of the Director-General should not be restricted.

[17] Secondly, Dr. Stoddard turned to the examination by the Executive Board of the Programmes and Budgets of Specialized Agencies of the United Nations [document 5C/OXR/4] and to the Draft Resolution arising out of those considerations (*ibid.* pages 10 and 11), which he recommended the Commission to adopt.

[18] As to the procedure to be adopted in examining the Programme and Budget, he suggested that, in their first consideration of the various points, delegates should judge them first from the point of view of their general desirability, and only later consider their effect on the total Budget. If necessary, they could always, at any stage, obtain from the Secretariat an estimate of the cost of the decisions taken up to that stage.

[19] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) supported the

United States delegate in his comments on document 5C/OXR/4: Unesco should see that its activities fitted in with those of the United Nations, whilst at the same time preserving the necessary autonomy in its own sphere.

[20] In fixing the ceiling for the 1951 budget, the recommendations of the Budget Committee must be borne in mind. On the other hand, the delegate of France expressed certain doubts as to the advisability of adopting the whole series of new resolutions presented by Member States. In this connexion, he paid tribute to the concentration and balance aimed at in the Basic Programme and the Programme for 1951.

[21] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. FLETCHER (Australia), Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium), Dr. KRISHNAN (India), Dr JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) and Professor DÜRING (Sweden), moved the adoption of the draft resolution on pages 10 and 11 of document 5C/OXR/4.

The resolution was *adopted* by 29 votes to none.[1]

[22] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) expressed his great satisfaction at the prospect of stability in Unesco's future activities offered by the new Basic Programme. Thanks to that Programme, the National Commissions—which only too often had not known what direction to give to their own activities—would henceforth be able to participate in a logical and efficacious manner in the Organization's work.

He emphasized the close relationship between the Programme and the Budget and the importance of safeguarding that unity. He was very anxious that the document containing the Basic Programme and the Programme for 1951 should be widely distributed.

[23] Professor CALÒ (Italy) fully endorsed the statements of the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General, and stressed the need for some flexibility in deciding on the budget ceiling.

[24] The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the *Report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission* [document 5C/ADM/18], which should be examined before the discussion on the budget ceiling; item 6 in that document should be deleted.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 9.91 to 9.912.

NINTH MEETING

Thursday, 1 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Discussion of the Basic Programme (continued) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev. 2, Part I].

Draft Resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States of America [document 5C/97].

[1] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) said that the draft resolution had been prepared in response to questions raised by the Chairman of the Executive Board at the first meeting of the Commission. There had been much discussion on how the Programme should be prepared; but, so far as he knew, no voice had been raised against the desirability of its being prepared by the Executive Board, and there had been much appreciation of the Board's work. The United States delegation thought that its draft resolution showed how a concentration of the programme might be achieved; when prepared by the Executive Board, the programme should be drafted in such a style as to appeal to the cinema, radio programmes, journalists and to all persons who were wondering what the concentrated objectives, great tasks and ideals of Unesco really were.

[2] Mr. Sargeant thought that, for the time being, the Commission needed to consider only two parts of document 5C/97 (firstly, page 1 and the first paragraph on page 2 and, secondly, the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4, where a list was given of what the United States delegation

regarded as Unesco's major tasks). The speaker added that the resolution referred only to Basic Programme; it did not refer at all to the Annual Programme.

[3] It might be helpful if other delegations, if they so wished and had the time, could offer suggestions as to how they would group the contents of the Basic Programme. But the United States delegation felt that some attempt should be made to present the whole future Programme of Unesco under some ten to twelve headings.

[4] The second recommendation (first paragraph of page 2), was explained at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4, where the major tasks of Unesco, in the United States delegation's view, were set out. It was quite clear that, if those major tasks were divorced from the preamble, the idea might be given that Unesco stood quite apart—a kind of super-university; so the United States delegation had attempted, in every one of those major tasks, to relate the programme work of Unesco to Article I of the Constitution, and it was through that preamble, which was a kind of ramp to the basic document through the Constitution, that cohesion was given to what might otherwise seem to be disparate tasks. In section 10 (pages 18 and 19 of document 5C/97), it would be seen that the ten tasks were really bound together: (*a*) by their relation to the preamble to the Constitution, and (*b*) by the central, professional, cohesive and permanent force of the Secretariat.

[5] Mr. Sargeant concluded by saying that his delegation felt that above all the other dynamic forces in Unesco, there was the Director-General, and the delegation wished to express its complete confidence in his leadership, in his inspiration and in his admirable qualities of imagination, feeling that he, above all the other forces in Unesco, would bind the tasks together. The United States delegation hoped that Unesco would be able to show to the world that, having been linked in a relatively small number of tasks and purposes, it had achieved a unity which had not thus far been apparent to those outside.

[6] Mr. Sargeant wished to put the motion that the Commission should accept the two recommendations in the draft resolution (document 5C/97, last paragraph on page 1, and first paragraph on page 2).

[7] At the suggestion of the United States delegate, supported by the delegates of the PHILIPPINES, DENMARK, PAKISTAN, NORWAY, TURKEY and SWEDEN, it was *agreed* that the two recommendations should be considered together.

[8] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) wished to congratulate the United States delegation on a valuable suggestion. He understood that the draft resolution was not concerned with any radical change in the Basic Programme. There were, however, two aspects of the document and the proposed resolution to which he would refer:

(*a*) With regard to the Basic Programme, the United Kingdom delegation supported the adoption of its main lines and structure, and formally proposed the setting up of a special sub-committee of the Drafting Committee to improve its preambles; he did not doubt that the United States delegation would agree to that suggestion.

(*b*) As regarded the work which the Executive Board must do between the current session of the Conference and the two following ones, Mr. Hardman understood that the United States delegation felt that the resolutions should remain in the same form and with the same arrangement as at present, and the United Kingdom delegation agreed. It also agreed that the Executive Board should consider the whole question of the preambles, taking into account the valuable contribution of the United States delegation and any other contributions which other States might care to make.

[9] The United Kingdom delegation would formally move the reference of document 5C/97 to the Executive Board for its consideration in preparing the preambles to the Basic Programme for use at future sessions of the Conference.

[10] In conclusion, Mr. Hardman considered that the document very much helped the line of thought which he had expressed in his opening speech at the Conference, and he was certain that the suggestions in the United States resolution would be a great source of inspiration to the United Kingdom National Commission in its discussions and work. The document would also provide immediately a most valuable guide for the Mass Communication Department in its publications service which aimed at spreading a knowledge of Unesco's work among the peoples of the world.

[11] The CHAIRMAN remarked that, strictly speaking, the formal proposal of the United Kingdom delegation to refer document 5C/97 to the Executive Board was an amendment, since the motion of the United States delegation was that the two recommendations in the document should be adopted.

The United Kingdom delegation's amendment was supported by the delegates of ITALY, LIBERIA and SWITZERLAND.

[12] Dr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) agreed to

accept that proposal, provided that the rules adopted were not of a restrictive nature and would be interpreted in the widest sense by the Director-General and by future sessions of the General Conference.

[13] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) asked at what stage it was contemplated that the matter would be referred to the Executive Board: whether it would be during the present Conference or afterwards. If afterwards, whether it would be the Executive Board's intention to report, for a decision, on the drafts submitted to it, to the next session of the General Conference.

[14] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) said that it had been thought that the drafts submitted, starting with the one made by United States because it seemed to be the first made along such lines, would be submitted either to the Drafting Committee already existing in the Commission, or perhaps to a special committee, which might work on the form of the Executive Board's Basic Programme with special reference to reclassifying the materials, and to the preamble of the Constitution. That went rather farther than the British amendment, which referred only to the last part of the United States second recommendation [document 5C/97, page 2).

[15] It was quite clear that the Executive Board could only act upon the document at a later time; but the purpose of having it submitted first to the Drafting Committee or to a special committee would be to see whether they could not, before the close of the session, without changing at all the substance of the United States resolution, submit a text acceptable to the Conference which would show the concentration into the ten tasks mentioned on pages 3 and 4. It was thought that, if the Commission were able to select a subcommittee to do that, a measure of concentration of the 1950 Programme would be achieved without having to wait for the further work of the Executive Board.

[16] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) was still not clear whether the decisions taken by the Executive Board would be subject to the approval of the General Conference at a later date.

[17] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was concerned for the consequences which might ensue from the United Kingdom delegation's amendment, for, if such an important document were referred to the Executive Board for its consideration, there would be no Basic Programme before 1951. Moreover, if the Programme presented were a merely provisional one, Unesco, after four years of activity, would be rightly accused of instability.

[18] In those circumstances, he ventured to submit the following considerations: as soon as the Basic Programme and preamble (with certain amendments) had been examined by the Executive Board, the resolutions could be presented to the General Conference for adoption. A drafting committee could then be instructed to place at the end of the exordium of the preamble the excellent list of the major tasks established by the United States delegate. The Programme would then consist of two parts: a uniform programme preceded by a general preamble, at the end of which there would be a complete and clear list of Unesco's main activities.

[19] As to the preambles themselves, it would no doubt be necessary to propose that they should not have binding force. A special drafting committee, composed mainly of English-speaking people, could be instructed to work out their form. It would be advisable, at the time of its publication, to indicate in a prefatory note that Unesco was publishing its permanent programme of activities, emphasizing in the general preamble the importance of the ten major tasks. The National Commissions, for their part, would be invited to disseminate the Basic Programme in terms which they considered most suitable to public opinion in their respective countries. In adopting such a procedure, the Commission would meet the wishes of the United States delegate and avoid the delay involved in referring the matter to the Executive Board, as well as the risk of publishing a public programme lacking in sufficient authority.

[20] The CHAIRMAN thought there might have been some misunderstanding. The United Kingdom delegation did not wish to cut out the preambles altogether from the resolution. They were thinking of that in connexion with a long-term basic programme but, in the meantime, they wished to maintain the preambles, perhaps modified and rewritten.

[21] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) wished to congratulate the United States delegation on the concise and practical manner in which it had presented the major tasks of Unesco.

[22] Dr. WALKER (Australia) thought the Director-General's observations very helpful. As a member of the Board, he had suffered under the process of trying to evolve a series of satisfactory preambles to the Basic Programme, and those that finally emerged, and which would be further considered, represented an attempt to compromise between widely differing points of view and ways of thought of members of the Board who came from eighteen different countries; that was a fact

which should be borne in mind when any delegation attempted to rewrite the preambles from the viewpoint considered most satisfactory by that particular delegation. The introduction at the present stage of a document of the size presented by the United States delegation, which set out, as it were, to substitute a new set of preambles, illustrated one of the difficulties under which the Board and the Conference were really labouring. It was quite obvious that if each delegation undertook the task of submitting a redraft of the preambles, the consequences would be a state of complete confusion and the documents presented could not be digested by the delegations. Personally, Dr. Walker did not think there was any prospect whatever of starting out to rewrite the preambles along the general lines of the United States resolution, because, as soon as it was entrusted to an international group, the same sort of difficulties would arise as had arisen in the Board, differences of expression and of conception.

[23] Dr. Walker agreed very strongly with the Director-General that it was essential for the Conference to complete the Basic Programme and any statement of preambles at the current Session of the Conference, and to avoid reopening the matter for further debate at future sessions which should be devoted to two things: consideration of what was going to be done in the following year, and to such matters as the passing of recommendations and resolutions and the adoption of conventions recommended to Member States.

[24] Having said that, Dr. Walker felt that the work put into the problem by the United States delegation was of considerable interest. The most interesting point was the list of ten main activities to be envisaged for the next few years, and he thought it would be a good procedure to consider that list as an amendment or addition, not for incorporation in the main text of the Basic Programme (as suggested in the first recommendation of the United States), but in the preambles, or in the preamble to the preambles, of the Basic Programme. Dr. Walker proposed that the list should be referred to the Drafting Committee for insertion in the preambles proposed by the Executive Board.

[25] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) thought that the proposals of the Director-General, and of the Australian and United Kingdom delegations might be combined. The United States delegation would withdraw its original proposal in favour of that of the Director-General, as elucidated by the delegate of Australia, but would like to add, as a second part to the Australian delegate's motion, the United Kingdom delegate's amendment: in other words, that the list of major tasks should be included in some appropriate place in the Basic Programme. The United States delegation's further proposal was that the whole of document 5C/97, and any other similar suggestions, should be sent to the Executive Board for future reference.

Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) seconded Mr. Sargeant's proposal.

[26] The CHAIRMAN said that the two proposals before the meeting were: (1) that the list of major tasks of Unesco should be referred to the Drafting Committee with a view to incorporating them in the preamble, and (2) that the whole of document 5C/97, with any similar proposals from other delegations, should be referred to the Executive Board for future consideration.

[27] Professor BRANCA (Italy) joined the previous speakers in congratulating the United States delegation on its excellent resolution. He thought that, to do justice to it, the Commission should be given some time to read and study it carefully. It might be advisable not to come to a conclusion at the present Conference, for, after all, the Basic Programme presented by the Executive Board was also an excellent document. He would not attempt to draw any comparison between the two, as the United States delegation wished to put the questions in a new way; but the Italian delegation thought that, if the discussion on the main points was not to be a conclusive one, it might be as well to keep to the Basic Programme as presented by the Board.

[28] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked the United States delegate for his accommodating spirit. He thought that, it they referred the whole of document 5C/97 to the Executive Board, they would give the impression that Unesco still lacked a final Basic Programme. Would it not be possible for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Executive Board asking it to take that into account when working out the Programme?

[29] The CHAIRMAN thought that to accept the alternative proposal of the Director-General would not alter the Commission's immediate task, which was to discuss the proposal that the list of ten points should be referred to the Drafting Committee. After that, the meeting could consider the Director-General's proposal and that of the United Kingdom delegation as possibilities, and arrive at a compromise.

[30] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) thought that the problem of the preamble should be examined in detail. If they agreed that each country should

be given complete liberty with regard to the use of the Basic Programme, there was nothing to prevent them from adopting in its present form the American document, which set out so clearly the ends and means of Unesco.

[31] Mr. MAURIAC (France) considered that the final text of the preamble should take into account the document presented by the United States delegation, in accordance with the procedure proposed by the Director-General. He pointed out that the publication of the general preamble offered Unesco an almost unique occasion of addressing itself directly to all peoples in order to make known to them its aims, methods and hopes. It was not sufficient to present them with a bare list; an appeal must be made to their minds and hearts, particularly as world public opinion was labouring under a misunderstanding. The peoples knew very little, if anything at all, about Unesco. They now had the opportunity of conversing with all the peoples represented at Unesco. In that connexion, he drew attention to the example of the United States which, better than any other Member State of Unesco, knew how to utilize all the resources of their National Commission. Subject to those remarks, he approved the suggestions of the Director-General.

[32] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) testified to the admirable work done by the American delegation to make known the main points of Unesco's programme of activities. It was obvious that the draft preamble could be an admirable source of inspiration to the National Commissions of English-speaking countries. The list of major tasks was an excellent one, but he regretted that international education was not included in it. It would perhaps be contended that it was implicitly contained in the ninth point in the list but it was difficult to maintain that international education meant no more than understanding of the machinery of the United Nations. It was a quite distinct task, which, owing to its importance, should occupy first place in the Programme. In that respect, he wondered if they should not refer the list of major tasks to the Executive Board so that the latter might carefully consider all its terms, for it was a problem which exceeded the powers of a drafting committee. The list, when established in its final form, should be placed at the end of the preamble.

[33] The CHAIRMAN remarked that there did not appear to be any difference of opinion regarding the inclusion of the ten major tasks in the Basic Programme, unless the remaining speakers had opposing views.

[34] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) would have liked to see some additions to the list; for example, under the term "to promote science", he did not think technical science only was meant, but human knowledge as well. He saw no reference either to relief to peoples who suffered from the cruelty of man or of nature. He suggested that the Drafting Committee should consider his proposals.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Rapporteur had taken note of the points raised by the delegates of Iraq and Switzerland.

[35] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) stressed the necessity of a really radical revision and rewriting of the preambles as they now stood; he referred to the English version only.

The CHAIRMAN thought that subject would be raised under the second recommendation.

[36] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) thought the translation of the Programme into different languages also sometimes needed explanation, synopses or commentaries. The explanation of the Programme provided by the United States delegation might be adopted as a commentary to the Programme, and other Member States might also be invited to comment.

[37] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) supported the proposals of the Australian and Swiss representatives, and proposed that another major task of Unesco should be added to the list drawn up by the United States delegation, in the following terms:

To oppose all tendencies towards hegemony and the stirring up of hatred among peoples and races; to fight against a war psychosis; to promote respect for national sovereignty and the free development of national cultures.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the suggestion of the delegate of Yugoslavia would be passed on to the Drafting Committee for incorporation in the ten points; when the question came up before the Commission again, the delegate of Yugoslavia could, if he wished, put a formal motion on the subject.

[38] The Chairman thought the meeting was ready to vote on the motion of the Australian delegate that the list of the major tasks of Unesco [document 5C/97, pages 3 and 4] should be referred to the Drafting Committee, for incorporation in the preamble, to be used as a basis for a new section in the preamble (that meant that the latter would be subject to modification) together with any suggestions or modifications that were accepted by the Drafting Committee.

[39] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) noted that the Chairman had referred to the Drafting

Committee. He had understood from the Director-General's remarks, and it was certainly his delegation's point of view, that there should be a special committee.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that he had merely wished to point out that, in his opinion, the most logical procedure would be to refer the American proposals to *a* drafting committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that this point would be considered when the Commission dealt with the United Kingdom delegation's proposal.

[40] The proposal that the list of ten major tasks of Unesco be referred, together with any other suggestions made in the course of the debate or subsequently in writing to the Rapporteur, to the Drafting Committee, to serve as a basis for a new section in the preamble or preambles, was *adopted* unanimously with the exception of one vote (Afghanistan) against.

[41] The CHAIRMAN put the second part of the original United States proposal, as modified by the delegate of the United Kingdom, to the vote. The question was whether, in the next year or in the future, the Executive Board should come forward with a possible new form of preambles to the Basic Programme. The Australian delegation supported the Director-General in feeling that that should not be done. The United States and the United Kingdom delegations rather felt that the matter should be left open for the Executive Board, if it saw fit, to introduce a new form of preamble, perhaps based upon the United States resolution in document 5C/97.

[42] The United States delegation's proposal, that document 5C/97, with any other suggestions by other Member States bearing on the same problem, should be referred to the Executive Board for its consideration, was *adopted.*

[43] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) proposed that the rewriting and incorporation of suggestions into the preambles in their English text should be in the hands of a special drafting committee (primarily of English-speaking people). He proposed a committee of four.

[44] After an exchange of views between ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia), Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) and Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), it was *decided* to set up a special drafting sub-committee, to consider the English text, consisting of three persons whose mother-tongue was English, and the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission (Mr. Seydoux).

[45] Mr. CAIN (France) emphasized the fundamental importance of the preamble. It was something quite new in the dissemination of Unesco's aims. That was why the French delegation could not agree to the adoption of a new procedure and preferential treatment for one of the working languages. It might accept that procedure in the present exceptional case, provided that it was understood to be purely a question of form and that the question of principle would not be dealt with by the drafting sub-committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

TENTH MEETING

Thursday, 1 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Membership of the Drafting Sub-Committee.

[1] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at the end of the previous meeting the Commission had decided to establish a drafting sub-committee to revise the English text of the preambles to the Basic Programme. The sub-committee would consist of three English-speaking members and one French-speaking member.

He said that he was not qualified to serve on the sub-committee, as his duty as Chairman was to be impartial in the work of the Commission and of its committees. He invited the Head of the United Kingdom delegation to designate three English-speaking persons whom he considered qualified to form part of the drafting sub-committee.

[2] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) put forward the following names: Professor Armfelt (United Kingdom), Dr. Stoddard (United States of America) and Dr. Beaglehole (New Zealand). He would support the Chairman's proposal as to the French member of the sub-committee.

[3] The CHAIRMAN would leave it to the French delegation to designate a delegate or an adviser who would collaborate with the three English-speaking members.

General Discussion on the Programme and Budget for 1951 (*continued*) [documents 5C/5 (I), Rev. and 5C/5 (II)].

[4] The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission [document 5C/ADM/18] and recalled that, the previous day, the Director-General had emphasized the danger to the Commission of taking an immediate decision on the total budget figure: as certain countries (whose contributions represented an important sum) did not pay their contributions, the sums voted would be purely theoretical and the Director-General would not dispose in fact of sufficient sums to carry out a normal programme.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, after reading document 5C/ADM/18, with which he had not been familiar on the previous day, his misgivings had increased. Commenting on paragraphs 4 and 5, he said that, although the "priority activities" included in Part I of the 1951 Programme should be entirely covered by a budget of $8,205,000 (which, owing to the non-payment of certain contributions, would be reduced to $7,500,000), it was rather ironical to qualify the activities of Part II as "priority" activities, for their realization seemed unlikely. In his opinion, the problem could not be raised in a more difficult fashion. The immediate fixing of the total figure for the budget (it seemed unlikely that a figure higher than $8,205,000 could be envisaged at the present stage) would at once oblige the Conference to cut down the programme in accordance with the solution advocated by the Committee of the Administrative Commission. In fact, the estimates would have to be reduced to $7,500,000. But certain expenses which could not be reduced would be higher in 1951 than they had been in 1950. Increases in salaries, for instance, would amount to $300,000. Moreover, the number of Member States would probably be increased to 59 during 1951, and that would involve an increase in overheads such as documents, travelling, etc. The funds available for the execution of the programme would have to be reduced to about $7,200,000. It therefore seemed indispensable that the Programme and Budget Commission should endeavour to fix a higher budget ceiling.

[6] The Commission should, in his opinion, point out to the Administrative Commission that the proposed decision might hinder its work. The Secretariat had done all it could in order not to submit exaggerated budget estimates to the Conference. The problem had arisen as to how they should meet the deficit due to the non-payment of contributions. The Administrative Commission was inviting the Programme and Budget Commission to answer that it intended, not to find compensation, but to reduce Unesco's activities. It must be pointed out to the Administrative Commission that they must avoid at all costs the necessity of classifying the projects in

two categories, the second of which would have to be abandoned. That was an extremely important matter for Unesco's future.

[7] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) thought it essential that delegates should endeavour to obtain at once a clear idea of the budget that could be expected in 1951. From experience in 1950, it had seemed reasonable to expect that about $8,000,000 might be collected; but, in actual fact, this seemed an optimistic forecast. There was striking evidence that the limit to which Member States could be expected to continue their contributions had been overreached. While the needs were admittedly great, the prime responsibility of Member States was their national sphere. The Executive Board and the Director-General had urged them to increase their activities on the national front, and these must be financed by the governments themselves.

He hoped it would not be necessary to reduce the budget, but he was prepared to support only those proposals which would keep the budget within reasonable limits in 1950 and enable Member States to meet their obligations to the full. His delegation was making appropriate recommendations in the relevant commission. He quoted, in support of his argument, the report of the United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (document 5C/OXR/4 - Annex I, page 2), and stressed his anxiety that a suitable system of priorities should be set up in Unesco. If that were not practicable in the Commission, he suggested handing over the problem to a sub-committee. However, he thought a motion to this effect should come rather from the delegations of countries having a major share in financing Unesco.

[8] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) proposed deferring the discussion until the following week, when the Commission could be put in possession of further data.

[9] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) summed up the existing position. The Commission had before it: firstly, the annual Programme and Budget (assessed at $8,200,000); secondly, a series of new resolutions (many of which, although they had looked innocent to their initiators, were found to involve financial provisions by Unesco assessed at $600,000 to $700,000); thirdly, the report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission (according to which the Organization could not reasonably expect to receive more than $7,500,000, if the $8,200,000 budget was accepted).

His delegation believed that the Conference must arrive at a realistic budget total which specified a series of programmes and activities, and contained no unappropriated money, but which also included a reserve within whatever total was adopted.

[10] Mr. HARDMAN therefore proposed that the upper limit of the Budget should be fixed within the $8,200,000, and he stated categorically that his delegation would not vote for more. This sum should also be used for purposes of assessing contributions.

He supported the suggestion of the Administrative Commission, contained in document 5C/ADM/18 paragraph 5, to divide the Budget into two parts, the first containing items of high priority with a total of not more than $7,500,000, and the second with the low priority items which would bring the total to $8,200,000.

He further suggested that the Director-General and the Executive Board should be requested to regulate the level of expenditure in 1951, as well as in 1950, so as not to exceed income in that year.

[11] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) hoped that the problem would be put more realistically. According to the estimates of the Swiss delegation, each Swiss citizen paid 15 Swiss centimes annually to Unesco's budget. Estimating the population of the United States at 120,000,000, an American citizen paid an amount equal to 10 Swiss centimes. It was difficult to take too seriously the figures being discussed by the Commission, as they represented a mere trifle in the total expenditure of each State.

The Swiss delegate confessed how disappointed he was on reading the report contained in document 5C/ADM/18. As it was the rôle of the Administrative Commission to administer, the latter, after qualifying the figure of $8,205,000 as a fictitious one, should have proposed an administrative solution for meeting the deficit. But it simply referred the problem back to the Programme and Budget Commission. The deficit due to the delay in payments was perhaps temporary. Could not a provisional solution be found, in the form of a loan, for instance?

[12] He therefore proposed the following procedure:

(1) To refer the matter back to the Administrative Commission with the request that it should examine one or more specific projects for meeting the deficit;

(2) To pass on immediately to the examination of the Annual Programme, in order to be able to adjust the budget estimates to the decisions taken concerning that Programme.

[13] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) also thought that the Conference must be realistic.

The Director-General had submitted to the Executive Board a draft budget, the total figure of which amounted to $9,500,000. The Executive Board had reduced those estimates to $8,205,000, a figure which it considered to be the minimum for executing the Programme. Since then, however, new projects had been submitted to the Conference and their execution would involve additional expenditure. Moreover, owing to the delay in the payment of contributions, it was to be anticipated that the receipts would not exceed $7,500,000.

[14] A very clear problem therefore arose: would it be necessary to reduce Unesco's activities as from 1951? No one could accept such a prospect, and he felt the same disappointment as Professor Piaget at the suggestions of the Administrative Commission. He therefore proposed that the Commission should refer the question back to the Administrative Commission with a formal request to re-examine the matter and find means of financing the programme. It might be possible to consider shortening the time-limit for the payment of contributions, or else to work out estimates for the payment of certain arrears, or to adopt the idea of establishing a reserve fund.

Finally, account must be taken of such hard realities as the urgent needs of humanity in the fields of education, science and culture.

[15] The CHAIRMAN said that it was not the Director-General who had originally presented a draft budget of $9,500,000; that figure had been established by the Secretariat after estimating the expenditure which would be necessary for the draft programme for 1951.

[16] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the Director-General's objectivity. The financial problem which faced them arose from the difficulty experienced by certain States in promptly providing the money required. If Unesco attempted to carry out all the possible programmes ahead of it, there would be no ceiling to the budget. He therefore thought they should work on two lines: firstly, as suggested by Professor Piaget, the Administrative Commission should be asked to make further proposals and secondly, a sub-committee should be set up on the lines proposed by the delegate of the Union of South Africa.

[17] Dr. Jamali emphasized that the present programme had been drawn up as a result of long experience. Admittedly, some of the additional resolutions might have been adopted under particularly favourable conditions; but he believed that, in the circumstances, the whole basis of Unesco's activities should be reorganized and three sets of priorities recognized: (*a*) the reconstruction of the human spirit; (*b*) the exchange of ideas between nations and the implementation of the United Nations ideals; (*c*) creative work, scientific research, the arts and humanities.

In the view of his delegation, this latter group had a low priority, since the activities involved would be continued even without Unesco's intervention. It was therefore on this group that economies could be made.

Dr. Jamali supported the proposal for the appointment of a sub-committee to evaluate and revalue Unesco's 1951 Programme along those lines.

[18] Dr. WALKER (Australia) stated that, in the view of his delegation, they should press on and try to reach a decision at once, because it was unlikely that the Administrative Commission could produce any different ideas if the matter were referred back to it. Besides, the whole work of the Conference would be paralysed if the size of the budget were not determined at the earliest possible moment.

[19] Those delegates who had referred to the danger of reducing the 1951 Budget, as compared to that of 1950, were under a misunderstanding. It was unlikely that the maximum income of $7,500,000 estimated by the Administrative Commission for 1950 would be exceeded; but it was also unlikely, in view of the assurances received by the Executive Board from the Director-General, that the budget of the current Financial Year would reach $7,500,000.

[20] The opinion of the Australian delegation was that the time had come when the budgets of the various Specialized Agencies of the United Nations should be stabilized. This was not to place a limit on their work. Indeed, they knew that the Technical Assistance Programme would call for a supreme effort from them during the next years; but, more than anything else, it should establish Unesco as a force at the present time. Therefore, if they pressed for a stabilization of the budget, it did not mean that it could not be expanded. However, his instructions would not permit him to vote for a budget in excess of $8,000,000. They believed that Unesco could nevertheless continue to flourish and develop, provided Member States themselves shouldered some of the responsibilities and undertook Unesco's activities wherever possible, and provided that they concentrated their programmes. The 1951 Programme should be centred on three major problems, apart from the established routine: fundamental education, technical aid and education in relation to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Australian delegation could neither support programmes involving extra expenditure, nor make snap decisions during a Conference, since they had no time to consult their Governments adequately on the new proposals.

Dr. Walker therefore proposed adopting the budget of $8,000,000 for 1951, including a reserve for the non-payment of contributions.

[21] The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Chairman of the Administrative Commission would no doubt be happy to answer the criticism levelled at his Commission's report. He therefore proposed inviting him to attend the meeting. *Agreed.*

[22] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to give additional information on several points raised by the Australian delegate.

The budget of $8,000,000 was not a stabilized budget. It was impossible to conceive of a stabilized budget, considering that, in 1951, $300,000 would have to be devoted to the increase in the salaries of the personnel and would therefore be deducted from the funds set aside for the activities of the programme departments.

In February 1950, the Director-General had promised to slow down the execution of the 1950 programme while awaiting a decision by the Florence Conference with regard to the covering of the deficit. But that slowing down had been particularly disastrous for the Secretariat, as it had mainly concerned the programme departments (frequent changes in the structure of the administrative bureaux would be impossible).

[23] The Director-General therefore asked the Conference to grant him for 1951 a *real* budget, in keeping with a *real* programme.

He also stated that the concentration of the Programme asked of Unesco would not be possible without a suitable budget. If Unesco had to devote itself exclusively to two, three or four activities, it would be impossible to devote to them the same budget as in the case of a balanced programme. It was altogether too simple a solution to reduce the field of work at the same time as the budget.

The tragic facts of life were more important than budgetary realities. If Unesco did not keep its promises, it would not be taken seriously and the world would never believe that it found such great difficulties in obtaining funds in the present circumstances, with its 59 Member States.

[24] The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Chairman of the Administrative Commission and explained that the problem was whether the Commission should accept the report of the Administrative Commission or whether it should ask it to make further efforts in the sense indicated by several delegates and particularly by the Swiss and French delegates.

[25] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) considered that the question should not be raised in the form of the acceptance or sending back of the report. They should merely ask for additional information before examining the total budget figure, in order to know, for instance, whether they could not envisage specific administrative changes, or some other solution.

[26] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that the report of the Administrative Commission corresponded with the facts at the disposal of the Commission when it examined the question. He thought that the meeting had to accept the report, but should not draw any immediate conclusions from it, for, taking into account actual facts, the Governments might be willing to extend the instructions they had given to their delegates.

The Brazilian delegate therefore proposed that, after accepting the report, the Commission should adjourn any discussion on the total figure of the budget until other solutions had been considered.

[27] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) said his delegation did not agree with the Brazilian proposal, but thought that Dr. Walker had expressed the correct point of view. They therefore proposed that the Report of the Administrative Commission should be adopted: he thought no useful purpose could be served by sending it back to that Commission, which would merely amount to a shelving of responsibility.

[28] Dr. WALKER (Australia) raised a question of procedure as to whether the Programme and Budget Commission had any right to accept, adopt, reject or refer back that report to the Administrative Commission.

[29] Professor CALÒ (Italy) paid tribute to the work done by the Administrative Commission, but he agreed with Professor Piaget that it should be asked for further information to guide the Programme and Budget Commission in its future work. He also thought that the budget ceiling could not be stabilized and that Unesco would make a very unfavourable impression on the world if it cut down on its activities. An effort should be made to make their resources cover the carrying out of their task, since, as the Swiss delegation had pointed out, the sums paid to Unesco represented a trifling contribution by each citizen.

[30] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) thought the Commission should be in no doubt about the intentions of the Executive Board in presenting the programme. Delegates

were well aware that, in the past, contributions had not come in to the extent that Unesco was entitled to expect, and they had therefore made certain proposals. He asked the Chairman of the Administrative Commission how much money the Conference should ask its Member States to contribute in 1951, in order that the full programme of the Board might be carried out. He suspected, from the wording of the Administrative Commission's Report, that there were about a half to one million dollars which, in its opinion, should not be spent before the money had come in. That thought had also been in the mind of the Executive Board. If, for example, a request for $8,800,000 in 1951 would justify a total expenditure of $8,200,000, it would be known that, in order to carry out the programme of the Executive Board, Member States would have to be asked to provide an additional contribution in proportion to that difference.

[31] Dr. CHAND (Chairman of the Administrative Commission) explained that, after most serious consideration of the situation, his Commission had decided to present its Report in two parts. As regarded the situation in 1950, it had noted the Executive Board's resolution that activities should be slowed down. At the Paris Conference in 1949, the ceiling had been set at $8,000,000; but, in view of the circumstances, it had decided to recommend a ceiling of $7,500,000, unless anything happened which would justify a revision.

[32] As regarded 1951, it was for the Programme and Budget Commission to suggest the ceiling. However, knowing the history of Unesco in 1947, 1948 and 1949, they had thought they might indicate that whatever ceiling was set by the Commission was unlikely to be reached by the contributions. It was the experience of the last three years which had induced them to propose the division of the Programme into two parts, one which could certainly be carried out, and another which might be implemented if the Executive Board found that more money was available than expected.

[33] During 1950, the Executive Board and the Director-General had, on their own initiative, slowed down work covered by the budget. The Administrative Commission suggested that it was the duty of the Programme and Budget Commission to give guidance in this matter to the General Conference and the Director-General.

[34] As to Sir John Maud's question, he thought it was not the business of the Administrative Commission to suggest a figure, but a task for the Programme and Budget Commission. Judging from the past, Dr. Chand estimated that about 10 per cent of the assessed contributions might be taken as unlikely to be realized.

[35] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) considered that the Commission did not have to take a decision on the report of the Administrative Commission, as the report had been communicated to it for information; but it was entitled to ask for additional information.

The document in fact consisted of two parts. The first part raised the problem objectively and showed that the real budget estimates must be reduced to $7,500,000. The second part indicated a positive solution, namely the dividing of the projects into two groups. The Programme and Budget Commission was entitled to refuse that suggestion, but it was also entitled to help the Administrative Commission by asking it to make other suggestions in order to reach a result, namely the obtaining of $8,205,000 in spite of the failure of certain States to pay their contributions.

In his opinion, the proposals of the Swiss and Brazilian delegates were not contradictory. In both cases good will was to be appealed to in order to realize a programme which the Executive Board had considered to be a practicable one.

The suggestion of the French delegate was seconded by the delegations of BRAZIL, ITALY, YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, ECUADOR, EGYPT, SWITZERLAND, URUGUAY and LIBERIA.

[36] Dr. CHAND (Chairman of the Administrative Commission) explained that his Commission was then examining the question of salaries and allowances, and that it might be possible to indicate some economies on those. Further, if all the steps it suggested were taken, it was thought that the deficit would be in the neighbourhood of 7-7.5 per cent, instead of 10 per cent. This deficit could easily be met if Member States would raise their contributions and would be prepared to shoulder a larger responsibility than in the past.

Replying to Professor PIAGET (Switzerland), he suggested that, if the Programme and Budget Commission wanted to adopt the $8,200,000 budget, they should assess for $8,800,000.

[37] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) was afraid that, if the 10 per cent deficit were taken into account in calculating the contributions which should be made, Member States might refrain from paying this additional amount. His delegation felt very strongly that Unesco should not accept a programme for which no funds were available; otherwise an injustice would be done to those

States which had regularly paid their contributions in full.

[38] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) understood that the Administrative Commission had assumed that certain arrears in cash payments would never be received; he repeated that the two figures of $7,500,000 and $8,200,000 must be taken into consideration, and that his delegation could not exceed the higher ceiling. It was the business of the Conference to decide what proportion of this figure should be represented by the recommendations of the Executive Board, and what proportion by the new resolutions submitted by delegations. His delegation supported the proposal of the Chairman of the Executive Board that these two figures should be accepted and the Programme divided as proposed by the Administrative Commission, in its report contained in document 5C/ADM/18.

[39] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) did not think that an immediate answer could be given to that question, which would have to be examined in greater detail.

[40] The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission was faced with three proposals:

(1) That of the Swiss delegation asking for additional information;

(2) That of the Brazilian delegation asking for the adjournment of the discussion concerning the total budget figure—in that sense, the proposal resembled that of the Swiss delegation;

(3) That of Iraq, which supported the Swiss proposal and also asked for the establishment of a sub-committee to re-assess the 1951 Programme in the light of the data given by the Administrative Commission.

[41] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) said that he was particularly anxious to have additional information concerning the possibility of carrying out the Programme provided for by the Executive Board with a *real* budget of $8,205,000. That was why he made a formal proposal.

The French delegate's proposal was *adopted* by 20 votes to 15.

Discussion of the 1951 Programme [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

1. Education.

SECTION 1.11 (EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS).

Items 1.111 and 1.112.

[42] On the proposal of Professor VERNIERS (Belgium), seconded by the delegates of SWEDEN, BURMA, BRAZIL, FRANCE and AFGHANISTAN, items 1.111 - 1.112 were *adopted.*[1]

SECTION 1.12 (DOCUMENTATION - GENERAL ENQUIRIES).

New item.

[43] Introducing the first point of document 5C/66, which he wanted inserted at the beginning of section 1.12, Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) pointed out that there had been a substantial increase during the past Financial Year and in the new Budget Estimates over the expenditure on Clearing-house activities in 1949. Such activities should have a definite place within the Programme of Unesco. At the Paris Conference in 1949, his delegation had offered substantially the same resolution, and it had then been adopted; but it was omitted in the draft Programme for 1951.

The United States draft resolution was seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, CANADA and PAKISTAN.

[44] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Secretariat was very pleased with the resolution, which closely approached what they were attempting to do. In fact, very few activities of the Clearing-house were not related to the 1951 Programme. The Secretariat received a large number of general enquiries, there had been sixty in April, and they hoped to undertake studies later in the year which would reveal different aspects of the educational system. The most important aspect of their work was in servicing the different departments of Unesco.

[45] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), having received the assurance that the resolution has no budgetary implications, also seconded it.

The draft resolution [document 5C/66, paragraph I] was *adopted.*[2]

[46] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) wondered whether the projects evoked by items 1.121, 1.122 and 1.123 did not correspond to work already being done by the International Bureau of Education, as that might give rise to overlapping.

Mr. ROSSELLO (International Bureau of Education) thought he could reassure the Afghan delegate on that point. The study of languages with a view to international understanding was an essential item in Unesco's programme. As to the enquiries provided for by item 1.122, they represented from IBT'S point of view, work done for the benefit of Unesco.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.111 and 1.1111.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.121.

Item 1.121.

[47] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) thought that the time allowed was too short, and therefore proposed deleting the words "to be completed in the course of the year".

[48] In that case, Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) suggested that the words "on the subject" should be inserted after the words "a report". He hoped that the results of the proposed inquiry would be published before the opening of the seminar devoted to that question.

Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought it might embarrass the Department of Education to ask for a report, and he therefore suggested asking the Director-General "to report on this matter".

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) entirely agreed to that proposal.

Mr. JAUME (France) thought that it would be a blunder to delete the words "to be completed in the course of the year", for Unesco might then incur the reproach of extending its projects in time; he proposed that those words should be replaced by the words "if possible in the course of 1951".

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) preferred the Australian proposal.

The United Kingdom amendment, modified by the Australian delegation, was *adopted* by 11 votes to 5.[1]

Item 1.123.

[49] Mr. BRANCA (Italy) thought that the words "including non-governmental teachers" should be added at the end of the text.

[50] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) said that item 1.123 was one which his delegation felt should be deleted altogether. It had no intention of calling into question the manner of carrying out this project. Indeed, it had great respect for the International Bureau of Education, and, in the United States, many activities were being carried out which might be called improvements in educational practices. Nevertheless, item 1.123 did not seem to contribute as directly as most of the other items in the programme to Unesco's major objectives. He thought it was a low-priority resolution, which could well be omitted, and he hoped this would be taken as an example of how to achieve a better concentration of the Unesco Programme.

[51] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) did not agree with the United States delegate. He thought that education could be improved only if teachers were satisfied with their lot, were well paid and had a social status worthy of their functions. If Unesco abandoned the project for a teacher's charter it risked alienating teachers even more than in the past.

[52] In answer to Dr. Zook, Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) emphasized that an essential item of Unesco's Programme was fundamental education, for which the recruiting of personnel was very difficult. If they wanted to do useful work in that field, they must be able to recruit teachers equal to their task and to ensure for them a proper standard of living.

[53] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) agreed with Dr. Zook that the Programme should contain no low-priority items if this could be avoided. Before agreeing to the deletion of this item, however, he wished to put three questions to the Director of the Department of Education. Firstly, had work on this programme already started? Secondly, did it involve much of Unesco's own resources, or was it mainly carried out by IBE? Thirdly, and most important, could it be completed in 1950?

[54] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that a start had already been made and some material collected. He doubted whether the Programme could be satisfactorily concluded in 1950.

In answer to Mr. Weeden's second question, Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) said that it was a question of an annual grand-in-aid to IBE which covered not only precise enquiries, but IBE'S participation in the preparation of a joint conference.

Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) understood this reply to mean that Unesco staff was not involved in the activities concerned.

[55] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) also asked that item 1.123 should be maintained, as, in his opinion, it had no important budgetary implications. He, too, thought that the recruiting of teachers depended on their living conditions. He pointed out that the documentation envisaged would give rise to an exchange of information enabling teachers in each country to know what was happening abroad.

Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) said that his delegation also would oppose the deletion of item 1.123. The sum involved was small and, in due course, his Government would need highly trained personnel to deal with the various tasks in question.

[56] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) agreed that the sum involved was not large. Nevertheless, the principle involved seemed an

1. In final form: Resol. 1.122.

important one, namely, that items, the execution of which was only of secondary importance to Unesco's objectives, should be deleted. It would be more appropriate to include a project on those lines in the fundamental education programme, rather than to leave it in its present position. It was the type of work which should be undertaken primarily by the National Commissions and other authorities within each country.

[57] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) emphasized that the International Bureau of Education was hardly in a position to go beyond the field of official education and that a large part of private education lay outside its field. He therefore asked for the rejection of the United States proposal.

That request was seconded by the delegations of BURMA, SWEDEN and LIBERIA.

The United States proposal was *rejected* by 15 votes to 8.

[58] Professor BRANCA (Italy) pointed out that the draft amendment which he had proposed, far from being intended as a criticism against private education, was simply aimed at obtaining information about the living conditions of teachers. Such information could be of great help in encouraging movements in favour of a codification of the position of non-governmental teachers on the economic as well as on the juridical planes.

[59] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) quite understood the intentions underlying the Italian proposal, but thought it would be wiser not to add it to the programme in 1950. In the first place, IBE was not equipped to undertake a detailed enquiry in non-governmental schools and, secondly, if the Secretariat were instructed to do this, it would mean too much work and there would be budgetary implications.

Professor BRANCA (Italy) having withdrawn his draft amendment, item 1.123 was *adopted* as it stood.[1]

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.124.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Speeding up Procedure.

[1] The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the considerable volume of work still outstanding: 222 resolutions, 14 special reports, about 100 amendments. It would therefore be necessary to arrange two supplementary meetings for Saturday, 10 June, two others for Tuesday, 13 June, and three night meetings on the 7, 13 and 14 June. Even this would not suffice, however, unless an accelerated procedure were adopted immediately. In this connexion, the Chairman made a number of proposals which were *adopted*.

Discussion of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

1. Education (*continued*).

SECTION 1.12 (*continued*).

Item 1.122.

[2] In presenting his delegation's amendment [document 5C/95], Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) suggested that the word "experimental" should be deleted.

His study of the answers to the enquiry initiated in 1949 had led him to insert in parentheses "observational, experimental and evolutionary", because he had noted that for many people the word "science" indicated experimental science only. The teaching of natural science on historical and evolutionary bases had been little studied.

If the amendment appeared to be too long, he would be willing to see the first and last parts deleted, retaining only the following words:

To undertake, in collaboration with the International Bureau of Education, enquiries into the teaching of natural science (observational, experimental and evolutionary) and the development of the scientific attitude in primary and secondary schools.

[3] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) was sure that the improvement of science teaching was highly desirable. He nevertheless considered that item 1.122 concerned the improvement of educational processes, which was only slightly relevant to the Unesco Programme. The subject

would be better left to national delegations and National Commissions. He therefore moved the deletion of item 1.122, together with the United Kingdom amendment.

[4] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) informed the meeting that, in the opinion of the Board, there should be no specification of detail. The Board would welcome the deletion of the last two lines of the United Kingdom amendment. He felt that the proposed insertion in parentheses was unnecessary.

[5] Professor CALÒ (Italy) feared that the particulars mentioned in the British amendment might give the impression that Unesco was taking a stand for or against a given attitude—in the problem of evolution, for example. Such an impression would be unfortunate. He therefore thought the present wording of the resolution should be maintained, since it was conceived in more general terms.

[6] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) considered that the adoption of the United States proposal would interrupt a number of enquiries into the teaching of the natural sciences, which were part of a programme now being carried out. It was desirable that, in collaboration with IBE, Unesco should make a comparative study of the various methods of teaching in the sphere of the natural sciences. He therefore proposed the retention of item 1.122.

The proposal of the United States of America to delete item 1.122 was seconded by the delegates of BURMA and LIBERIA, and *rejected* by 23 votes to 5.

The British amendment, seconded by the delegate of AUSTRIA, was *rejected* by 13 votes to 5.

Item 1.122 was therefore *adopted* without amendment.[1]

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) deplored the abandonment of an enquiry in progress.

BUDGET TABLE III.1.B (1) [document 5C/5 (II), page 80].

[7] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) understood that, whether or not an expenditure ceiling had been fixed, the report by the Budget Committee was an interim document. The Committee had made general comments, but had not given its views on any particular projects.

The CHAIRMAN replied that that interpretation was correct.

Budget table III.1.B (1) was *adopted.*

SECTION 1.13 (SPECIAL RESEARCH AND STUDIES).

Item 1.131.

[8] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom), referring to page 87 of document 5C/5 (II), enquired how much of the sum to be granted to the International Bureau of Education was to be devoted to the Conference on Public Education.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) informed her that the proposed contribution to the Conference was $1,000. A contribution would also be made to the cost of publication of reports.

Item 1.131 was *adopted* without change.[2]

Item 1.132.

[9] Professor CALÒ (Italy) thought that items 4.211 and 4.212, appearing at present under the chapter on Cultural Activities, should be inserted after resolution 1.132.

The CHAIRMAN replied that this suggestion would be considered when the Commission came to study the items in question.

[10] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) suggested that it was not necessary for IBE to give information in that connexion. She therefore moved the deletion of the words "and to invite the International Bureau of Education to continue the general enquiry into the position in this matter".

[11] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) pointed out that the original text merely invited the International Bureau of Education to continue the general enquiry into the present position with regard to the *ways of applying the principle of free compulsory education.* Consequently, the adoption of this whole text would in no way prejudice the publication of monographs which Unesco (and not IBE) had intended to publish.

[12] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) explained that the resolution dealt with two subjects: the publication of monographs, and the general enquiry. In her opinion, the latter could be more successfully conducted by the Member States themselves. She therefore maintained her motion.

[13] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that Unesco would publish monographs in collaboration with National Commissions and Member States and, secondly, that the International Bureau of Education would continue to bring up to date the work on which it had been engaged since 1935.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.123.

2. In final form: Resol. 1.131.

[14] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) thought the original text should be maintained, since the International Bureau of Education had been entrusted with a general enquiry which was already being carried out and which there was no reason to interrupt.

The British amendment, seconded by the delegate of AUSTRALIA, was *rejected* by 20 votes to 5.

Item 1.132 was therefore *adopted* without amendment.[1]

Item 1.133.

[15] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) thought that it should be specifically stated that the Director-General was authorized "to prepare, jointly with the International Bureau of Education *and the international women's organizations*, a meeting of the Conference on Public Education, etc. . ."

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was quite willing to accept that insertion.

[16] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) recalled that, in September 1951, Mills College for Women was to hold centenary celebrations. The authorities of the College had asked his delegation to bring that to the notice of Unesco and ask for its co-operation in the convening of a conference on its premises. He explained that it was not its intention to propose that a sum of money should be voted for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Secretariat would take note of the point raised by Dr. Zook.

[17] Professor CALÒ (Italy) seconded the Belgian proposal. He wished, for his part, to draw attention to the fact that, at the beginning of that resolution ("to pursue the study of the problem of the access of women to education . . ."), it would be useful to define the term "education" by adding "at all levels".

[18] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wondered whether that addition might not weaken the application of the resolution, since, in practice, the question at issue in most of the Member States was women's access to *fundamental education*. The general formula should meet the wishes of the Italian delegate.

[19] Professor CALÒ (Italy) replied that the formula he had suggested would have the advantage of implying that the proposed measures would be applied to the extent that the various countries could put them into effect. However, he noted the explanations given by the Director-General and withdrew his amendment.

The Belgian amendment, seconded by the delegate of BRAZIL, was *adopted*.

Item 1.133, thus amended, was *adopted*.[1]

New Item.

[20] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a proposal by the United Kingdom delegation [document 5C/94] for the re-insertion of an item which had appeared in the draft Programme for 1951 submitted to the Executive Board at its Nineteenth Session; the item was as follows:

To make available for Member States information on the subject of school building in order to facilitate the construction or reconstruction of large numbers of schools.

[21] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) stated that her delegation deplored the disappearance of a resolution which was capable of producing results and would, at the same time, be inexpensive. Many governments were in a position to give valuable assistance to others as regarded the construction or reconstruction of school buildings.

[22] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that, in view of the additional expense involved—the Secretariat had suggested a figure of $8,000—the Board had not thought it advisable to accept the additional resolution. However, he hoped that Member States would use the Clearing-house for that purpose.

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) withdrew her amendment in the hope that the matter would be reconsidered the following year.

Item 1.134.

[23] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) warned the meeting of the difficult nature of the question. She doubted the possibility of reaching any equivalence between university degrees. Bilateral arrangements were the only methods which might succeed.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought that it was perhaps ambitious to claim to "solve, so far as possible, the problem of the equivalence of university degrees", at least in the Programme for 1951. He therefore suggested that the end of the resolution should be amended as follows: ". . . to *undertake a study* of the problem of equivalence. . ."

The CHAIRMAN proposed the formula: ". . . in order to carry forward the study of the problem of equivalence . . . " and Mr. ABRAHAM (France) agreed.

Item 1.134, thus amended, was *adopted*.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 1.132.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.133.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.134.

New item 1.136.

[24] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to an Italian draft amendment [document 5C/30], proposing the adoption of a new 1.136.

[25] Professor CALÒ (Italy) stated that the draft resolution was based on the work of Professor Licocchi, Director of the Pediatric Clinic in Florence. The school should play an important part in the education of will-power and the formation of character; but very often school curricula were so overloaded that they had unfavourable repercussions both on the child's physical development and on the development of his personality. It was time to react against this and to ensure normal equilibrium in the development of children during their early period of growth as well as during puberty.

It might perhaps be preferable to replace "the physical qualities in children" by "the physical condition of children".

[26] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained with regret that the Board found it impossible to advise the Programme and Budget Commission to adopt the resolution, owing to the increased expenditure which such research would involve. The Board was of the opinion that such an undertaking would overload the 1951 Programme. The project might be incorporated in the programme of a subsequent year.

[27] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that the draft resolution contained an extremely important idea, but one whose budgetary implications would, owing to its very importance, exceed Unesco's present capacities. In these conditions, and since the essential need was to provide the Secretariat with a precise working basis, he asked whether the Italian delegate would agree to the following text: "Member States are invited to undertake research. . ."

[28] Professor CALÒ (Italy) accepted that suggestion; the essential thing was that the problem should be put forward for consideration. However, it should be stated that such research must be undertaken in order that Unesco might draw the necessary conclusions and publish them.

The Italian amendment, thus amended and seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, BRAZIL, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, FRANCE, NETHERLANDS, URUGUAY, VENEZUELA and LIBERIA was *adopted*.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 1.136.

SECTION 1.14 (CIRCULATION OF INFORMATION).

Item 1.141.

[29] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) hoped that the *Bulletin*, in its new form, would include much information on adult education. He also hoped that the integrated work of the Secretariat, to which reference was made on page 95 of the Budget Estimates, would produce sufficient information on adult education for it to be possible, at some future date, to produce two separate Bulletins, one on fundamental education and the other on adult education.

Item 1.141 was *adopted*, as it stood.[1]

Item 1.142.

[30] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America), referring to the close connexion between resolutions 1.142 and 1.361, presented a draft amendment [document 5C/66] which was intended to combine the two and carried no budgetary implications.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed, but wondered whether it would not be better to insert that resolution instead of item 1.361.

Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) accepted the suggestion.

It was *agreed* to defer consideration of this question until the discussion of item 1.361, when the Commission would also discuss the draft resolution presented by the French delegation [document 5C/62].

Item 1.143.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

SECTION 1.15 (PREPARATION AND EXCHANGE OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL).

Item 1.151.

[31] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) suggested that, there being three different matters involved, the resolution should be sub-divided into three distinct parts.

She further suggested the deletion of the word "monthly", in order that the Director-General might thus enjoy greater freedom in the preparation of the documentation in question.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL having given his assent, the above proposals were *adopted* and item 1.151 was referred to the Drafting Committee for final drafting.[3]

1. In final form: Resol. 1.141.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.142.
3. In final form: Resol. 1.151 to 1.153.

NEW SECTION (HUMANISTIC STUDIES).

[32] Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela), presenting his delegation's draft resolution [document 5C/76], said that the roots of the crisis prevailing were probably to be found in the abandonment of methods and measures of general cultural training. Some countries placed too much emphasis on intellectual education. Humanistic studies—by which he meant the study not only of Greek and Latin classics but also of the classics of all languages—should take a large place in general training and could contribute much to its equilibrium.

[33] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) sympathized with the intention of Dr. Arvelo Torrealba, but could not advise the Commission to include the matter in the Annual Programme because it might be difficult to avoid an extension of the practice in future. He therefore hoped that Mr. Arvelo Torrealba would not press for its inclusion.

Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) recognized the difficulty but wondered whether the resolution might not be included in the Basic Programme.

The CHAIRMAN realized the value of the Venezuelan draft resolution. For this very reason, however, he thought it should appear in the Preamble.

Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) accepted that solution.

It was *agreed* to pass draft resolution 5C/76 to the Rapporteur for insertion in the Preamble.

BUDGET TABLE III.1.B (2) [document 5C/5 (II), pages 84 and 85].

Adopted without discussion.

1.2 Extension of Education.

SECTION 1.21 (FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND ADULT EDUCATION).

[34] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution 1.21 in document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum.

[35] Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) seconded the draft resolution. The study of regional conditions over a three-year period would much facilitate fundamental education. He did not wish to try to raise the illiterate masses to a level beyond their reach. He was suggesting a more modest and practical plan, through which Unesco would be able to give its Member States much help as regards methods of child education.

The draft resolution was *adopted*.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 1.2111, 1.21111, 1.21112, 1.21114.

[36] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) thought that it was also important to draw the attention of Member States to the need for introducing into their curricula the study of folklore, which provided a basis for strengthening both regional ties and international understanding.

[37] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was of the same opinion. It might be added in the text of draft resolution 1.21 (which was an invitation to Member States) that national folk-lore should be taken into account in research and experiments.

Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) accepted this proposal, which was *adopted*.[1]

Item 1.211.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

SECTION 1.212 (TECHNICAL AID TO FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND ADULT EDUCATION UNDERTAKINGS).

Item 1.2121.

[38] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) presented his delegation's draft resolution [document 5C/86]. In view of the danger that might lie in programmes prepared in advance along preconceived lines, and in view also of the short period allowed, the experts should concern themselves chiefly with training national personnel.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) agreed in principle.

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the principle there was so important and its general application so obviously necessary, that there seemed to be little point in mentioning it specifically in every resolution. However, he recognized the particular interest of training national personnel. In that connexion, the best formula would probably be to specify that Member States were invited to take advantage of the presence of Unesco experts to plan with them the training of national personnel.

Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) accepted that proposal.

Item 1.2121, thus amended, was *adopted*.[3]

Items 1.2122 and 1.2123.

Adopted without discussion.[4]

Item 1.2124.

[40] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to two documents relating to this item. The first

1. In final form: Resol. 1.21113.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.2112.
3. In final form: Resol. 1.2121 and 1.21211.
4. In final form: Resol. 1.2122 and 1.2123.

[document 5C/PRG/18] explained the setting up of a regional Training and Production Centre in Latin America. The second [document 5C/PRG/18, Annex I] set out the relevant draft agreement between Unesco and the Mexican Government.

[41] In this connexion, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the text of resolution 1.2124 went somewhat beyond the facts in speaking of agreements concluded with the Government of Mexico and the Organization of American States. Those agreements had not yet been signed, although the Mexican delegate's reply was expected in the very near future.

Item 1.2124 was *adopted* without change.[1]

SECTION 1.213 (INDIRECT AID).

[42] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution 1.213 contained in document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Professor CALÒ (Italy) felt that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation on the education of the blind [document 5C/31] should be inserted at the beginning of section 1.213.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Italian proposal would be discussed after item 1.2151.

Item 1.2131.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item 1.2132.

[43] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) enquired whether other countries had the same difficulty as the United Kingdom in finding suitable experts for seminars lasting six weeks. It would be much easier to provide experts for shorter seminars. He suggested that the Director-General should make enquiries among Member States and National Commissions on the subject.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that the question of the duration of seminars was important. He asked the Commission to revert to this question when discussing the general problem of seminars.

Item 1.2132 was *adopted* as it stood.[4]

Item 1.2133.

[44] The CHAIRMAN read out a note from the observer of the International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL had had occasion to be present at the first meetings of the seminar in 1950. He had hoped to find more members of workers' associations among the delegates. Unfortunately, that had not been the case. Thus, not all the resolutions taken at Beirut had been carried out by Member States. That failure was unfortunate, and the criticism of Unesco voiced at the seminar in Paris seemed to be justified, if the General Conference's recommendations were to be treated only as pious hopes. The Director-General therefore wished to associate himself with the observer of the International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations, and to express the hope that Unesco would effectively and genuinely strengthen contacts with the members of workers' associations. There were great opportunities in labour circles, which should be seized by sending urgent invitations in that sense to Member States.

[45] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) warmly supported that proposal. He submitted a draft recommendation to the effect that Member States should be invited to associate representatives of workers' associations with the work of their National Commissions.

Mrs. ROSS (Denmark) proposed also that Member States should be asked to include representatives of workers' organizations in their delegations to the General Conference.

The proposals made by Professor Verniers and Mrs. Ross were *adopted* and referred for final drafting to the Drafting Committee.

Item 1.2133 was *adopted* without change.[1]

SECTION 1.214 (WORK WITH UNIVERSITIES).

Item 1.2141.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item 1.2142.

[46] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought that the whole section should be entitled "Collaboration with universities and other institutes specialized in the extension of education". Similarly, it should be specified in item 1.2142 that the object was "to prepare a list of universities and *other institutions* which collaborate in adult education campaigns. . ."

[47] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL admitted that the proposal was logical. Unfortunately, budgetary considerations militated against such an activity. It would be impossible to prepare a list of the universities and all the competent institutions

1. In final form: Resol. 1.2124.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.2131.
3. In final form: Resol. 1.2132 (first part).
4. In final form: Resol. 1.2132 (second part).

1. In final form: Resol. 1.2133.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.2141.

tions without increasing the personnel engaged on that work.

In any event, the Director-General assured the delegate of France that, if the Secretariat were in a position to amplify the list, it would do so. He hoped that Mr. Abraham would be satisfied with that assurance, thus avoiding the necessity of adopting a resolution that could not be carried out.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) entirely understood the budgetary considerations, and he proposed the following change in his amendment: "to prepare a list of universities *and, if the need arises, of other institutions* which collaborate etc. . ."
Adopted.

[48] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) thought that the universities themselves could be entrusted with the preparation of monographs which were factual and not matters of opinion. She therefore suggested that the second half of item 1.2142 should be amended to read: "ask Member States to provide for the drafting of monographs by universities in order to provide guidance and encouragement".

[49] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that experience had shown that recommendations were generally executed very slowly. If definite action were required, it would therefore be necessary to have funds available for the engagement of specialists to prepare the studies and monographs required by Unesco.

[50] As Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) wished to maintain her draft amendment, the CHAIRMAN stated that, as any recommendation directed to Member States required special consideration, the matter would be *deferred.*

SECTION 1.215 (CO-ORDINATION OF THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES).

Item 1.2151.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.2151.

TWELFTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Discussion of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

1. Education (*continued*).

SECTION 1.214 (*continued*) (WORK WITH UNIVERSITIES).

[1] Returning to item 1.2141, Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) raised the question of Unesco's activities in the field of fundamental and adult education, with particular reference to his own country, where there were fourteen different clans, each speaking its own dialect.

His Government was spending large sums on the encouragement of university research into the question, and the project should be of great interest to Unesco. But he found, in fact, that his colleagues on the Commission preferred to deal only with universities of the European and American type. The West African colleges were not universities in the sense of the term accepted in Europe and North America, but they were doing as much and could provide very interesting results in the linguistic and psychological field of fundamental and adult education in multi-lingual countries.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) expressed the strong sympathy of the Secretariat with the point of view of the delegate of Liberia. He hoped that in 1951 his Department would be able to send a representative to Liberia to assist them in the collaboration for which they had asked.

BUDGET TABLE III.1.C. (1) [document 5C/5 (II), page 91].

Adopted without discussion.

SECTION 1.22 (EDUCATION FOR MALADJUSTED CHILDREN).

Draft resolution presented by the United States delegation [document 5C/57].

[2] Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) explained that her delegation was proposing that the Director-General should be authorized to employ a programme specialist with limited travel allowance and essential clerical assistance to initiate a programme of early childhood education, designed to concentrate the attention of Member States on the social growth and development of young children.

Steps should be taken in 1951 to prepare the ground for a conference, to be held possibly in 1953, to consider all aspects of the social training of young children. In the meantime, the Unesco specialist should confer with Member States, the United Nations and Specialized Agencies on the programme for such a conference; confer with, and if necessary assist, Member States in organizing their resources for concentrated study of the problems involved; and assist Member States in sharing their knowledge and experience in that field.

[3] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board had thought this was a proposal which should be left to the consideration of the Programme and Budget Commission, since it involved a change in the Programme. It seemed that the United States proposal would involve an expenditure of some $13,000 as against the $45,000 involved in the resolutions of the Executive Board; if adopted, therefore, the proposal would entail a saving of $32,000.

[4] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) emphasized that the acceptance of the United States proposal would involve the discontinuance of a whole series of important activities (such as those relating to children's communities). Unesco had already embarked on work in connexion with early childhood education by encouraging the establishment of the World Organizations for Early Childhood Education, which had yielded valuable results in the United Kingdom, France and Belgium and had been responsible for the establishment of National Committees for Early Childhood Education. Results had been most encouraging and keen interest had been shown in that problem. Professor Verniers therefore considered it necessary to adhere to the text presented by the Executive Board and to reject the United States proposal.

[5] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) also urged the need for adopting the original text. The new resolution would mean the discarding of all in the programme relating to maladjusted children. The French delegation strongly advocated work in that field.

The delegate of France clarified the meaning of "maladjusted children": they were not merely children without any family and, accordingly, deprived of their normal place in society; they were also children who had been severed from their families on account of some social handicap (as in the case of children of unworthy parents incapable of educating their children), or they might be delinquent children who had had to be removed from their homes. Unesco should be primarily concerned with such children who were victims of wartime conditions, injustice, or social handicaps. The problem that had to be faced was that of devising measures to enable children to take their normal place in society, to give them a family education and to help them to learn a trade. Previous solutions (orphanages, reformatories) had rarely been satisfactory, and in many other cases children had been left to their own devices. The war had demonstrated the need for definite action on behalf of maladjusted children—a need of which educationists had been growing increasingly aware over the past few years. Unesco had not initiated the movement, which it merely encouraged; but in that field its duty was to act as the "conscience" of the various countries. It was thanks to the efforts of Unesco and the National Commission that the movement had been spreading in France over the past eighteen months.

Regarded as a duty to mankind, such a problem was something infinitely more important and difficult than the teaching of such subjects as natural sciences. It was Unesco's duty to encourage all who were working for maladjusted children—most of the workers in this field had a wonderful faith in their work and were devoting to it all their time and energy.

[6] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) said she would like to emphasize one phrase in particular in the speech of the French delegate, namely his reference to this problem as being something "infinitely more difficult" than the teaching of natural science. She wondered whether Unesco was as yet really equipped to deal with the problems of the pre-school child. She felt the urgency of this problem as greatly as the other speakers, but would prefer to think that preliminary work would be undertaken by a body which already existed for the purpose, such as the World Organization for Early Childhood Education, which had been set up in concurrence with Unesco three years ago and which included specialists in this field. It would be better to ask them to prepare the ground, so that the question

could be included in the Programme for the following year, when a person competent to co-ordinate this work had been found in the ranks of the Secretariat.

[7] Mr. MONTUS (World Health Organization) stated that WHO attached great importance to the education of maladjusted children, and the improvement of the mental well-being of children. At the last Conference of WHO, its Director-General had been authorized to collaborate with the Specialized Agencies in all matters affecting maladjusted children, and especially the mental well-being of children. In particular, collaboration had been established with the World Organization for Early Childhood Education and the World Federation for Mental Health. WHO was accordingly prepared to co-operate with Unesco in those fields.

[8] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) was inclined to think that the Commission was confusing two entirely different problems: early childhood education and maladjusted children. The first ranked as one of the general problems of education and should not be considered simultaneously with the second.

The Chairman did not think there was any confusion, since the resolution contained in document 5C/57 was concerned with "the healthy mental and social development of pre-school children".

The United States delegation's proposal was seconded by the delegation of CANADA.

[9] After re-reading the United States draft resolution and the series of resolutions which it might replace, Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) failed to see any contradiction between the two texts. The American proposal merely provided for a broader field of action and was intended to afford some kind of preventive mental hygiene for children. The French delegate therefore proposed the adoption of the American resolution and the retention of the text presented by the Executive Board.

Replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) said that, if it were possible to adopt the French proposal within the framework of the Unesco budget, her delegation had no objection to its insertion. She would abide by the decision of the Director-General.

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to make it clear that he considered the programme proposed for education and for the re-education of maladjusted children far too modest. He personally would have preferred a more effective programme with a more substantial budget, for Unesco merely grazed the surface of many problems without being able to carry out creative work in all fields. It was financial considerations which had induced the Executive Board to retain only a few pioneering activities.

If, as proposed by the French delegation, the United States proposal were adopted as well as those of the Executive Board, the budget would have to be increased, and an additional expenditure of $13,000 was to be anticipated.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) was certain that the Board would share the opinion of the Director-General. The French proposal, involving an increase of $13,000, would be one whose rejection the Board would have to advise.

Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) reminded the meeting that the Executive Board had already made a considerable reduction in the programme as originally proposed by the Secretariat, so that the Commission was faced with a residue of the Secretariat's proposals.

Professor CALÒ (Italy) joined with the Director-General in deprecating the fact that the reduction of the programme compelled Unesco to keep within too narow limits and to sacrifice certain important projects. He supported Mr. Sedar Senghor's views regarding the maintenance of the whole of section 1.22, as he thought that the problem of maladjusted children was of vital importance.

[11] Replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) said that her delegation did not wish to be arbitrary. Looking carefully at the resolutions before the Commission she wondered whether all of them in fact pertained to maladjusted children. Her delegation was only anxious that the Commission should consider carefully the problems of mental and social health, and concentrate on a constructive programme in that field. She therefore upheld her proposed amendment.

The United States draft resolution (document 5C/57) was *rejected* by 16 votes to 8.

Draft resolution presented by the Venezuelan delegation [document 5C/77].

[12] Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela) recognized that the problem of maladjusted children was great, but pointed out that that of the exceptionally talented child had hitherto received little attention, although such children had an even greater right to particular care and culture from the State, since they constituted society's greatest hope. Throughout history, all societies had shown concern for the future by the selection of the *élite*. The task presented was even more difficult than the education of normal or mal-

adjusted children, but the satisfaction to the teacher was all the greater. In the United States, special schools existed to cope with this problem in thirty States, and the results had proved most satisfactory. This was a problem which should be of primary interest to Unesco.

[13] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Board were greatly indebted to the delegation of Venezuela for having drawn attention to this problem. Unesco could not, however, tackle everything at once, and the Board had thought the problem of maladjusted children paramount. That of exceptionally gifted children would be considered in the future.

[14] Professor CALÒ (Italy) clearly recognized the social aim of that proposal and was not unaware of previous experiments.

But in the first place, for the sake of logic, he thought that the question of talented children should not be embodied in the chapter dealing with maladjusted children. Viewing the matter as an educationist, he thought that if talented children were to be educated separately, the consequences might be disastrous, both as regards the character of the children and the normal organization of the school. No useful purpose was served by educating highly gifted children separately and encouraging them to believe themselves geniuses, more especially as certain very precocious children often lapsed into mediocrity as they grew older. Children who could not keep up with the regular syllabus might be educated apart, but for the others it was avisable to encourage emulation and exchanges between children of varying ability.

[15] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic), supporting the Venezuelan proposal, said that in his country the State already gave prizes in the schools to particularly brilliant pupils and helped them to continue their education. Any help they could receive from Unesco to improve the system would be greatly appreciated.

The Venezuelan draft resolution (document 5C/77) was *rejected* by 22 votes to 9.

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/31].

[16] Professor CALÒ (Italy) stated that his delegation felt that the serious problem of educating the blind should be included in the section on maladjusted children. The Secretariat had already carried out intelligent, praiseworthy work in that direction, and, after a meeting of experts held at Unesco House, had published extensive documentation on the question of the standardization of Braille. The information supplied indicated both the desirability and the feasibility of introducing a standard Braille script.

Professor Calò asked that, when the promised Braille Committee was being established, a place on it should be offered to Italy, one of whose sons, Augusto Romagnoli, had been a pioneer in such work. Professor Calò hoped that his delegation's proposal could be incorporated, without entailing substantial budgetary repercussions.

He urged the need for taking the educational and cultural requirements of the blind into consideration. The books, newspapers and magazines published for them were extremely costly, and substantial savings could be effected by setting up a single publishing centre which would have Unesco's financial and moral support; it would issue the classics, textbooks, possibly medical treatises, maps, and technical papers on the various trades. Consideration should also be given to the establishment of an international exchange centre to enable all libraries for the blind to obtain essential publications. Lastly, there was the problem of training teachers for the blind; they should be able to pay visits to countries where some progress had been made with the education of the blind.

Any improvement in the treatment of the blind would mean a general improvement of society. It was Unesco's duty to assist the blind to lead normal lives.

[17] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that he entirely agreed with the Italian delegate in everything he had said about the blind. He thought the present Commission and the General Conference, which had had the privilege of hearing the valuable information given by the Head of the Egyptian delegation, should be the last to undervalue the importance of that work. The question, however, was what it was best to do in 1951. He drew the attention of the Commission to the concrete proposals of the Executive Board contained in document 5C/PRG/9, concerning progress to be made in Braille notation. These proposals, though modest, could be carried out in 1951, whereas the Italian proposal was infinitely more ambitious and would call for great expenditure.

He therefore hoped that the Italian delegate would not press for the adoption of his resolution in the 1951 Programme, but he assured him that it would be Unesco's goal for future years.

[18] Professor CALÒ (Italy) urged that the draft submitted by his delegation should be taken into consideration and approved by the Executive Board. As a less ambitious measure, he suggested that Unesco should continue in 1951 with the standardization of Braille and should investigate

the possibility of centralizing the publication of works for the blind.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, in that case, it would be possible to meet the wishes of the Italian delegation by drafting an addendum to document 5C/PRG/9 embodying his suggestions.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that even the adoption of that suggestion would have budgetary repercussions. Allowance would have to be made for the recruitment of at least one programme specialist with an annual salary of not less than $4,000.

The latest proposal of the Italian delegation, which was seconded by the delegation of IRAQ, was *rejected* by 11 votes to 6.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL hoped that the Commission's decision would apply only to the 1951 Programme. In his opinion, the Commission should recommend the consideration of that question by the Executive Board with a view to its inclusion in the 1952 Programme.

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/32].

[19] Professor CALÒ (Italy) explained that the draft resolution advocated substituting the ideas of social maladjusted and abnormal conduct for that of "juvenile criminality", and the replacement of the reformatory by an educational system for delinquent children. The draft was prompted by a state of affairs that had often been criticized by persons in authority and that called for serious consideration.

It was both harmful and distressing to refer to delinquent children as "criminals". In most cases, their abnormal conduct was the outcome of abnormal conditions, and the word "criminals" could not be used to denote persons not yet fully developed. It was also necessary to substitute a system of education for purely coercive methods. The speaker referred to the Ministry of Grace and Justice in Italy. That body had set up social service centres which carried out psychological research on abnormal children and took care of minors released by the law courts to be restored to their families. They sponsored the formation of groups of children who worked in various establishments and lived a family life under the supervision of a woman, generally in modest circumstances, who replaced their mother. It was an experiment that had yielded satisfactory results.

Italy also had a Federation of Children's Communities, comprising 24 communities, some of which brought together normal children to lead a home life, while others made themselves responsible for readjusting to society children of irregular conduct (criminal, abnormal or socially dangerous behaviour). Results obviously depended on the leader of the community and his assistants. Qualified staff had to be trained for such children's communities, and social services organized.

The first point in the resolution should not have any budgetary consequences, as it was merely a matter of requesting Member States to use different terminology and to reform their correctional methods.

The Italian delegation's proposal was supported by the delegation of VENEZUELA.

[20] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) expressed his sympathy with the proposal, whose urgency was not underestimated. He hoped, however, that the Italian delegate would not press this point either, but leave it for inclusion in a programme in later years, since other activities were even more urgent.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought it hardly possible to add anything to the programme for maladjusted children, which represented a substantial curtailment of the original programme. He also referred to recent recommendations that Unesco should compress its Programme; it was therefore impossible to admit additional items, even of such an essential nature.

The Italian delegation's proposal (document 5C/32) was *rejected* by 15 votes to 6.

Item 1.221.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Item 1.2211.

[21] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) said that her delegation felt that *all* children should be protected from the undesirable influence exerted by the press, the radio and the film, and that normal children also should not be debarred from any assistance they could receive in that respect. She therefore proposed the insertion of "all" before "children" in the second line. She thought that, in any case, the resolution should be relegated to the Basic Programme for consideration when more adequate funds were available for the purpose.

Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) agreed with Miss Charlesworth. She did not see how suitable films and newspapers could be selected, especially for maladjusted children, out of the total media of mass communication. She therefore proposed the deletion of the item.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) requested the retention of item 1.2211; he considered juvenile literature to be a problem of paramount

1. In final form: Resol. 1.221.

importance in view of the number of harmful publications on sale.

Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) was of the same opinion. He regretted that the Commission was not retaining that part of the resolution proposed shortly before by the United States delegation advocating preventive measures.

[22] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of items 1.2212-1.224, and their replacement by the following resolution:

To furnish in 1951 financial assistance and the services of personnel to aid the children rendered homeless in Greece and in the Middle East.

She recalled that the Chairman of the Executive Board had urged firmness in cutting out resolutions which could not be implemented in 1951; in the view of her delegation, this applied to the whole of section 1.22 the execution of which would require enormous resources far beyond the possibilities of the Organization's budget. The delegation was of course in agreement regarding the urgency of the needs of handicapped children, but the General Conference, at its Paris Session in 1949, had laid upon Unesco the special obligation to devote the utmost resources in educational relief to the children rendered homeless in Greece and in the Middle East.

To send a travelling expert round the world, as suggested in 1.222, besides being very expensive, would make it practically impossible for him to carry out the necessary additional research in the current year. The seminar proposed in item 1.223 also would be very costly. As to the International Federation of Children's Communities mentioned in item 1.224, the United Kingdom delegation felt that Unesco should not give it assistance in 1950, as they were not sure that this organization was truly international. Besides this, the United Nations Social Commission was suggesting the setting up of a Children's Committee, and Miss Charlesworth felt that Unesco should not anticipate this.

She therefore suggested that Unesco should concentrate on carrying out the task enjoined on it at the last Session of the General Conference, and for which only partial provision had been made in the section for Relief Assistance Services. Unesco would be far more useful if all available resources were devoted to financial assistance and to the services of personnel to help the homeless children in the Near and Middle East.

[23] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) said that the social dislocation caused by the war was one of the major causes of child delinquency. His Government would be very grateful for any information which Unesco could collect for them on this subject, and he would welcome the maintenance of item 1.2211.

Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) supported the United Kingdom proposal, saying that he had also been influenced by a statement of the Budget Committee to the effect that the funds available were too small to be really effective. He therefore hoped that Unesco would find means of employing these funds on a project conceived on a smaller scale.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) also gave his hearty support to the United Kingdom proposal. He recalled his recent appeal that Unesco should reconsider the order of priorities to be given to different aspects of the programme. The point at issue should in any case come up for discussion under the heading of *Relief Assistance Services.*

Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) thought there was much value in the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation; however, he did not see anything to prevent maintaining both it and the resolutions concerning maladjusted children. Referring to document 5C/5 (II), page 254, he thought the proposal should be inserted in section 7.2 (Direct Assistance).

[24] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL warned the Commission against the danger of deciding on a draft resolution whose budgetary implications had not yet been considered.

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) assured the Commission that her delegation would not have ventured to make any proposal having budgetary implications beyond the estimates. It was merely felt that the sum provided was far too modest to enable effective help to be given to all the handicapped and displaced children, and that it would therefore be better to devote it to helping the Greek and Arab children. Although it might be merely a drop in the ocean, it could at least be promptly used.

In reply to a question from Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), Miss CHARLESWORTH confirmed that the United Kingdom proposal amounted to eliminating the whole programme contained under items 1.2212 to 1.224, and devoting the funds to the education of the homeless children of Greece and the Middle East.

[25] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought it difficult to take any decision regarding assistance to children in Greece and the Near East while assistance for maladjusted children was under review: the problem at issue was one of education and not of relief. No choice could be made between two projects that were quite unrelated. The delegate of France therefore requested the Commission to vote for or against the retention

of the resolution proposed by the Executive Board.

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) regretted that her delegation was unable to accept the French proposal. Throughout the programme on Education, there were instances in which relief was included as part of the draft programme as it stood. She therefore maintained her proposal.

Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) reminded the meeting that Unesco had on several occasions extended symbolic assistance to Greek and Arab children, thought it had fallen far short of the real needs. It was inadvisable to continue with mere symbolic gestures. If $18,000 were inadequate for the programme proposed in section 1.22, they would be still less adequate to assist children who were in need of more subtantial relief. The insignificance of such a sum would have a deplorable moral effect in the present situation.

Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) agreed in principle, but could not believe that any aid, however small, could be detrimental to Unesco's prestige. Much more detrimental would be a series of ill-conceived resolutions badly carried out.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) emphasized that section 1.22 provided for studies and for financial assistance to the institutes responsible for such studies. It was an entirely different matter from assistance to Greek and Arab children. He therefore proposed the maintenance of financial assistance for surveys and research.

Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) expressed his delegation's support for the very fine United Kingdom proposal, which it would be sorry to see rejected on a mere question of procedure. He suggested combining the question of Greek and Arab children with that of handicapped or displaced children.

[26] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) sympathized with the proposal of the Egyptian delegate, in whose wishes he concurred; but he expressly requested the inclusion of the United Kingdom amendment in a separate resolution which could be considered under chapter 7 at the same time as the problems of relief assistance.

That proposal, supported by the delegates of BRAZIL, AUSTRIA, YUGOSLAVIA, VENEZUELA, URUGUAY, LIBERIA, SWITZERLAND, ECUADOR, MONACO and MEXICO, was *adopted* by 20 votes to 5 and 1 abstention (Greece).

[27] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand), seconded by the delegates of CANADA and IRAQ, thought the French point of view was perfectly logical; but his delegation agreed with the United Kingdom delegation that the programme was trying to do too much with too little money.

There seemed to be some difference of opinion among delegates about the exact meaning of the word "maladjusted". He therefore suggested that, instead of deleting the whole of section 1.22, it should be modified to read as follows:

In the field of maladjusted children, Unesco, during 1951, shall restrict itself to simple clearing-house services.

This resolution would cover items 1.2211 and 1.2212. Its budgetary implications could be worked out later, but he thought there might be a considerable saving.

The motion was seconded by the delegates of BRAZIL, IRAQ and NORWAY.

Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) thought Dr. Beeby's proposal was clear, concise and to the point; her delegation would like to second it, since it would in addition afford a year in which to clear up a rather confused situation.

[28] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) understood the New Zealand delegate's point of view, but he nevertheless remained somewhat perplexed, for the problem of maladjusted children had been clearly put by the Budget Committee which had stated that the funds available were inadequate. Was it therefore necessary that Unesco should be confined to clearing-house activities? That had been his first view, but he had come to the conclusion that if Unesco did nothing that year, it would never do anything. With regard to the proposed items, he was not in favour of recruiting a travelling expert; one such expert could accomplish little and, in that case, a member of the Secretariat would be sufficient for the task. On the other hand, he considered it important to assist private institutions concerned with the training of staff—an item which he thought required special consideration.

Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) supported the Swiss delegate; Unesco had too often been criticized for carrying out surveys and research, and for reluctance to undertake practical work.

By 25 votes to 4, it was *agreed* to maintain items 1.2211 and 1.2212 in their original form[1] and to suppress items 1.222 and 1.223.

[29] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the Commission had just rejected a series of projects because the available budget seemed too small. That was a proof that programme problems were always budgetary problems.

Draft resolution presented by the Yugoslav delegation [document 5C/87].

[30] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) ex-

1. In final form: Resol. 1.2211 and 1.2212.

plained that the draft resolution aimed at making governments prohibit the production and diffusion of articles, films and radio programmes detrimental to a child's moral and intellectual training. The draft resolution would have no budgetary implications as its purpose was to urge governments to take action. He mentioned the highly satisfactory and encouraging results obtained in Yugoslavia in that connexion.

The Yugoslav proposal was seconded by the delegate of IRAQ.

[31] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated that the Board had no comments to make, as the proposal raised no budgetary problems.

[32] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the Secretariat still had not sufficient staff to undertake any definite action; he imagined the Yugoslav delegation would have no objection to the framing of the resolution as a request to Member States.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), seconded by Professor CALÒ (Italy), thought it best to soften the resolution by deleting the words "prevent the production".

Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) accepted that amendment.

Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) feared that such a request would be regarded by governments as a pious hope and thus be ineffectual.

[33] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) considered that the recommendation of the Yugoslav delegation was implicit in resolution 1.2211 which had just been adopted and which provided for all that could possibly be done to shelter children "from the undesirable influence exerted by the press, radio, and films".

[34] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) feared that Unesco, by making suggestions such as that put forward by the Yugoslav delegation, was too often urging pressure on the part of governments and would appear as a kind of super-state which did not pay sufficient heed to the spiritual forces that must be brought to bear if the situation were to be improved.

[35] Dr. ZOOK(United States of America) regretted that his delegation would be obliged to vote against the Yugoslav resolution, even if amended, because, under the United States Constitution, it would be undesirable for the Federal Government to receive suggestions which it could not carry out, since they were matters for the various States themselves.

The Yugoslav proposal (document 5C/87) was *rejected* by 21 votes to 6.

Item 1.224.

[36] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) repeated her earlier fears that the International Federation of Children's Communities was not truly international. Nor was her delegation prepared to vote for the other unspecified organizations included in the resolution.

[37] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) emphasized the immediate possibility of Unesco's assisting maladjusted children under item 1.224. If the Commission felt obliged to make reservations in the matter, it would perhaps be preferable not to name the International Federation of Children's Communities, although the latter had been set up under Unesco's auspices; and even in that case, the grant-in-aid provided for the Federation should not be cancelled: it should rather be extended to monitor training colleges and similar institutions.

[38] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) also argued the impossibility of cancelling the grant-in-aid to the International Federation of Children's Communities. These groups carried out perhaps the most valuable experiments in the education of maladjusted children, in preparing children to take their place in society and in a full international life. The French delegate therefore advocated the retention of item 1.224.

[39] In reply to a question from Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the International Federation of Children's Communities had been set up as the result of a conference organized by Unesco in Trogen (Switzerland) in 1948 and attended by the directors of existing communities. The Federation covered six or seven countries and was endeavouring to extend its influence. It had been operating for two years.

[40] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) thought that all the activities mentioned under item 1.224 could be carried out equally well by clearing-house services; he therefore saw no reason to maintain this item.

[41] Miss CHARLESWORTH (United Kingdom) explained that she was not in opposition to children's communities as such, which must exist under present conditions, but only to the International Federation of Children's Communities, which she did not think was a properly constituted international body. In addition, she did

not think that children's communities would continue indefinitely, and her delegation did not therefore want the International Federation to continue indefinitely.

The United Kingdom proposal to suppress item 1.224, seconded by the delegates of EGYPT, UNITED STATES of AMERICA and IRAQ, was *rejected* by 18 votes ot 9.

Item 1.224 was therefore *adopted* as it stood.[1]

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.222.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Draft resolution on Extraordinary Projects submitted by the United States delegation [document 5C/59].

[1] The CHAIRMAN welcomed Senator William Benton, a member of the United States delegation and a pioneer of Unesco, which he had served from its earliest days, both abroad and in his own country. Mr. Benton had attended the Preparatory Conference in London and had headed his country's delegation to the Conferences in Paris (1946) and Mexico (1947). As Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs, Mr. Benton had strongly encouraged all work connected with Unesco and had personally contributed to the development of the United States National Commission.

The Chairman called on Mr. Benton to present a draft resolution [document 5C/59] framed by the United States delegation and requesting the adoption by Unesco of exceptional measures to cope with an exceptional world situation.

The Chairman was sorry he could not open a discussion on the draft that day, but nevertheless thought it worth the Commission's while to hear Mr. Benton's statement forthwith.

[2] Mr. BENTON (United States of America) regretted that it had been impossible for him to join earlier that particularly important Session of the General Conference. In recent weeks the United States Senate had approved the extention of ERP (European Recovery Programme), and had discussed President Truman's Point Four proposals, in which Unesco would have an important share. Part of a Senate resolution he had been sponsoring called upon all Member States to assist an acceleration of Unesco's work so as to make it a significant and perhaps decisive contribution to peace. He urged a return to fundamentals and pointed out that in Unesco, education, science and culture were not ends in themselves but means of making a direct contribution to peace. This contribution, however, could only be made by strict concentration and integration of the Programme. He quoted from Article I, paragraph 1 of Unesco's Constitution, and from Articles 19, 26 and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and emphasized that those in Unesco who denied these fundamental principles should not be permitted to retard the Organization on the way to its great objective.

The political struggle raging in the world was an intellectual, moral and educational struggle; Unesco could not remain indifferent to the pressures by which the minds of men were assailed from all sides. Mr. Benton hoped the Conference would agree with the Director-General's arguments for Unesco's right to an active role in world politics in order to ensure the implementation of Article 26, i.e., "to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations". The occasionally expressed theory that Unesco must soften its policies so that it could be a bridge between East and West was a chimera. The present world situation called for measures over and above the normal Programme and Budget; they should represent a constructive and positive affirmation of freedom for the sake of freedom and an effort to bolster the fundamental freedoms wherever they were threatened. Unesco must find a way to tap all the resources of the free world, and learn to use every means of mass communication to tell the glorious story of freedom. It must greatly increase the world-wide exchange of

students, writers, teachers, journalists, trade unions and opinion leaders. Bold and creative effort could overcome most obstacles and make Unesco live up to its mighty dedication of 1945. The speaker stressed the importance of expanding Unesco's Programme in Germany, whose population needed a real chance of self-education, of which they had been deprived since 1933. Mr. John McCloy's $16,500,000 for the re-education in the United States Zone were not enough at this stage, when German people were more receptive to new ideas than at any time in the last hundred years. The needs of the French and British Zones were very similar to those of the American one. A greatly expanded exchange of persons programme—extending to at least 10,000 persons a year—would be an essential factor of Unesco's Programme in Germany. Mr. Benton felt that here and now might be Unesco's decisive hour, under the extraordinary leadership of Mr. Torres Bodet, for the extraordinary efforts it should now put forth. The father and protector of all freedoms was the freedom to communicate, and the security of each Member State was part of their joint security. From this viewpoint, Unesco could be potentially as important as military and economic defence measures. By developing projects of a truly international character, it could materially promote that security. A vision of freedom would inspire remarkable devotion among those who believed in it. Freedom had survived because it was an inspired faith and Unesco should add to it the good works of which it was capable.

[3] The CHAIRMAN considered the applause that had greeted Mr. Benton's statement to be the best expression of gratitude, betokening, as it did, the interest it had aroused in the Commission. His words, imbued with the enthusiasm and dynamic energy that Mr. Benton placed in the service of ideas, were all the more timely as the Commission was about to discuss the budget ceiling; they would perhaps prompt certain delegations to review the modest scale of contributions they were intending to propose.

Provisional decision regarding the budget total for 1951.

[4] The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission had received the replies of the Administrative Commission [document 5C/ADM/20] to the questions it had raised; but there was no reason for dwelling further on the document; all that was necessary was to take note of it and to thank the Administrative Commission for the useful supplementary information it had provided.

At the close of the meeting, the Commission was to decide on the budget total for 1951 so that it could then proceed with its discussion of the programme.

[5] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) wished to congratulate the Administrative Commission upon the excellent work it had done. The Commission took the view that the only budget of Unesco was the figure on which Member States' contributions were assessed, and it rejected all three proposals which had been submitted to it. The United States delegation was fully prepared to support the budget figure necessary to implement a really creative programme concentrating and integrating all the Organization's resources. He thought it would be necessary to eliminate certain projects in the Programme which were not part of such a concentration, and introduce others. He found it a little difficult to accept the concept of attempting to lay down a provisional budget figure before the Programme and its price tags had been approved; but he was ready to accept the idea of setting up an early target as long as it was really a provisional one.

Mr. Sargeant stressed the concluding remarks of the Director-General's opening address "the time for talking was past; the hour of decision had struck" and emphasized the United States' faith in Unesco, which would manifest itself by (1) continuing to support the United States National Commission; (2) continuing to support the Technical Assistance plan and Unesco's share in it, for which it should receive an approximate sum of $2,000,000; (3) helping to find outside sources to finance the extraordinary projects envisaged in the resolution the United States delegation was submitting to the Conference.

Mr. Sargeant moved:

That the Programme and Budget Commission adopt the provisional budget ceiling of $8,200,000 for 1951 with the understanding that whatever programme, within that amount, is approved by the General Conference be carried out by the Director-General at its full level by means of the income from normal assessments of Member States and some additional resources which can be made available by a waiver for 1951 of certain Financial Regulations.

The special funds he had in mind would be derived from:

(1) The contribution of the Member States which had joined Unesco in 1950, i.e., an approximate sum of $220,000, which would normally be used to reduce the 1951 contribution, but which he suggested using to meet the anticipated failure in the collection of certain contributions;

(2) The cash surplus for 1947—approximately $220,000— which the Conference could decide to use for the same purpose;

(3) Some economies on the Budget Estimates made by the Budget Committee and the Administrative Commission—which could be estimated at some $100,000.

The total of those assets would enable Unesco to operate a full programme at the $8,200,000 level, irrespective of the regularity of payment of the contributions. The action outlined was not intended to create a precedent but to meet conditions which it was hoped would not recur.

[6] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) remarked that his task had been facilitated by the statement of the United States delegate, as the draft amendment he had communicated to the Secretariat was along the same lines as the American proposal. It read as follows:

AMENDMENT TO PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION FOR 1951.

For the financial year 1951, the amount of $8,200,000 is hereby appropriated for the purpose indicated in the Appropriation Table included in this resolution, with a view to financing the entire Programme approved by the Fifth Session Conference.
Should the income of the Organization for the financial year 1951 prove inadequate, the Director-General shall endeavour to reduce administrative expenditure and shall further be authorized to draw upon the Working Capital Fund as a temporay means of offsetting a possible budgetary deficit for the financial year 1951.

Mr. Sedar Senghor attached no special value to his draft: the aim in view was all that mattered. The deficit resulting from arrears in the payment of contributions by certain Member States was no new problem. In the past, that deficit had been met through the Working Capital Fund and the recovery of arrears of contributions. As at 28 February 1950, those arrears amounted to $1,609,776, as against a budget surplus of $1,105,391, thus making an actual deficit of $504,385. The Working Capital Fund with a reserve of $3,000,000 consisted of advances and actually belonged to Member States.

Mr. Sedar Senghor observed that there was a twofold problem to solve; there were two kinds of arrears, some of which had to be regarded as irrecoverable, while there was every reason to expect that the others would eventually be paid. The French delegation was intending in due course to propose that the Administrative Commission should amend Financial Regulations 25 and 26, and to advocate the establishment of a special reserve fund built up from budget surpluses. For the time being, a solution had to be found for the "normal" arrears, which could be met from the Working Capital Fund.

On behalf of the French delegation, Mr. Sedar Senghor advocated an actual budget of $8,200,000 and emphasized that the Director-General should have that full sum at his disposal for the implementation of his programme. He assumed that the arrears could be covered by effecting savings in personnel costs and by drawing on the Working Capital Fund.

The subscriptions from new Members and the firm promises of payment by certain Member States were an encouraging factor which would go some way towards restoring the situation to normal.

[7] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) warmly praised Mr. Benton's statement and supported the United States proposal. He stressed that the so-called advanced countries needed self-education as much as the others required re-education.

[8] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) seconded the American proposal to the effect that the Organization should have a real budget of $8,200,000 in 1951, the Director-General being authorized to draw upon any further funds that might be available from the financial year 1950.

[9] Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt) wished to pay homage to the Director-General's leadership and supported the United States motion.

[10] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) also agreed with the United States proposal that the budget ceiling should be fixed at $8,200,000.

[11] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) was glad to note the recognition that Unesco's action must also be political if it was to prevent war and preserve peace. He emphasized that the Programme must essentially consist of (1) reconstruction through the Technical Assistance Programme, (2) the reduction of existing tensions, and (3) spreading United Nations ideals and aims. He stated that the Iraqi delegation associated itself with everything the United States delegate had said.

[12] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) emphasized that, despite its poverty, Greece was prepared to contribute by every means in its power to the budget and the fulfilment of Unesco's ideals, in accordance with its policy since the earliest days of the Organization. He therefore supported the proposals of the United States and French delegations.

[13] Mr. SEVERI (Italy) agreed with the United States proposal and shared the views expressed by the delegate of Iraq. He suggested that the General Conference should authorize the Executive Board and the Director-General, after the close of the Conference and in accordance with its instructions, to establish an order of precedence relegating the less important proposals to the

background, should the budget be found inadequate for the full implementation of the programme approved.

[14] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) supported the United States proposal and stressed that, though there was a practically unanimous desire to compress the programme, the various delegations held very different views on the means of attaining that end: he considered that in its first few years Unesco would have to resign itself to a compromise programme, as the compression advocated and desired by all was bound to be a gradual process based on experience.

[15] Mr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) also spoke in favour of the United States proposal. Referring to the last remark of the Swiss delegate, Mr. Jiménez felt safe in asserting that Unesco's main aims had already been defined by the Conference, both in plenary meeting during the discussion of the Director-General's report and in that Commission. He felt that the matter presented no serious difficulties, since it was generally agreed that the programme should be compressed.

[16] Dr. WALKER (Australia) was in full agreement with the United States delegate's views concerning the necessity to concentrate on objectives of major international importance; but he was unable to follow his financial proposals, because it would be confusing for the Conference to be invited to vote for a ceiling on the assumption that the Administrative Commission would take certain decisions. He pointed out that:

(1) The new Member States' contributions should be applied to reduce contributions two years later, if there were a real surplus on the current year—an unlikely event;

(2) The proposal that the 1947 surplus should be withheld had not been settled by the Administrative Commission and, while the United States proposed to use it for the implementation of the 1951 Programme, the Executive Board was in favour of applying it to the accumulated deficiency of contributions;

(3) The suggested economies might or might not produce $100,000.

The budget ceiling could not be based on a series of assumptions which prejudged the Administrative Commission's decisions; it was the Australian Government's view that the Budget should not exceed $8,000,000 and that the Commission should take into consideration the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations to keep the expenditure of the Specialized Agencies within the amount of income which could be reasonably expected for the current financial year. On behalf of his Government, Dr. Walker moved the adoption of an $8,000,000 ceiling.

[17] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) associated himself with Dr. Walker's warning; but it was not possible to pick and choose projects in order to establish the concentrated programme strongly favoured by the United Kingdom delegation without a provisional ceiling. In his opinion, the total Budget should be $8,200,000; but the fact that the whole of that sum would not be received should be faced and therefore a reserve within the total was necessary. The three sources of additional income referred to by Mr. Sargeant might enable the Director-General to carry out an $8,200,000 programme on a $7,600,000 income, but unfortunately those additional assets were by no means guaranteed. Accordingly, he was in favour of one Budget in two parts: (1) $7,600,000 for those projects on which the Director-General might confidently embark, and (2) $500,000 for the projects to be initiated *only* if the Director-General was assured of the necessary income.

[18] The CHAIRMAN explained that the Commission had to take a *provisional* decision regarding the budget total for 1951.

It had two formal proposals before it, one put forward by the United States delegation and the other by the French delegation, fixing the budget at $8,200,000 and suggesting means of raising that sum.

In addition, the Head of the United Kingdom delegation had suggested a similar figure, but had gone further in proposing both a maximum of $8,200,000 and a minimum of $7,600,000, to allow for the possibility of certain income being received in 1951. However, the alternative proposal was liable to give rise to some confusion in the minds of delegates, and the Chairman thought it preferable for the United Kingdom delegate to keep to one figure only (either $8,200,000 or $7,600,000); an amendment dealing with a supplementary budget could be drafted, should there be any possibility of the Organization's having an actual budget of $8,200,000.

[19] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand) agreed with most of what Mr. Sargeant had said; but he felt compelled to ask whether the Commission should vote on a resolution containing conditions which were not within its control or competence to decide. He suggested that the Commission should consider the first part of the resolution and defer consideration of the second part until the full report of the Administrative Commission was available.

[20] Professor GLEDITSCH (Norway) supported

the point of view of the Australian delegation and stated that she had definite instructions from her Government to try and keep the ceiling at $8,000,000.

[21] Mr. FLORES (Philippines) was in complete accord with the United States delegation. He thought the ceiling flexible enough to enable the Organization to take care of any contingencies, and held that Unesco's increased responsibilities justified the proposed budget figure.

[22] Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) entirely agreed with the first part of the United States proposal, but not with the second, which he thought lacked a concrete basis. He was in favour of a provisional figure of $8,000,000.

[23] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) agreed with the United States proposal and pointed out that the views of those who opposed it were also based on pure suppositions.

[24] Mr. DÉSY (Canada) was prepared to accept the United States proposal in order to facilitate the Commission's work, provided the Programme were carefully considered and all steps taken to discard any non-essential projects.

[25] In reply to the New Zealand delegate, the CHAIRMAN explained that the Programme and Budget Commission was responsible for fixing the provisional budget for 1951. It was not only competent to do so, but was also authorized to indicate by what means the total should be raised. It seemed to him idle to bring up any question of procedure, since the representatives of delegations attending that meeting were more or less the same as those forming the other Commissions of the Conference. Such being the case, the Chairman considered both parts of the American proposal to be acceptable.

[26] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) emphasized that the delegate of the United States had in mind not only the immediate matter of a budget ceiling but also the grounds on which he felt able to base his proposal, the second part of which was a suggestion to the Conference as to how the first part could be implemented.

[27] The CHAIRMAN regretted his inability to agree with the Chairman of the Executive Board. As the time-table of meetings was fixed, the Commission had to take an immediate decision, if possible at that very meeting.

[28] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) agreed with Sir John Maud's excellent analysis, which was the exact tenor of the United States proposal. He stressed that a provisional budget ceiling was necessary before the Programme could be carefully examined.

[29] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) had already stated when presenting his amendment that he took no special author's pride in it. As the aim was all that mattered, he withdrew his proposal and supported that of the United States delegation.

[30] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that the Commission also had before it a proposal by the Australian delegation, fixing the budget ceiling at $8,000,000 but not indicating how it was to be financed. Furthermore, the United Kingdom had proposed a budget of $8,200,000, also without any indication of how it was to be financed.

The Australian proposal was *rejected* by 27 votes to 6.

[31] At the request of Dr. WALKER (Australia), the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States proposal in two separate parts.

The first part of the proposal (fixing the provisional total for the 1951 budget at $8,200,000) was *adopted* by 37 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

[32] In reply to a question by Dr. WALKER (Australia), the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the vote on the second part of the United States proposal (means of financing the budget) would represent the Commission's views on the matter.

Professor SEVERI (Italy) said he would vote in favour of the second part, with the proviso to which he had previously referred.

In reply to Dr. WALKER (Australia), the CHAIRMAN informed the meeting that the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly would be discussed by the Conference in plenary meeting.

Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) sympathized with Dr. Walker's point of view, but stressed that the ceiling he had proposed was provisional and that the final decision would depend on the Programme which the Commission would approve.

The second part of the United States resolution was *adopted* by 28 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

1. Education (*continued*).

SECTION 1.213 (*continued*).

[1] The CHAIRMAN read the Drafting Committee's proposed text for Professor Verniers' and Mrs. Ross' recommendations:

1.2134: Member States are invited to associate representatives of workers's organizations with the work of their National Commissions:

1.2135: Member States are invited to ensure that the interests of workers' organizations are represented in their delegations to the General Conference.

[2] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL advised bringing out more clearly the aim of the first recommendation—adult education. With regard to the second recommendation, he thought the General Conference might recommend to Member States the inclusion of a representative of workers in their delegations.

It was *decided* to refer item 1.2134 to the Drafting Committee which would bear those remarks in mind.

[3] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) was in sympathy with item 1.2135, but he found it quite inapplicable to certain parts of the world. As a hope, it was excellent; but he thought that extending an invitation, when that invitation could not be immediately responded to, was out of place.

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) explained that the Drafting Committee had not wished to imply that labour organizations should send delegates, but merely that contacts should be established with organizations, with a view to representing their interests.

Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) considered the wording rather vague; if it was merely a matter of bearing the interests of workers in mind, they were automatically included in all the national interests bound up with Unesco's work.

Item 1.2135 was *adopted* by 22 votes to 1.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 9.82.

SECTION 1.22 (*continued*) (HANDICAPPED CHILDREN).

Draft resolution of the United States of America [document 5C/57].

[4] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) could not agree to the substitution of that study for the whole section on handicapped children, but it was a most valuable proposal, that might well be considered, since the deletion of items 1.222 and 1.223 would result in considerable savings which could go to finance the United States proposal. Professor Piaget therefore moved its adoption under the heading *Preventive Education*.

Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) thought that preventive education and remedial measures should be considered together, and he suggested adopting the United States proposal for insertion after resolution 1.221.

[5] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked how much money would be saved by the elimination of items 1.222 and 1.223, and what was the estimated cost of the United States resolution.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the reply to the first question could only be a provisional figure, as the matter still had to go before the Budget Committee; but the estimate given to that Committee would be an approximate saving of $25,000 out of the $45,000 originally budgeted for section 1.22. With regard to the United States resolution, the Chairman of the Executive Board had at the preceding meeting quoted the cost as $13,000. In point of fact, there would probably be a possibility of some further saving on the whole section.

[6] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) wished to know whether, should the proposal be accepted, it would be necessary to call on the assistance of the World Organization for Early Childhood Education. If so, he would suggest adding to the end of the paragraph the words: "in collaboration with the national sections of the World Organization for Early Childhood Education".

Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) believed that the Secretariat would wish to invite the assistance of that Organization, and possibly of others.

[7] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive

Board) thought that the Commission ought not to vote on the proposal until the Budget Committee had given its opinion about the financing of the new proposal.

Agreed.

BUDGET TABLE III.1.C. (2) [document 5C/5 (II), pages 97 and 98].

Adopted without discussion.

Education for International Understanding (1.3).

SECTION 1.31 (CURRICULA AND METHODS).

Item 1.311.

[8] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) asked that the findings of the proposed study should be communicated to the educational authorities *before* being published and disseminated.

It was *decided* to adopt item 1.311 with a request that the Drafting Committee bear in mind the amendment proposed by the Lebanese delegation.[1]

Items 1.312 and 1.313.

[9] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) considered the six weeks proposed for the seminars in those two items to be too long a period. If they were reduced to four weeks, not only would some $5,000 be saved on each seminar, but certain persons who could not give up so much time would then be able to attend.

He pointed out that seminars were now far more carefully prepared by expert preliminary investigations. Such being the case, a four weeks' seminar would, in his view, be quite adequate.

[10] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) agreed with the points made by the delegate of France, which were strong ones. There was however another point, perhaps less tangible but no less real, and even more convincing. His past experience had been that there was a kind of periodicity about a seminar, a rhythm; a seminar had a life of its own. During such meetings there was a considerable amount of international understanding, which lessened during the fourth week, but rose again during the fifth or sixth weeks. From that experience, therefore, he would say that seminars were a live history of international understanding, which required about six weeks to come to fruition.

[11] Professor ARMFELT (United Kingdom) said his delegation was aware that the matter under discussion was a very controversial one and that there were arguments for four weeks and for six weeks. Taking into account the considerations mentioned, his delegation was inclined to support the delegate of France for the reasons the latter had given.

[12] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL advised against the adoption of a fixed principle regarding the length of seminars; he urged the meeting to trust the Secretariat, which would always give due consideration to the preparation of the seminars, the number of participants and the subject with which they were to deal.

He shared the views of the New Zealand delegate. He was well aware that France and the United Kingdom were highly developed countries where brilliant experts could be appointed to attend short seminars, but that was not always the case; seminars should not be regarded as meetings consisting entirely of leading authorities who could deal quickly with very complex questions. The Director-General requested the the case; seminars should not be regarded as minars in every circumstance, as participants from States with less technical preparation could not derive the same advantage from them.

[13] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) recommended that lecturers for those seminars should be chosen as far as possible from among participants; he was strongly against inviting experts from countries far from the seminar to give a small number of lectures.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Secretariat to bear those remarks in mind.

[14] Dr. ZOOK(United States of America) observed that his delegation had presented three proposals in connexion with human rights: two draft amendments to items 1.313 and 1.321 (document 5C/66) and a draft resolution concerning an enlarged project connected with Human Rights (document 5C/56). The United States delegation was withdrawing its amendments to items 1.313 and 1.321, but was still in favour of an enlarged programme and was intending, to bring up the matter in the wider context of the Mass Communications programme (item 6.31).

Items 1.312 and 1.313 were *adopted* unchanged.[1]

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE ITALIAN DELEGATION [document 5C/69].

[15] Professor CALÒ (Italy) explained that the draft resolution, called for the adoption of a code of principles in the field of education.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.311.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.312 and 1.313.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board was naturally sympathetic to the proposal, but felt that it was not proper for the General Conference to specify ways in which the Secretariat and the Director-General should discharge their duties. Nor was it thought that such resolutions were appropriate in any annual programme. Though not in any disagreement with the intention of the resolution, the Board felt bound to advise the Commission not to agree to its inclusion in the 1951 Programme.

Professor CALÒ (Italy) suggested transferring the proposal to the Preamble so as to avoid the difficulties to which the Chairman of the Executive Board had referred.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL doubted the possibility of transferring to the Preamble of the Basic Programme the code of principles to which the Italian delegation wished to draw attention, whereupon Professor CALÒ withdrew his proposal.

SECTION 1.32 (SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS AND TEACHING MATERIAL).

Item 1.32 [document 5C/5 (I) (Rev.) - Addendum].

[16] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) supported the new text in the belief that it was a natural sequence of the 1950 seminar.

Item 1.32 [document 5C/5 (I) (Rev.) — Addendum], was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 1.321.

[17] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) reminded the meeting that his delegation had withdrawn its draft amendment to that item (document 5C/66), but it would present its draft resolution 5C/56 again in connexion with item 6.31. He would, however, point out that the amount of money provided for items 1.321 and 1.322 did not seem very adequate to carry on what, to his delegation, was a very important part of the Education Programme.

[18] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with the United States delegate that the funds allowed for that section were lamentably small. However, he reminded him that the deletion of certain resolutions would make additional funds available; they could be re-allocated in such a way as to focus Unesco's energies on certain important tasks. The Director-General enquired into the possibility of devoting those additional funds to certain projects for education, as the inclusion in the Programme of the United States resolution concerning early childhood education (document 5C/57) would probably absorb such funds. Should the Commission prefer to distribute the budget evenly among the various Programme activities, the Director-General thought that the Education Department's resources should be increased in that section rather than others.

[19] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board was particularly anxious that the final Programme should be a better one than that with which the Commission had begun. The Board had done its best to secure a balance in its Programme, and the Commission was in turn seeking to improve its work. Sir John therefore suggested that the Commission, if it felt that a certain part of the Board's Programme should be diminished or soft-pedalled or deleted, should indicate its wishes in such respects. He hoped that the Chairman would allow delegates who wished to propose a diminution in one item of the Programme, to indicate at the same time the section which they hoped would benefit from such a diminution.

[20] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) asked whether the living languages referred to were French and English; if so, he did not see any need at all for the resolution.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that it was not proposed to limit the studies to any two languages.

Item 1.321 was *adopted* unchanged.

Item 1.322 was *adopted* without comment.[2]

Item 1.323.

[21] Professor CALÒ (Italy) did not approve the term "model textbook", as in his view, history textbooks should have a centre of interest which might not be the same for all peoples. To his mind, textbooks should merely be free of any remarks prejudicial to international understanding, any expression of national pride and of hatred or contempt for other peoples; they had to bring out the contributions of every country to civilization as well as the inter-play of cultures. Accordingly, the Italian delegation suggested substituting "the improvement of history textbooks" for "the preparation of model history textbooks".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL approved that wording as being more flexible; but he advised against discussion of the principle of the problem, as Unesco was shortly to organize a seminar on the subject in Brussels.

Professor CALÒ (Italy) maintained that the work of the seminar should be guided by certain principles which could not be disregarded, and again moved his draft amendment.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.321.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.321.
2. In final form: 1.322.

[22] Professor ARMFELT (United Kingdom) sympathized with the views expressed by Professor Calò, and noted the advice given by the Director-General. Professor Armfelt proposed that the word "model" should be deleted, and replaced by the words "examples of". His delegation distrusted the word "models", as they were afraid of uniformity in schools. They would like their teachers to make their own choice of textbooks, and thought the words suggested more suitable.

Mr. MONTEL (France) suggested "the preparation of sample textbooks" as an expression that might meet with the approval of the Italian delegation.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) pointed out that there would be no occasion for the Italian delegation's misgivings on that score if it were understood that it was not a question of one model textbook but of several sample textbooks; he emphasized that the word should be in the plural.

He expressed his support for item 1.323, which provided for no recommendations to governments but for examples on which other textbooks might be modelled.

Professor CALÒ (Italy) supported the amendment proposed by the British delegation.

[23] The CHAIRMAN suggested referring item 1.323 to the Drafting Committee for the framing of a new text in both languages which would take into account the British amendment. *Agreed.*

SECTION 1.33 (HIGHER EDUCATION).

Item 1.331.

[24] Professor ARMFELT (United Kingdom) wondered how the budgetary provision of $3,000 for this item would be incurred. It seemed to the United Kingdom delegation that it would be possible for the information to be collected by correspondence without any more expense than postage. They supported the intention of the resolution, but questioned whether such expenditure was necessary.

[25] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that the budgetary provision was $2,000, and the reason for it was the need for supplementing reports from Member States with a comparative study; it was felt that there was no one in the Secretariat with the particular professional competence to make such a study.

Item 1.331 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 1.331.

SECTION 1.34 (EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH).

Item 1.341.

[26] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) suggested adding: "and the obstacles that stand in its way".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this addition would considerably enlarge the scope of the proposed study and would consequently involve an increase in the funds required.

Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) withdrew his amendment in view of the budgetary repercussions to which the Director-General had referred.

Item 1.341 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 1.342. Draft amendment presented by the Yugoslav delegation [document 5C/88].

[27] Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) thought it unwise to confine the studies to psychological and educational questions; provision should also be made for economic, social and cultural studies.

Professeur PIAGET (Switzerland) observed that the research would cover the educational problems involved in education for international understanding and for that purpose it was necessary to begin with child psychology. He suggested using the term "psycho-sociological".

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Executive Board sympathized in principle with the Yugoslav amendment, and as it had no budgetary implications and was merely a matter of substance, he thought the matter could be left to the wisdom of the Commission.

Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) would be in favour of the following wording: "... the study of certain psychological, sociological and educational questions ...".

Item 1.342, thus amended, was *adopted.*[2]

SECTION 1.35 (TEACHING ABOUT THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES).

[28] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wondered whether it would be more logical to change the heading of that programme section to lay stress on teaching about Human Rights and suggested the following: "Teaching about Human Rights and the United Nations System". *Agreed.*

Item 1.351. Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Dominican Republic [document 5C/50].

[29] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) stated that his delegation's draft proposal was submitted in order that the second part of item 1.351 should have a structure identical

1. In final form: Resol. 1.341.
2. In final form: Resol. 1.342.

with that of item 1.352. He did not insist on retaining paragraph 3 of the resolution (document 5C/50, page 2), as its inclusion in the 1951 Programme would have budgetary implications. Member States should, however, be invited to ensure that the subject was incorporated in the curricula of primary and secondary schools. He asked the Secretariat for information on the "sample tests" mentioned in item 1.351.

[30] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland), referring to the checks provided for in item 1.351, advised against leaving them solely to the responsibility of Member States, whose findings were likely to reflect a certain degree of optimism; in his opinion, the Secretariat should also initiate surveys, for there were at the present time many obstacles to teaching about the United Nations and Human Rights. It was necessary to call upon specialists to check the results already obtained in that field.

[31] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that a new text should be drafted for item 1.351, since the Dominican Republic's amendment was a second invitation to Member States that could hardly be included under the same item. Referring to Professor Piaget's remarks, the Director-General feared lest work on the part of the Secretariat would involve budgetary and technical complications, at least in 1951. He advised restricting the project for the time being to verification by Member States and providing for the Secretariat to undertake studies only in 1952. *Agreed.*

[32] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) urged the need for using simpler terminology for item 1.351 since it referred to teaching in schools. The term "Specialized Agencies" was, in his opinion, not clearly understood outside international organizations.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that the Commission had already approved an amendment to the heading of that section, deleting the expression "Specialized Agencies". In his opinion, it would be wrong to give pupils merely a general view of the United Nations Organization, leaving them without any information on the work of the various Specialized Agencies.

Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) was not advising against teaching about the Specialized Agencies; he merely hoped that a more readily understood term could be found.

The CHAIRMAN suggested referring item 1.351 to the Drafting Committee with the request that it should frame a new draft in the light of the foregoing remarks. *Agreed.*

Item 1.352.

[33] Professor ARMFELT (United Kingdom) said that this delegation was disturbed by the suggestion that such matters be dealt with in the curricula of primary and secondary schools, and offered an alternative phrase: "to encourage teaching about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to pupils of suitable ages". Account should be taken of a child's capacity not merely to learn by rote, but to understand. The United Kingdom delegation would prefer the word "suitable", so that teachers could introduce the subject when they felt that their pupils were ready for it.

[34] The CHAIRMAN suggested adding to the item: "by such means as the adaptation for children of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights".

Mr. MOHR (Norway) stated that his delegation preferred the original text, with the addition of the words proposed by the Chairman.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL saw no point in mentioning an instance of teaching methods; moreover, the idea of adapting the Declaration did not appeal to him, as, in certain cases, the new version might not be in keeping with the spirit in which the proposal had been put forward.

[35] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) feared that the resolution as it stood would remain a dead letter as long as it was not accompanied by proposals for the preparation of suitable textbooks for the teaching of Human Rights. He doubted very much whether a primary or secondary school teacher was qualified to teach on such a subject. He asked whether "the promotion of appropriate teaching methods" implied the preparation of suitable textbooks.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that the Secretariat would hesitate to publish textbooks, but was going to publish a teachers' guide, hoping that teachers in every country would make the appropriate adaptation.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) observed that the dissemination and teaching of the principle of Human Rights and the introduction of those studies in schools needed great technique. He proposed adding to the end of the resolution: ". . . by disseminating documents already prepared".

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that it was intended to disseminate documents. There was an appropriation for publishing a teacher's guide in three languages, incorporating the results of the studies previously mentioned.

It was *decided* to refer item 1.352 to the Drafting Committee, with the request that it should frame a new text, taking the foregoing remarks into account.

Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Persia [document 5C/113].

[36] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) gave his delegation's reasons for presenting a resolution in favour of the World Federation of United Nations Associations. He described the work already carried out by that Federation to promote Unesco's aims, notably by means of a number of most successful seminars. The speaker reminded the meeting that WFUNA was the only non-governmental organization with a formal agreement with Unesco for which no grant-in-aid had been provided in the 1951 budget, and he explained that the purpose of the Persian delegation's proposal was to enable the Federation to continue with its work.

In conclusion, Mr. Sadighi drew the Commission's attention to the Basic Programme (Education: Preamble to Section 3), stating that "Unesco must help the competent organizations and institutions" working in that field.

[37] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated that the Board had not had an opportunity of considering that particular suggestion. The Board knew well the valuable work of WFUNA, and the only opinion Sir John would give on the Board's behalf was that it did not think that a resolution of the kind proposed was appropriate for the 1951 Programme. That did not mean that the Board thought that money should or should not be given to WFUNA: if there was a particular piece of work which WFUNA could do on behalf of Unesco, that would be the occasion for a subvention.

[38] Professor CALÒ (Italy) suggested referring the matter to the Budget Committee for reconsideration.

[39] Mr. ENNALS (World Federation of United Nations Associations) said it was true that WFUNA, in co-operation with the Education Department of Unesco, had, during the past 18 months, organized a series of five seminars on methods of teaching in schools about the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies. They had encountered a number of problems in that connexion. The seminars had, however, given a considerable stimulus to countries represented, and, as a result, a programme had been submitted to Unesco for four more seminars. It was felt that the results so far achieved had been so encouraging that it would be a pity to interrupt the movement at the present stage, and the Federation would be glad if consideration could be given by the Budget Committee to the possibility of some help being given to WFUNA in the organization of the seminars in question. It was not a question of a subsidy; all they asked for was slight help from Unesco.

The CHAIRMAN proposed referring the question to the Budget Committee for reconsideration.

[40] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) thought the point raised by the Executive Board had already been answered; there were specific bodies which Unesco could help in that respect. He therefore supported the proposal of the delegate of Persia.

[41] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) agreed with the delegate of Iraq, but it was clear that the proposal did involve an increase in the Board's Programme, and therefore an increase in the Budget. He therefore agreed with the Chairman of the Commission that the next step was for the Budget Committee to consider the matter and report back to the Commission. *Agreed.*

SECTION 1.36 (YOUTH MOVEMENTS AND CHILDREN'S COMMUNITIES).

Draft resolution submitted by the French delegation [document 5C/62].

[42] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) presented the proposal embodied in document 5C/62, stating that the French delegation had considered it necessary to concentrate all Unesco's work on behalf of young people. It was felt that Unesco should include a service responsible for co-ordinating such activities and maintaining contact with school and other youth organizations concerned with international understanding. It was Mr. François' view that, among international organizations, Unesco was specially qualified to deal with all matters affecting youth; it should therefore be aware of their needs, keep them informed of its work and make every effort to assist them to attain its objects.

He suggested setting up a co-ordination service in Unesco to be responsible for contacts with youth movements, voluntary work camps and children's communities; the service would also work in collaboration with the Exchange of Persons Service, with a view to promoting foreign travel for young people.

[43] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was in agreement with the substance of the French delegation's proposal, but he did not think it could be considered by the Programme and Budget Commission, as it was mainly a matter of internal organization, which was more within the terms of reference of the Administrative Commission.

[44] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board had considered the French draft resolution; but it was felt very

strongly that the Conference should resist the temptation to put into its Programme matters which ought to be left to the discretion of the Director-General. It was hoped that the French delegation would not misunderstand the attitude of the Board in the matter for, if there was any way in which the Programme for youth could be concentrated, that was a perfectly appropriate task for the Commission; but a resolution such as that proposed should not be pressed for inclusion in the 1951 Programme.

[45] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) felt that the French delegation's proposal could be introduced at the end of section 1.36 in the form of a recommendation to the Director-General. However, he was prepared to rely on the Director-General to act in accordance with the proposal, if it were not included in the Programme.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked the French delegate and assured him that his proposal would be taken into consideration.

Item 1.361. Draft resolution presented by the delegation of the United States of America [document 5C/66, item 2].

[46] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) felt that as there was a place for youth education in many sections of Unesco's Programme, it would be quite appropriate to make a simple combination of items 1.361 and 1.142. The combination would not diminish their scope nor entail any budgetary implications.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was under the impression that the Commission had already voted in favour of combining the two items and, if it were still agreeable, the Drafting Committee only had to be requested to take that into account.

It was *agreed* to refer item 1.361 to the Drafting Committee for incorporation in the amendment proposed by the United States delegation.

Item 1.362.

[47] Professor CALÒ (Italy) drew attention to an instructive experiment carried out in Italy under specially difficult circumstances, but which had yielded most satisfactory results. In his opinion, such experiments should be encouraged and continued at the international level.

[48] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) drew attention to the value of children's communities as an international movement on behalf of maladjusted and more particularly of delinquant children. He felt that the Secretariat should take account of experiments already carried out, notaby in Italy, and should subsequently embark on a pilot project on the problem of children's communities, with the assistance of experts with wide experience in that field. Professor Piaget explained that he was not putting forward any formal proposal, in view of present budgetary difficulties; but he stressed the value of such experiments.

Item 1.362 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

BUDGET TABLE III.1.D. [document 5C/5 (II), pages 103 and 104].

[49] The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to the Budget Committee's remarks with regard to item 1.331 (document 5C/BUD/1 - Annex I).

Budget Table III.1.D. was *adopted* without discussion.

2. Natural Sciences.

SECTION 2.1 (DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION).

Item 2.11 [document 5C/5 (I), Rev. - Addendum].

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item 2.111. Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States of America [document 5C/64, item 1].

[50] The draft resolution, presented by Mr. STAKMAN (United States of America), was seconded by Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) who felt that the calling of a world conference of engineering bodies was essential, because their full co-operation must be assured if success was to be achieved.

[51] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) asked whether such a conference was not within the sphere of ILO, and whether Unesco was not overlapping with that Organization.

[52] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that it was not proposed to convoke a professional engineers' organization but a council to co-ordinate work carried out by existing international scientific unions. The co-ordinating council would have similar responsibilities to those of the Council for the Co-ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences (CCICMS) and the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (CIPSH); it had been thought necessary to extend such liaison work to the applied as well as to the basic sciences. Professor Auger

1. In final form: Resol. 1.363.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.11.

was not in favour of affording delegates an opportunity of meeting once only, without enabling them to continue their work. He stated that the resolution provided for a constituent meeting for the council, for which a preliminary meeting had already been held; consideration should also be given to the subsequent work of the council to enable it to achieve as satisfactory results as the two large Councils already existing.

Mr. MONTEL (France) agreed with the views expressed by Professor Auger and was in favour of adopting item 2.111.

[53] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that, when the Board considered the United States amendment, it was given to understand that the effect of adopting it would be that $11,000 less would be spent than if the resolution put forward by the Board were adopted by the Commission.

[54] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) having asked whether or not the Advisory Committee was still a temporary one, Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that it was a matter of setting up a permanent council on the same lines as the CCICMS and CIPSH, in accordance with the decision of a provisional advisory committee which had suggested bringing together the delegates of the one hundred and fourteen existing organizations, which had agreed to establish the Permanent Council. Funds had therefore been set aside to cover that council's initial work.

The amendment of the United States delegation (document 5C/64) was *adopted* by 18 votes to 4.[1]

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

1. See next meeting.

FIFTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

[1] Before continuing the discussion of the Programme, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Rapporteur of the Budget Committee would be present at the meetings of the Commission to advise it on any budgetary implications of new resolutions. The General Committee suggested that any delegate who wished to present a new resolution should first find out from the Secretariat what would be its approximate cost. Finally, he reminded the Commission that no resolution having budgetary implications could be finally adopted until it had received the sanction of the Budget Committee.

Appointment of a Sub-Committee (Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Material).

[2] On behalf of Mr. Seydoux, the CHAIRMAN proposed the appointment of a Sub-Committee to examine the Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Material [document 5C/PRG/11], to be composed of representatives of Australia, Belgium, the United States of America, France, Mexico, the United Kingdom and Switzerland. The member for the United Kingdom, who had chaired the Committee of Experts in Geneva, might be appointed Chairman of this Sub-Committee, and Mr. Bourgeois, the Swiss member, who had also taken part in the Geneva discussions, might be appointed Rapporteur. *Agreed.*

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

1. Education (*continued*).

SECTION 1.214 (*continued*) (WORK WITH UNIVERSITIES).

Draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation [document 5C/33].

[3] Professor VITO (Italy) explained that, in certain European countries, the social service

schools referred to in the draft resolution were only just beginning to work, and his delegation thought the exchanges suggested would be very useful.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) regretted that the Board was unable to advise the Commission to increase the 1951 Programme to satisfy the precise wording of the Italian proposal. It would in any case be possible for the Secretariat to pay some attention to this activity within the framework of the existing 1951 Programme.

Professor VITO (Italy) withdrew his proposal.

[4] Replying to Miss BORSINGER (Switzerland), the CHAIRMAN said he was sure that the Secretariat would be only too glad to use the services of any organization which was already in existence in that field.

2. Natural Sciences (*continued*).

[5] At the request of Professor BHABHA (India), seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, BURMA, EGYPT, FRANCE, ITALY, PAKISTAN, NETHERLANDS, UNITED KINGDOM, SWITZERLAND and UNION of SOUTH AFRICA, it was *agreed* to reconsider the first items of the Natural Sciences programme, which had been given brief consideration at the previous meeting.

SECTION 2.1 *(continued)* (DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION).

Item 2.11 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum] *(continued)*.

Unchanged.[1]

Item 2.11 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.].

[6] On item 2.11 of document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), supported by Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia), considered the proposal excellent in principle, but stated that his delegation could not support it at the present time, when the money could be more usefully spent on scientific and technical aid than on international meetings.

[7] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) proposed the adoption of the item in question, but suggested that financial assistance from Unesco should be restricted to projects definitely related to the Unesco Programme. He was giving this as an opinion for the guidance of the Director-General and was not proposing it as a definite motion.

Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said his delegation regarded the resolution as one of the most important in Unesco's Programme. The scientific organizations were doing invaluable work for science and for peace, and included people who were among the few really internationally-minded.

Item 2.11, seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN and BRAZIL, was *adopted* by 31 votes to 3.[1]

Item 2.111. Draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation [document 5C/64, item 1].

[8] Dr. RABI (United States of America) explained that the reason for proposing this amendment to item 2.111 was that his delegation felt it to be an unnecessary additional drain on the budget. Engineering congresses were usually well supported by industry and could be held without additional expense for Unesco.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) seconded the United States amendment.

[9] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) recalled that the amendment would reduce the cost of the original proposal by about $11,000.

[10] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that Unesco's work in connexion with the engineering sciences had already been going on for three years and was approaching the stage of practical achievement. A conference of fourteen delegations from scientific unions was to be held during the year to set up a permanent council to co-ordinate the congresses and work of international organizations concerned with the engineering sciences. The purpose of item 2.111 was to make it possible to provide that council with financial assistance and services for its first year's work. It should be noted that:

(1) Unesco was the only Specialized Agency dealing with the engineering sciences;

(2) It was not advisable to give up the attempt to secure international co-operation in that field at the very time when the number of contacts between the Secretariat and engineers was bound to increase owing to the Technical Assistance Programme;

(3) It seemed absolutely essential that there should be some international organization to assist research workers to meet and work freely, without being dependent on funds supplied by industry.

[11] Professor BHABHA (India) thought that, since the main objective of the United States

1. In final form: Resol. 2.11.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.121.

amendment seemed to be to save expense, and since the saving involved was only $11,000, it was not worth deleting the Executive Board's resolution. Co-operation in the field of engineering sciences was exceedingly important and, from the economic point of view, possibly even more so than in the basic sciences.

[12] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) agreed with his Indian colleague. To take such a step after three years of assistance to this organization might have serious consequences, and he therefore supported the retention of the original text.

[13] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) was surprised that some delegations were opposed to granting a comparatively small sum to assist work in the engineering sciences, while the Organization was making a substantial contribution to the medical sciences, which were really the concern of WHO.

[14] Mr. MONTEL (France), supported by Professor COLONNETTI (Italy), emphasized the force of the Secretariat's arguments and laid stress on the importance of such co-operation, which was one of Unesco's most fundamental objects.

[15] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) explained that he was not opposed to the idea in the original item; it was merely a question of how much service would be rendered to science and how much to peace. In view of the previous day's decision to concentrate the Programme, he thought that this proposal could not really be given a high priority.

[16] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) felt that the setting up of an engineering body could not be successful unless complete co-operation were obtained from engineering associations throughout the world. An Advisory Committee had met in July 1949 to make recommendations, and a Temporary Advisory Committee had again met in March 1950; but their conclusions were not yet available. His delegation felt that it was too early to undertake the work proposed in resolution 2.111. He therefore supported the United States amendment.

Mr. PAGE (Canada) also supported the amendment.

[17] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) felt that, within a short time, the engineering sciences would themselves be well able to pay the costs involved; but the difficulty was to bring them together in the first place. The Secretariat having used its initiative to call the Advisory Committee together and having paid the costs for three years, it would be undesirable to withdraw the money at the present stage. He therefore opposed the United States amendment.

[18] Dr. RABI (United States of America) stressed that the intention of the amendment was to "*assist* in defraying the expenses of *a* meeting . . .". It was the business of the Advisory Committee itself to see how it managed after that.

The United States amendment [document 5C/64, item 1] was *rejected* by 19 votes to 13.

Australian amendment.

[19] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) proposed a further amendment, namely to delete all reference to the organization of congresses and symposia: to quote an example, meetings of the World Power Conference had been held satisfactorily for many years without Unesco's help. He therefore suggested adding to the resolution the words:

> Provided that for the first year the work of the Advisory Committee does not include the holding of congresses and symposia.

The proposal was seconded by the delegates of BURMA, IRAQ and LIBERIA.

[20] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) informed the Australian delegate that Unesco had provided assistance for the World Power Conference by means of a grant for its meetings and publications. Other unions had also received similar assistance in past years.

[21] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) said that, since the budget provided a total of $14,000 to cover grants-in-aid and congresses called in the normal course of events, the present situation should be adequately covered. What he wanted to oppose was the calling of additional meetings and symposia, and thus to save, he thought, some $7,000.

[22] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that it was not a matter of introducing something new into the Programme, but simply of attributing to a single organization grants which had previously been made to different unions.

[23] The Australian amendment was *rejected*.

Item 2.111 was *adopted* without change.[1]

Item 2.112.

[24] After a statement from Dr. MONTUS (World Health Organization), setting forth his Organization's desire that collaboration with Unesco in the co-ordination of the medical sciences should be continued, item 2.112 was *adopted* without discussion.[2]

1. In final form: 2.122.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.123.

Item 2.113.

[25] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) wished to add an additional phrase, namely, "taking due cognizance of organizations at present firmly established". Work was already proceeding with various bodies engaged on basic research, and it would be a pity if Unesco's work and discussions were not carried on in conjunction with them.

The amendment, seconded by the delegates of CANADA, UNITED KINGDOM, SWEDEN and URUGUAY was *adopted.*

Item 2.113, thus amended, was *adopted.*[1]

Item 2.114.

[26] Dr. RABI (United States of America), seconded by the delegates of BURMA, IRAQ and PAKISTAN, proposed the deletion of the item, since Unesco's main interest in this sphere was in fundamental education, and it had already published a pamphlet on the subject. Activities such as the compilation of card indexes, etc., could more appropriately be left to the International Union for the Protection of Nature, to be paid for out of its own funds.

[27] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) emphasized the vital importance of this problem to certain countries, and the need for assistance with their work in the shape of up-to-date information on the technical and scientific aspects of nature protection.

Professor GLEDITSCH (Norway) agreed.

[28] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) thought that the work in question could be carried out by the competent departments in each government. His own country had the same problem to contend with, but it did not require a special international meeting.

[29] The CHAIRMAN having explained that the work could not be done under the heading of Education, and that the budgetary implications were given in the Budget Estimates [document 5C/5 (II) paragraph v, pages 118 and 119], Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) added that he was not in favour of the complete deletion of item 2.114, but merely felt that it might be impossible to carry out all its provisions, for example the production of pamphlets for international use in schools. It would be more appropriate to produce them through the ordinary channels of the Secretariat, having them adapted to each country's needs by the National Commissions.

Seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA and CANADA, Mr. Cummins therefore proposed, as an instruction to the Budget Committee, deleting from the last line of page 118 [document 5C/5 (II)] the phrase beginning: "to publish pamphlets and booklets . . .".

[30] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) agreed with the arguments put forward by the Australian delegate. He thought, however, that it would be necessary to allot a portion of the sum provided for the publication of pamphlets to cover the cost of liaison work to secure the collaboration of technicians. He therefore suggested that, in the Budget Estimates, the sum of $4,000 mentioned in paragraph v on page 119 [document 5C/5 (II)] should be replaced by $2,000 to be spent on the work in question.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) agreed to Professor Auger's proposal.

[31] The United States amendment to delete item 2.114 was *rejected* by 26 votes to 5.

[32] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) felt that, if the pamphlets and booklets for schools were intended to describe general methods and not the particular conditions obtaining in each country, they should still be published.

Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) and Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) also stressed that the Executive Board's proposal was of general interest.

[33] The amendment proposed by the Australian delegation was *rejected* by 17 votes to 11.

Item 2.114 was therefore *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 2.115.

[34] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) emphasized the principle involved in this proposal. If it were accepted, it would be difficult to refuse similar requests put forward in the future by organizations in other countries.

[35] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) thought that the uses to which the money could be put should be specified. In his view, it should be restricted to paying the costs of sending experts to distant parts of the world.

[36] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia), supporting this proposal, explained that the conference in question was to discuss genetics, a subject in which Australia was vitally interested. The money could be used to pay the expenses of experts undertaking the long journey from Europe or North America.

[37] Dr. RABI (United States of America) said that, in view of the Conference's decision to con-

1. In final form: Resol. 2.124.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.125.

centrate the programme, his delegation was opposed to the holding of regional meetings unless they formed a part of the larger Unesco Programme. As that did not appear to be the case in this instance, he would oppose the adoption of the item.

[38] Professor OZORIO DE ALMEIDA (Brazil) agreed with the Australian view, and emphasized the special scientific interest of the rich and varied fauna of Australia.

[39] Item 2.115 was *adopted* unchanged[1] by 20 votes to 5, subject to the examination of its budgetary implications.

Item 2.121.

[40] The CHAIRMAN having assured Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) that his vote would not prejudice his future attitude to the Unesco Coupon Scheme, item 2.121 was *adopted* unchanged.[2]

Item 2.131.

[41] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) opposed the whole work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 123, paragraph II] doubting whether the subject was as yet sufficiently developed. Mechanical, and in particular electronic, devices were still in the process of development and change, and he doubted whether a stage had yet been reached which would justify calling a five-day conference. This was in any case too short a time to permit the drawing up of a standardized code on a subject so complex, on which there was still so little information available.

Item 2.131, together with the corresponding work plan, were *adopted* by 18 votes to 7.[3]

Item 2.132.

[42] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that Unesco had already set up three special committees dealing respectively with physics, biology and medical sciences, and the engineering sciences. A fourth committee to deal with chemistry was being established. Finally, the Secretariat was already in touch with FAO with a view to setting up a committee on applied biology. Each of these committees was apparently to meet every two years. The committee on physics was to meet in 1950, and those on biology and medical sciences and the engineering sciences in 1951. It was not expected that the other two committees would be able to meet before 1952. Professor Auger thought that it would be possible to secure world-wide co-ordination of all those activities in a way satisfactory to everyone.

Item 2.132 was *adopted*.[1]

Item 2.133.

[43] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) explained that the International Conference on Science Abstracting had included representatives of all countries and international unions concerned. They had set up a provisional Advisory Committee to advise Unesco on how to implement the Conference recommendations. The life of this Committee had been limited to twelve months after the publication of the report, but it now seemed that the report would not be ready until about September. Several countries, including his own, were not prepared to take action on the recommendations until they had received the final report.

He therefore proposed that the following words should be added to the text of item 2.133: ". . . and to make arrangements for a meeting of the provisional Advisory Committee for the Co-ordination of Abstracts during 1951".

The proposal was seconded by the delegate of the UNITED KINGDOM.

In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) added that he anticipated the cost of his proposal at approximately $5,000.

[44] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) apologized for the fact that the final report of the Sub-Committee on Medical and Biological Sciences had not yet been published; he thought it would be brought out in a few months' time and that a final meeting of the Committee set up in 1948 might then be considered; in the circumstances, a sum of $4,000 should be added to the estimated amount ([document 5C/5 (II), page 123, paragraph IV].

The Australian amendment was *adopted*.

Item 2.133, thus amended, was *adopted*.[2]

Items 2.141 and 2.142.

[45] Refering to item 2.141, Mr. PAGE (Canada) observed that this was a problem which had been studied for years by the appropriate scientific groups, and he therefore proposed amending the opening words of the item to: "to stimulate the collection and circulation . . .". He thought that this change might possibly involve a reduction in the budget.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) wished a similar amendment to be made to item 2.142.

[46] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) pointed out that

1. In final form: Resol. 2.126.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.13.
3. In final form: Resol. 2.141.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.142.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.143.

the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 123, paragraph v] referred to medicine and biology, whereas there was no specific definition in the resolution. He therefore suggested the inclusion of a reference to the Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences. He agreed with the delegate of Canada that this amendment would tend to save money.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) gave his wholehearted support to that proposal.

[47] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) observed that, if the item were amended as proposed by the Canadian delegation, Unesco would be unable to do any practical work itself and item 2.141 would therefore become useless. Moreover, the budgetary saving would be only $1,000.

The Canadian amendment was *rejected* by 16 votes to 11.

[48] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) still thought that the activities proposed in the original resolution were not a task for Unesco, so much as for the Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences. He proposed amending item 2.141 by the addition of the words "to arrange for the collection and circulation . . .".

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the difference between this and the preceding draft amendment was that the Australian proposal would mean that Unesco would pay for the project.

[49] Mr. MONTEL (France) proposed the following amendment: "to assist in standardizing and spreading wider knowledge of internationally approved scientific terms".

[50] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) regretted that he was unable to accept the French amendment, since there were twenty-two other scientific items left for discussion, and he feared that, if the Commission accepted this, they would be involved all along the line.

In reply to an observation from Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) said that there was no question of weakening the resolution, but of referring a specialized question to a specialized body.

The Australian amendment, seconded by Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan), was *adopted* by 14 votes to 10.

Thus amended, item 2.141 was *adopted* without opposition.[1]

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

1 In final form: Resol. 2.151.

SIXTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

2. Natural Sciences (*continued*).

SECTION 2.1 *(continued)* (DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION).

Item 2.142.

[1] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) enquired who had asked for the preparation of interlingual dictionaries on electronics and stationary power plants, and which body was to produce them.

[2] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) replied that the number of subjects which the interlingual dictionaries could cover was obviously very large, but, for the time being, it had been necessary to restrict them to two subjects, selected after consultation with the Committee on Engineering Sciences.

Professor Auger explained that the words "to arrange for the preparation" indicated that the dictionaries would be prepared with the help of existing organizations. For the dictionary on stationary power plants, Unesco would apply to the World Power Conference, and for the dictionary on electronics, to two or three international electricity organizations which would

certainly be able to carry out the work. He assured the delegate of Australia that Unesco would seek all necessary advice and would select a well-established body in which full confidence could be placed.

[3] Mr. PAGE (Canada) asked whether Unesco had investigated the possibility of having the interlingual dictionaries prepared by private firms on a non profit-making basis.

[4] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) pointed out that item 2.142 provided only for the preparation of the dictionaries, as Unesco intended to have them published by a commercial firm. He quite agreed with Mr. Page that it would be a paying concern which would certainly meet with considerable success and that, in those circumstances, Unesco should have no difficulty in finding a publisher.

[5] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) stressed the importance and urgency of the problem, which would also arise in connexion with other sciences. He agreed with Professor Auger that the project was a tentative one and that projects in other spheres should be undertaken only after mature consideration. He would therefore vote against the adoption of item 2.142.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) entirely endorsed that point of view.

[6] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) observed that the dictionaries would fill an urgent need, especially in countries whose languages were not very rich in modern terminology. In that connexion, he asked in how many languages it was intended to publish the dictionaries.

[7] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) replied that the Committee on Applied Sciences had thought that the dictionaries should be published in five languages, but Unesco was already studying a new formula which would make it possible to extend the dictionaries quite easily to a greater number of languages. Thus they would first be published in five languages and then extended to ten languages without much difficulty.

Item 2.142 was *adopted* by 13 votes to 4.[1]

The corresponding budget estimates [document 5C/5 (II), page 123, paragraph VI] were *adopted*.

Item 2.151.

[8] While supporting the continued backing of the Field Science Co-operation Offices and recognizing the benefit accruing to the areas concerned, Mr. PAGE (Canada) feared that the extension of the system might result in offices serving one or two countries only, instead of an entire region. He suggested that the offices be regarded, not as permanent establishments, but as temporary liaison centres pending the development of services within the countries concerned. Had that aspect been considered, particularly in relation to the development of scientific services?

[9] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) agreed that the original conception of field science co-operation offices should be maintained, and that care should be taken not to allow them to multiply unduly, but he did not think that there was yet any real danger of their being transformed into national centres, as there was only one branch for the whole of Latin America, and only two for the Middle East. Five regional offices for the whole world were not excessive, and two or three branches could be added to each of them, without incurring the danger of changing their original character.

[10] Dr. RABI (United States of America) asked whether there were any plans for making the offices self-supporting by raising contributions in the areas which they served.

[11] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL hoped that special attention would be given to the resolution, which he considered extremely important, in view of the immense value to Unesco of the field science co-operation offices, which constituted an excellent basis for technical assistance, although they had not hitherto functioned as effectively as they might have done, owing to lack of staff. If economies could be made in other parts of the programme, the Director-General would strongly advise an increase in the funds for that resolution, in order to strengthen the action of the field science co-operation offices.

[12] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) explained that, as Unesco was not a regional organization, the field science co-operation offices were really an extension of the Secretariat, upon which they were entirely dependent. The countries in which they were situated, however, were already contributing, to some extent, to their functioning, as they had placed free premises at their disposal and obtained travel and other valuable facilities for Unesco agents working in the offices; in certain countries, they were even granted diplomatic privileges. Professor Auger regarded the conferring of privileges of different kinds as a contribution to the running of the offices, and he hoped that the example would be followed by

1. In final form: Resol. 2.152.

all countries having a field science-co-operation office on their territory.

[13] Professor DUSHKIN (Israel) stressed the value of the work carried on by the Director-General and Professor Auger, which Israel had been able to appreciate from its close relations with the Istanbul branch.

[14] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) agreed and said that his delegation would welcome the suppression of other items of the programme so that funds could be made available for the implementation and extension of item 2.151.

[15] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) appreciated the extremely useful and fruitful work of the field science co-operation offices (particularly the one in Latin America). If the results which they obtained were not greater, it was only because they had to cover such a vast expanse of territory. Although he did not suggest an increase in the number of offices in Latin America, Professor Carneiro stressed the fact that the field science co-operation offices were not numerous enough to meet all needs, and that there should therefore be no question of curtailing their means of action in any way. He seconded the Director-General's suggestion that the funds allocated to the offices should be increased as much as possible.

Professor Carneiro further pointed out that there did not seem to be any co-ordination of the work of the field science co-operation offices with that of National Commissions; he thought that Unesco should invite its National Commissions to collaborate more closely with them, and asked the Director-General for more information on that point.

[16] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL repeated that he would be very glad for field science co-operation offices, whose work was so useful to Unesco as a whole, to receive additional funds. These might be taken from other parts of the programme, in accordance with the principle of concentrating activities, which the current Conference had agreed to adopt. The present achievements of the offices gave only a small idea of what they might be able to do in the future, and their activities should be expanded by increasing their staff.

Replying to the delegate of Brazil, the Director-General assured him that the co-operation offices would receive the necessary instructions, enabling them to work in collaboration with National Commissions; but the collaboration was bound to be limited to some extent, as it was not always possible to wait for the agreement of National Commissions when rapid action was required. The Director-General suggested that the Conference should address a recommendation to Member States, requesting them to ensure that their particular field science co-operation office received the active support of their National Commission.

[17] Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) observed that the climate varied very greatly from region to region in South America and that each region had its own needs; hitherto, there had been no field science co-operation office for the tropical zone, since the Latin American office was situated in the temperate zone. He therefore suggested that Unesco should consider opening a branch in Venezuela or Colombia.

[18] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) warmly supported the view that more centres and branches should be set up. The existing offices for the whole of Asia—at New Delhi and Nankin—were widely separated and inadequate to cover the whole of the continent. There were also regions without offices whose problems were quite different from those arising near the existing regional office. The heavy monsoon region, for instance, presented characteristic problems which could not be satisfactorily dealt with from New Delhi and Nankin. If it was Unesco's intention to establish a Field Science Co-operation Office in that region, he could assure the Organization that every facility would be granted.

[19] Mr. AKVERDI (Turkey) stated that the Istanbul office was extremely satisfactory and worked in close liaison with his country's National Commission.

[20] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that he had promised the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination between the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, at its recent meeting in Paris, that he would inform the General Conference that a final decision on the new office for South East Asia should not be taken before consulting the Committee on Co-ordination, in order to avoid the opening of offices by the different Specialized Agencies without any co-ordination.

[21] In view of the statement made by the Director-General and the opinions expressed in the Commission, Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) moved that:

If funds could be found by the suppression of other parts of the Programme, they should be allotted to extend that project.

[22] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) seconded the motion and quoted the proverb—the word of the night is cancelled by the day—to suggest that, if the United Kingdom motion were adopted the pre-

vious decisions of the Commission would have to be reconsidered.

On hearing the ruling of the CHAIRMAN that no reconsideration of earlier decisions was possible at that time unless such was the express wish of the Commission, Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) enquired on what basis it would be possible for the meeting to approve the United Kingdom motion.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the United Kingdom motion could be adopted on the assumption that the Commission would ultimately review its decisions.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) stressed the need for a revaluation of the Programme resolutions to be entrusted to a special sub-committee which would confine its study to the basic issues.

[23] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) considered that, while the development of Field Science Cooperation Offices might be advisable, the meeting should not lose sight of the necessity for keeping a just balance between the various parts of the Programme.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there would be an opportunity to reconsider the provisional decisions taken, although it was not possible to proceed to such reconsideration at once.

[24] Professor SEVERI (Italy) noted with regret that the adoption of programme resolutions usually depended upon their budgetary implications which could not be judged properly without seeing the whole thing in perspective and being able to compare the relative importance of each resolution. He recalled that he had asked the Commission to propose that the General Conference should authorize the Director-General to list the resolutions in order of priority. In his opinion, the budgetary implications should be discussed only after all the resolutions had been examined, at a time when it was possible to have a general view of the Programme.

[25] The CHAIRMAN replied that the budgetary implications should be considered at the same time as the relevant programme resolutions and that the Commission would not be infringing any rules if it submitted a resolution to the General Conference requesting the Director-General to set up a list of priorities within the programme.

[26] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the United Kingdom motion was one to which, if adopted, the following procedure could be applied: the Budget Committee would note the desire of the Programme and Budget Commission that a larger proportion of the funds be set aside for the work under item 2.151, and make a statement to that effect when reporting back to the Commission.

It would, however, be useful for the Budget Committee to have a figure to guide it in its estimates.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the United Kingdom motion involved cuts as well as increases. Accordingly, he suggested that, if the procedure suggested by Sir John Maud were adopted, Dr. Jamali's point of view should be taken into account when the Budget Committee had made its report.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) approved that suggestion.

[27] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) seconded the suggestion by the delegate of Venezuela, and proposed that item 2.152 should be amended to allow for the establishment of new regional offices in South East Asia and in the North of South America.

[28] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was in favour of strengthening existing offices, rather than of increasing the number of branches; he thought it better to concentrate efforts on existing offices, increasing their efficiency to the fullest possible extent, rather than running the risk of wasting money on the establishment of small offices which would not be very effective.

Mr. GHIKAS (Greece) seconded the Director-General's remarks.

[29] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) thought, from his knowledge of the debates of the Budget Committee, that the sum of money required would not be forthcoming for the year 1951.

In order to prevent the intention behind the United Kingdom motion from being lost, he suggested that, for the information of the Director-General, the meeting record its wish that he consider the question of new branch offices and submit, in the 1952 Programme, proposals for the extension of the scheme.

[30] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) nevertheless felt obliged to maintain his motion. He was not altogether convinced that a useful purpose would be served by indicating a figure at that stage but, in deference to the wishes of Sir John Maud, he would suggest a maximum increase of 10% of the present figure.

[31] The CHAIRMAN gave the final text of the United Kingdom motion as follows:

That if funds can be found from other parts of the Budget by the suppression of proposed resolutions, they should be allotted to extend the application of resolution 2.151 and that the total additional sum should not exceed $2,500.

The motion was *adopted*, on the understanding that the Budget Committee would be informed.

[32] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) wondered whether it was for the Programme and Budget Commission or for the Budget Committee to make economies which might be used for the co-operation offices.

[33] Mr. MONTEL (France) would support any proposal which aimed at making the field science co-operation offices more effective by increasing their staff and improving their equipment.

[34] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the United Kingdom motion just carried did not affect the text of resolution 2.151. He requested the delegate of Italy not to press his point.

[35] Professor SEVERI (Italy) recalled his proposal, made on account of financial difficulties, that the Director-General should be authorized to list the resolutions in order of priority, in order to select the most interesting and postpone those which seemed less urgent.

[36] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked Professor Severi for his proposal, but explained that such a method could not be applied immediately, as it was impossible for the task to be carried out without consulting the Executive Board, and the priority list could not be ready until several months after the General Conference. Yet it was essential that the Secretariat should have the necessary instructions at the end of the Session, and it would therefore be desirable for the Programme and Budget Commission itself to take decisions. It was for those reasons that the Director-General requested Professor Severi not to press his proposal, so that the Secretariat might have the list of priorities at the end of the Conference.

[37] Professor SEVERI (Italy) withdrew his proposal, as the Director-General seemed to think that the method he had advocated could be applied in the future, if experience proved it to be necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) intimated that he would not press his point either.

Item 2.151 was then *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Items 2.1511 to 2.1514.

[38] On the CHAIRMAN'S suggestion that items 2.1511 to 2.1514 were all closely bound up with item 2.151, those items were *adopted* without comment.[2]

Item 2.152.

[39] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia), enquired where the new office for South East Asia was to be set up.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that he had promised to take no decision in the matter without prior consultation with the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, and he asked the Commission to consider only the principle of the resolution, without deciding upon the exact location of the office.

[40] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) suggested that, when the question of the site of any new branch for South East Asia came up for discussion, the possibility of locating the branch in Indonesia should be considered, in view of the importance of that area in international affairs.

[41] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) thought it premature to ask the Director-General to consider creating new branches. Unesco's effort should not be dissipated and existing offices should be strengthened before the Organization embarked on new ventures in that field.

[42] In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN as to the scope of his objections to item 2.152, Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) explained that he thought the time was not ripe for the creation of new branches of existing offices.

[43] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that it was not proposed to "create", but to "consider the creation", of new branches. He repeated that he thought it preferable to improve existing offices, rather than to create new ones. If, however, the Commission thought that new offices should be created, for the time being it could only request the General Conference to study the question at its next session.

[44] Mr. MONTEL (France) proposed the insertion of the following sentence in resolution 2.152: "as soon as existing offices are adequately équipped".

[45] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that it was difficult to tell exactly when an office was sufficiently equipped, and he feared that the introduction of the sentence would entail an unnecessary delay in certain cases. He was satisfied that the Executive Board's wording was flexible enough and he advised the Commission not to change it.

Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) agreed not to press his point, in view of the remarks of the Director-General.

Mr. MONTEL (France) also agreed with the Director-General and withdrew his proposal.

[46] Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela), returning to his earlier suggestion: as there was

1. In final form: Resol. 2.161.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.1611 tot 2.1614.

no branch for the tropical zone, he proposed that the following words should be added at the end of resolution 2.152: "especially in the northern part of South America".

[47] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) asked whether the creation of a new office in Latin America would mean the dropping of the plan to open an office in South East Asia.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Director-General was only to *consider* the creation of new branches of existing offices "especially in the northern part of South America" and that the matter would be raised at a subsequent session of the Conference.

[48] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) stressed the advantages of creating a new auxiliary office in the northern part of South America: the single office in Montevideo had to cover a vast area, which entailed heavy travelling expenses; consequently, he did not believe that the opening of a new office would mean any considerable increase in expenditure. Although he did not ask for an immediate decision, Professor Carneiro hoped that the matter would be given due consideration.

[49] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) felt that any decision on the matter would be premature, especially as it would be raised again.

[50] Item 2.152, with the amendment proposed by the delegate of Venezuela, was *adopted* by 19 votes to 8.[1]

New item.

[51] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled his former suggestion, made in reply to the earlier remarks of the delegate of Brazil on the subject of National Commissions. As well as giving precise instructions to the effect that co-operation offices should collaborate with National Commissions, the Director-General considered that it would be advisable to address a recommendation to Member States, which would be particularly effective at a time when it was proposed to increase the funds allocated to the offices. The recommendation might be drafted in the following terms:

Member States in regions where field science co-operation offices are situated are invited to collaborate with them as closely as possible in their work.

Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) moved the adoption of that wording.

The motion was seconded by the delegates of IRAQ, URUGUAY, ECUADOR, GREECE and *adopted* without opposition.[1]

BUDGET TABLES III.2.B (1) and (2) and III.2.C (1) and (2) [document 5C/5 (II), pages 115-116, 121-122, 126-127, 129-130].

[52] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) thought that a saving could be effected on the sum of $12,000 "to be used to obtain the services of outstanding scientists in setting up the office" (page 132, paragraph 11): as Unesco had some previous experience in such ventures and as the adjacent countries would probably be willing to make their experts available, he thought that the sum could be halved.

Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) explained that the figure of $12,000 represented the salary of the two people who were to set up the office and run it during the first years.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) replied that such had not been his impression. He had thought that the salaries of the two scientists had been provided for under the heading of Personnel.

The budget tables corresponding to section 2.1 of the Programme were *adopted*, on the understanding that the matter would be referred to the Budget Committee.

SECTION 2.2 (ASSISTANCE TO RESEARCH FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF MANKIND).

Draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation [document 5C/58].

[53] In presenting the resolution, Dr. RABI (United States of America) expressed a certain diffidence, as his delegation was acutely aware that in certain fields of research the United States and perhaps the United Kingdom held almost a monopoly.

The resolution was primarily intended to help countries which had previously made great contributions to science to go on doing so when financial circumstances would otherwise have prevented them from contributing further. He did not intend to suggest that Unesco run a laboratory; he realized that would not be within its Programme. He thought that the creation of a centre in Europe where many experts in the various branches of science were available would be a small beginning which might give the impetus to the creation of similar centres in other parts of the world. The initial venture might take place in the field of physics, with which Professor

1. In final form: Resol. 2.162.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.163.

Auger was particularly well acquainted, and in which he would know what assistance he could obtain from his staff inside Unesco, thus calling for a minimum of outside assistance and consequently a minimum of expense. He thought some $5,000 should suffice.

[54] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) informed the meeting that, in view of the additional expenditure which would be required for the year 1951, the Board had decided that the final decision on the inclusion of the project in the Programme for that year must rest with the Programme and Budget Commission.

[55] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) warmly supported the United States motion. He drew attention to the difference between a centre serving science, like the high altitude station on the Jungfraujoch, and centres serving areas less developed in scientific research.

He particularly approved of the choice of Western Europe as the site for such a centre, as Western European science was seriously hampered by the financial situation.

He thought that the financial side of the project would be more satisfactory if some of the ECA. funds, available only in that area, were used to meet the expense.

[56] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) pointed out that the last sentence of the United States draft resolution seemed to be in direct contradiction with resolution 2.25 proposed by the Executive Board in document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum 2.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained that the two cases were different. He suggested that the meeting should concentrate on the United States draft resolution and consider Addendum 2 separately.

[57] Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) pointed out that draft resolution 2.25 concerned the transfer of funds allocated by Unesco to services dependent upon international scientific unions, which, under the new directives governing the allocation of grants-in-aid, were no longer eligible to receive such grants. To enable those services to continue their work, therefore, it had been necessary to add a resolution authorizing Unesco to supply them with funds hitherto allocated in the form of grants-in-aid. It was therefore not a question of a new project, but merely of a change in the method of allocating funds.

Resolution 2.25 was not connected in any way with the United States' proposal for the creation of a research centre.

[58] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) had understood that the institutes of scientific unions would receive subsidies and those set up under the United States resolution would not; however, that was not so.

[59] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) warmly supported the United States proposal and the remarks made by Dr. Rabi in presenting it. He suggested that, from the point of view of science itself, it was less important that such centres should be created than that scientists should have the opportunity to collaborate to the fullest. He further considered the resolution to be in complete harmony with Unesco's main Programme.

[60] Professor SEVERI (Italy) warmly supported the proposal of the United States delegation. He agreed that the proposed European international research centre might serve as a model for other centres which might subsequently be set up in other parts of the world.

Without wishing to make any formal proposal, he expressed the hope that, in carrying out such a noble project, Unesco would not forget certain national institutes and research centres already existing in Europe, which, at a very low cost, might be transformed into international centres.

[61] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) fully supported the proposal of the United States delegation, as well as the views expressed by the Swiss delegate. He considered it a very important experiment which might serve as a model for future centres.

The proposal of the United States delegation [document 5C/58] was *adopted* unanimously,[1] and it was *agreed* to refer it to the Budget Committee.

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/35].

[62] Professor COLONNETTI (Italy) explained that the aim of the proposal was to establish international relations between research centres in different parts of Europe which had not hitherto managed to make bilateral arrangements for the exchange of persons and documentation.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board could not support such an addition to the 1951 Programme, and he suggested that the Director-General should study the question, which might be taken up again later.

In response to Sir John Maud's suggestion, Professor COLONNETTI (Italy) withdrew his proposal.

---

1. In final form: Resol. 2.21.

Item 2.21. Draft amendment submitted by the Italian delegation [document 5C/34].

[63] Professor SEVERI (Italy) read a new text, which he suggested as a substitute for the proposal made by his delegation in document 5C/34:

At the appropriate time, to convene a conference for the setting up of an International Computation Centre on the specific lines proposed by the International Mathematical Union, which is to hold an international congress at Cambridge (Massachusetts) in September of this year.

Professor Severi observed that the proposal had no budgetary implications. Before taking any definite decisions, he thought that it would be better to wait until the International Mathematical Union had been re-established, and the Congress had considered the proposal.

[64] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) hoped that the meeting would not urge the Chairman to alter the text of the Board's proposal. The study of international computation centres should be continued after the congress at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Professor SEVERI (Italy) was satisfied by the declaration of the Chairman of the Executive Board and would not press his proposal for a change of wording.

[65] Mr. MONTEL (France) agreed with the Chairman of the Executive Board, but suggested the substitution of the word "mathematical" for "computation", as it was not a question of a conference on applied mathematics.

Professor SEVERI (Italy) had no objection to the deletion of the word "computation", as he considered that "mathematical" covered both pure and applied mathematics.

Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) pointed out that resolution 2.21 referred to work which had been initiated by the Economic and Social Council and which was being carried out by Unesco in collaboration with the United Nations. The word "computation" should be retained, as it appeared in all United Nations documents.

[66] In that case, Mr. MONTEL (France) wondered whether it was necessary to await the decisions of the Cambridge Congress, since the latter would be concerned exclusively with pure mathematics.

Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) explained that the International Mathematical Union was to be formed in October 1950, while resolution 2.21 provided for the continuation of the study of the project in 1951; the Union set up in 1950 would of course be consulted in 1951, when the study of the project was continued.

[67] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) suggested that the word "international" raised difficulties with regard to the expense and the means of financing the centre. As more than one centre would ultimately be required, he considered that the countries benefiting directly from the provision of the centre should contribute towards its upkeep. He moved:

That the Director-General is authorized to investigate the possibility of obtaining the collaboration of European Member States and of appropriate national and international organizations in the establishment of a regional computation centre in Europe.

In that way, the creation of the centre would carry a minimum of budgetary implications.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested that the representative of the United Nations should be asked to state his Organization's views on a matter in which Unesco had always worked in close collaboration with the United Nations.

[68] Mr. DURÁN (United Nations) announced that the Committee of Experts set up by the Economic and Social Council had prepared a report on the subject, which would be considered at the Council's next session. The report contained a recommendation for the establishment of a Computation Centre, a Brain Centre and a Social Sciences Institute; it gave second priority to four other laboratories, on the strength of reports submitted to it by Unesco.

The details of the financing of the institutes and laboratories had not yet been settled, as the Economic and Social Council intended to convene, in 1951, a conference on the basic sciences at which those questions would be considered.

Referring to the United States draft amendment in document 5C/64, Mr. Durán emphasized that that Committee had informed the Economic and Social Council that it considered questions relating to the Computation Centre and to a certain number of other laboratories quite obviously to be within Unesco's competence and that, consequently, it was for that Organization to take the main responsibility for the continuation of the work. Mr. Durán therefore feared that the Economic and Social Council might be somewhat disconcerted if Unesco's General Conference decided to refer the matter back to it.

[69] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) agreed in part with Mr. Cummins and in part with Dr. Rabi. He proposed that Mr. Cummins's text should make specific mention of a centre for *Western* Europe, and proposed the addition of the words

"and to appoint a group of experts to advise the Economic and Social Council at its next meeting".

[70] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) thought that the proposed name of the centre in English was misleading. Routine calculation was only an accessory part of its work, which was to consist of applying mathematics to other sciences throughout the world. He suggested that the centre be called an "International Centre for the Application of Mathematics". Without the word "application" its scope would be too wide.

With regard to the Italian proposal [document 5C/34], Professor Nielsen agreed that the conference envisaged should not be held before the establishment of the New International Mathematical Union. He felt that Unesco should not hand over the initiative in the matter of the centre either to the Economic and Social Council or to the new Union.

[71] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) felt some uneasiness about the projects for scientific institutes of Unesco, which he had not experienced with regard to the proposal made by Dr. Rabi, because that project was coupled with a man's name. He felt that the first step in setting up an institute was to find a scientist to take the lead; otherwise probably nothing would be done. He therefore recommended that the Director-General should be asked, as an initial step in the execution of these projects, to seek the advice of scientists with a view to finding suitable persons to direct the institutes.

[72] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) did not think that Unesco could be considered merely as a scientific institute, as its principal aim was not only to advance science, but to diffuse scientific knowledge to countries in need of assistance. He thought that the setting up of a computation centre in India would enable contact to be established with scientists far away from any centre of civilization. He hoped that Unesco would try to discover what its real duties were, and would not be satisfied with carrying out the programme of a scientific institute.

[73] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India), supported by Dr. RABI (United States of America), thought that the Netherlands and Australian amendments were already covered by the United States proposal. If, however, it was proposed to set up a centre subsidized by Unesco in a specific geographical area, he would oppose it because it would hamper Unesco's freedom of decision.

[74] Professor SEVERI (Italy) observed that the International Computation Centre would only survive if it were set up in a place where there was a mathematical tradition. The idea of an international centre should be retained; he did not believe that regional centres would produce satisfactory results.

In view of the stage reached in mathematical sciences, it should be possible to find not one, but several, persons capable of directing such an institution; it had to be remembered that similar centres existed, and were already run on an international basis, in England, France and Italy.

In conclusion, Professor Severi strongly recommended the adoption of item 2.21.

[75] The CHAIRMAN ruled that item 2.21 should be taken with the Australian draft resolution.

[76] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) raised a point of order, requesting that item 2.21 (providing for the setting up, in collaboration with the United Nations, of an *international* computation centre) should be dissociated from the United States proposal (for the creation of a *regional* centre). The two projects were entirely separate and had nothing in common.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) stated that he considered his draft resolution as an amendment to item 2.21.

[77] Professor Carneiro's proposal that the two resolutions should be considered separately was *adopted* by 16 votes to 3.

The Australian draft resolution was *rejected* by 12 votes to 9.

[78] The CHAIRMAN put the Netherlands motion to the meeting.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that the appointment of a group of experts would entail budgetary implications for which allowance had not been made in the Budget Estimates.

The Netherlands motion was *rejected.*

[79] The CHAIRMAN put item 2.21 to the meeting.

Professor AUGER (Director, Natural Sciences Department) pointed out that the Commission was only required to decide upon the principle. It would be for the conference, which was to be convened in collaboration with the United Nations, to decide upon the location and organization of the future institution.

[80] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) formally moved his previous suggestion.

Dr. RABI (United States of America), with whom Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) agreed, observed that the suggested change of title would involve a complete change in the nature of the proposed institution.

The CHAIRMAN suspended the discussion until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

2. Natural Sciences (*continued*).

SECTION 2.2 (*continued*). (ASSISTANCE TO RESEARCH FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF MANKIND).

Item 2.21 (continued).

[1] In the interests of speeding up the Commission's work, Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) agreed to withdraw his earlier proposal, but thought an explanation might be useful for those who had been unable to follow the development of the question. After the Session of the General Conference which had instructed the Director-General to pursue the plan, the Committee on Unesco of the National Research Council in the United States had set up a Sub-Committee which prepared a most inspired report, to which the Director-General drew the attention of Member States, with a request for comments. This step was endorsed at the Fourth Session of the General Conference.

In its report, the Sub-Committee in question had suggested that the proposed institute should not confine itself to routine work in computation, but that its principal task should be to foster and develop the mathematical theory behind modern computation; to adapt the problems of pure and applied mathematics to the new and powerful tools of the day and to collect and publish the results. In order to avoid any overlapping and because the action recommended was not sufficiently covered by the name "International Computation Centre", the Sub-Committee of United States experts proposed that it might more properly be called the "International Mathematical Statistical Consulting Centre".

Professor Nielsen considered that the important point was not the name of the body, but that it should develop along the lines which had characterized it during recent years.

[2] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) said that his delegation, like several others, had doubts as to the objectives of the Centre and its relationship to the United Nations: they had understood that it was intended to be a United Nations scientific centre, but it appeared that that was not in fact the intention, and Mr. Cummins therefore asked for an explanation.

[3] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) remarked that he had intended to support the motion, in the belief that it was a question of a computation centre, to which mathematicians could send their formulae to be turned into numbers. He considered that to be an admirable project and truly international. But if the Centre was to be for the development of a certain branch of mathematics, whether pure or applied, then he submitted that it would be a waste of Unesco's money; it was extremely questionable whether it was desirable at all to have such an institution. If that was the conception of the International Computation Centre, the United Kingdom delegation would oppose the motion.

[4] Mr. MONTEL (France) thought, after the explanations already given, that it would be a question of establishing a centre where mathematicians could resolve among themselves the problems submitted to them. Once agreement had been reached on mathematical solutions, machines would permit the formulae to be turned into numbers.

[5] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that a Committee of Experts established by the United Nations and Unesco had, among other things, examined the functions and constitution of the computation centre in question. The Committee of Experts had, in fact, envisaged an institute, as conceived by Mr. Montel, where chemical, biological and statistical problems would be expressed in equations and then entrusted to machines; the results of the computations would then be applied in various fields of science. For the Committee it had never been a question of an international organization. It was only after an agreement had been reached on its constitution and functions that it would be necessary to examine the problem of financing it.

[6] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) said that he had misunderstood the purpose of the resolution, thinking

that the Centre would deal with statistics. He asked whether it was urgent to continue the sudy for the setting up of the Centre.

Dr. RABI (United States of America) thought the matter had been discussed long enough and far beyond its importance. He moved that a vote should be taken.

[7] The CHAIRMAN said that his first impression had been confirmed: the objects of the centre had not yet formed the subject of any precise agreement. Would it not be possible to clarify the situation by asking representatives of the countries most concerned to meet together in order to reach a final agreement?

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it unnecessary, for such a meeting could do no more than carry out the task which would be entrusted to the conference envisaged in item 2.21.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the majority of delegations were agreed on that point.

Resolution 2.21 was *adopted* unchanged by 22 votes to 2.[1]

Items 2.22 and 2.23. Draft amendment presented by the United States delegation [document 5C/64, item 3].

[8] The draft amendment was seconded by the delegates of CANADA and the PHILIPPINES.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) had no comments to make.

[9] In answer to a question by Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained the possible consequences of adopting item 2.22 on the one hand, and the United States amendment, on the other.

The adoption of item 2.22 would enable the International Institute of the Arid Zone to begin to function in 1951 and encourage the exploitation of the arid and semi-arid zones by bringing the different national institutes into contact with one another.

The United States amendment would involve transmitting the general problem to the Economic and Social Council. However interested the Council might be, it could do no more than entrust the task to FAO or to Unesco, so that even in 1952 no positive steps would have been taken.

[10] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) asked whether the United States delegation knew of services or agencies which could give the benefit of their experience to countries who needed it.

Dr. RABI (United States of America) had understood Professor Auger to say that Unesco did not intend to do anything in the matter except consult agencies that already existed. Clearly, with $14,000, not very much research could be done on such a difficult problem as the Arid Zones. He was sure the bodies already engaged on such work would be very pleased to give information. Dr. Rabi did not see how Unesco could help to solve the problem, which he felt was quite outside its field.

[11] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) opposed the view of the United States delegation. Most problems connected with the development of the Arid Zones were still of a fundamental nature and could not be left to those concerned with applied research. The speaker therefore asked for the retention of the original resolution.

[12] Dr. KRISHNAN (India) believed that both item 2.22 and the United States draft amendment concurred regarding the importance of research and development of the Arid Zones, although the available financial resources were inadequate. The main difference between the proposals was that one suggested that the work should be sponsored by Unesco, and the other by the Economic and Social Council; in either case, there would have to be collaboration between the two. Dr. Krishnan proposed the adoption of the text proposed by the Executive Board.

[13] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation was interested in the problem and was inclined to favour the project, although they would require more definite information on its cost before giving their unqualified approval. They were not satisfied, however, that the project fell within the framerwork of Unesco; as the matter came within the purview of a number of Specialized Agencies, it should be coordinated through Ecosoc. If Ecosoc recommended that Unesco should undertake the work, the South African delegation would be prepared to consider the proposal within that framework. It therefore supported the United States proposal.

[14] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) considered that the original text should be retained.

[15] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) had been present at the Committee of Experts on the Arid Zones; that Committee had not thought it necessary to set up an Institute immediately. Its view had been that, in its early stages, the proposed International Arid Zone Council should assist in coordinating and distributing information to the countries concerned. The Australian Delegation thought the question should be referred to Ecosoc of FAO because the problem was urgent and fundamental scientific research was not going to give assistance to those bodies very quickly. The

1. In final form: Resol. 2.22.

South African delegation therefore supported the United States proposal.

[16] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) emphasized the value of this project, to which the United Nations had given second priority in the list of international organizations to be established. He said that the experts of the countries having arid zones had unanimously declared in favour of the establishment of an international institute. Considering the extreme importance of the problem, it was necessary to adopt the most effective and most rapid procedure. Without taking a definite attitude, the Brazilian delegate merely wished to state that, as the United Nations representative had pointed out, it was Ecosoc which had taken the initiative of submitting the question to Unesco. It would therefore be rather surprising if Unesco referred it back to that Organization.

Mr. DURÁN (United Nations) had nothing to add to his statements at a previous meeting. It would indeed be disconcerting if the General Conference of Unesco were to send back to Ecosoc a question which had been expressly entrusted to Unesco by the Committee of Experts set up by Ecosoc to study the question of United Nations laboratories.

[17] The United States draft amendment [document 5C/64, item 3], seconded by the SOUTH AFRICAN and AUSTRALIAN delegates, was *rejected* by 14 votes to 9 with 1 abstention.

Item 2.22 was *adopted* by 21 votes to 2. [1]

Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Israel [document 5C/78].

[18] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) hoped that the Conference would agree to Unesco's sponsoring the symposium on the "conquest of the desert".

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) observed that the Board had no comment to make and that the proposal had no budgetary implications.

[19] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) was opposed to the proposal on political grounds.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Unesco was concerned solely with scientific and cultural questions, to the exclusion of all political considerations.

[20] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) remarked that the idea behind the Israeli proposal was an interesting one. He was completely in agreement with its principle; but it was a question of vital importance for the arid zones and therefore had the greatest interest for countries bordering on the Saharan, Egyptian and Arabian deserts. In those circumstances, the Egyptian delegate asked the Commission to examine whether, for obvious reasons of practical convenience, it would not be advisable to implement that proposal in some place other than the capital of the State of Israel, so as to enable countries directly concerned, such as Iraq and Egypt, to participate in it.

[21] Dr. RABI (United States of America) seconded the draft resolution, as the proposal carried no budgetary implications and the meeting was apparently a scientific one.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) also supported it.

ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) stated that the problem was of vital importance for most of the countries of the Middle East. He also thought that it was unnecessary to specify the place where the meeting should be organized. The essential point was to designate some place in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that, if the resolution had no budgetary implications for Unesco, it was precisely because the inviting State agreed to hear the cost of the meeting.

The Israeli draft resolution [document 5C/78] was *adopted* by 17 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions. [1]

Item 2.23

[22] On the proposal of the DIRECTOR-GENERAL, seconded by the delegations of CANADA, UNITED KINGDOM, PAKISTAN, EGYPT, PERSIA, YUGOSLAVIA, AFGHANISTAN and UNITED STATES of AMERICA, item 2.23 was *deleted*.

Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Sweden [document 5C/83].

[23] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) considered that an institute of meteorological research was highly desirable, and that the task of establishing it was beyond the capacity of any one country. The Swedish Government was very interested in promoting its establishment by every means, and had promised to take the responsibility for the initial costs with regard to housing, building and equipment. It had been thought that it would perhaps be found appropriate, and in conformity with the Basic Programme, to use Unesco as some sort of catalytic agent in the formation of that research centre; the delegation had asked that the Director-General be instructed to set up a small committee of experts to study the problem more closely and prepare a report to be submitted to Member States. However, Professor Düring had been impressed by the pleas for economy made in the Commission, and by the turn of the discussions on other proposed research centres. He therefore withdrew the proposal, hoping,

1. In final form: Resol. 2.23.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.231.

however, that other ways of discussing the question raised in document 5C/83 would be found.

Item 2.24

[24] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) thought that the publication of a handbook on such a subject as genetics would be extremely useful, but it would have to include a detailed bibliography of treatises already published on the question.

[25] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) observed that, if the intention was to publish a handbook on genetics, his delegation was in agreement; but, as item 2.24 was worded at present, it opened the door to demands from other sciences and even from the humanities as well. He therefore proposed that the text should not read "such as genetics", but "a handbook on genetics", and be quite clear on the matter.

[26] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) believed that the execution of that resolution would encounter the following dilemma: the preparation of the handbook would be entrusted either to an outstanding specialist in genetics—which would produce a one-sided statement of a particular point of view—or to a second-rate author lacking in talent. In both cases the results would be devoid of practical interest. Professor Piaget therefore proposed the deletion of item 2.24 and the transfer of the corresponding credits to the Field Science Co-operation Offices.

Professor DÜRING (Sweden) associated himself with Professor Piaget's remarks.

It was *agreed* to delete item 2.24.

Item 2.25 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.-Addendum 2].

[27] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained that the aim of the additional resolution was simply to continue in 1951 what was being done in 1950. A further resolution was necessary because the Directives governing payments to international non-governmental organizations had, in the view of the Board, to be changed in one respect; Sir John understood that this recommendation of the Board had met with some support, but such a change in the Directives would mean that certain work which the Board thought it desirable to continue in 1951 would have to stop, unless an additional resolution, item 2.25, was inserted in the 1951 Programme. The budgetary implications would be unchanged by the proposed alteration in the Directives governing relations with international non-governmental organizations and the consequent addition of a new item 2.25.

[28] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wondered if it would not be advisable to indicate clearly the organizations benefiting from such aid, in order to avoid giving an impression of instability and incoherence, and the necessity of answering an indefinite number of additional requests.

The CHAIRMAN proposed referring the new resolution to the Drafting Committee.

[29] As the Directives were still under consideration in the Official and External Relations Commission, Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) thought that it might be more appropriate if the matter were referred back to that Commission, which had not yet decided what classes of institution should be eligible for subventions; besides, those classes might be altered to provide for the conditions that were envisaged in item 2.25; a specific recommendation to that effect might be made to the Official and External Relations Commission.

The CHAIRMAN'S proposal was *adopted.*

BUDGET TABLE III.2.D. [document 5C/5 (II), page 134].

[30] *Adopted without comment.*

SECTION 2.3 (TEACHING AND POPULARIZATION OF SCIENCE).

[31] Commenting on the section as a whole, Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) pointed out that, in the draft Programme, there were four resolutions out of sixteen relating to the teaching of science; in the Programme as amended, that proportion had dropped to two out of eleven. The Australian delegation felt that the teaching of science in schools was one of the most important aspects of the popularization of science, and he asked the Commission to bear that fact in mind.

Item 2.31 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.-Addendum].

[32] The Executive Board's draft resolution was seconded by the delegates of IRAQ and PERSIA.

[33] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) recalled that the General Conference at its previous Session had adopted a resolution on the methods of teaching natural sciences in primary schools. In discussing item 2.31, it would be necessary to verify the manner in which that earlier resolution had been implemented. He therefore proposed adding the following words to the end of the text:

Member States are invited to communicate the results obtained in the execution of the decisions taken by the previous Session of the Conference concerning the method of teaching natural sciences in primary schools.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL having asked whether Anas Khan would be willing to withdraw his amendment if he were given an assurance that the

Committee of Experts would take his proposal into account, ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) agreed to withdraw his proposal.

Item 2.31 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev-Addendum] was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 2.31 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.]

Adopted without comment.[2]

Item 2.32.

[34] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was of opinion that item 2.32 belonged to the section on Education; he therefore moved that it should be transferred to chapter 1.

[35] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) observed that $2,400 had been allocated to the meeting of science teachers; that very small sum would be insufficient for more than a few teachers from very few countries. The subject proposed for study, in item 2.32 was a big one, he thought it would be better to deal with it in an international seminar of the kind Unesco was organizing. He therefore moved the deletion of item 2.32, and the transfer of the corresponding money to Field Science Co-operation Offices.

The Swedish proposal, seconded by the delegate of IRAQ, was *adopted* by 16 votes to none.

Item 2.33.

[36] On the proposal of Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegations of IRAQ, LIBERIA, BRAZIL and SWEDEN, it was *agreed* by 18 votes to 1 to delete item 2.33.

Item 2.341.

Adopted without comment.[3]

Item 2.342.

[37] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) asked for information on science clubs. He did not see any value in them, and proposed the deletion of the resolution.

Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) disagreed with Dr. Jamali, and moved the retention of the item.

[38] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) indicated the valuable services rendered by the science clubs in the United States and in Switzerland, for instance. Unesco had disseminated documentation about these activities, and this had given rise in France to the establishment of a special committee whose work had already yielded excellent results. This movement consummated the teaching of those sciences and enabled scientific vocations to be discovered and sometimes even to be called into being.

[39] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) did not question the value of science clubs; but he considered they were an ordinary part of school life, about which teachers could learn from textbooks. Such clubs should not take up Unesco's time and effort.

[40] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) supported item 2.342, the great value of which resided in the fact that it related to out-of-school activities. He himself could testify that he had acquired most of his knowledge outside classrooms and universities.

[41] Dr. RABI (United States of America) agreed with Professor Auger; the United States delegation also believed in science clubs, but it was their opinion that such activities were outside Unesco's province and certainly outside that of the Natural Sciences Department. The United States delegation therefore opposed the resolution.

[42] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) asked what means could be more adequate or more appropriate for the popularization of science than the collection and circulation of information on science clubs, especially in those countries where science was just being introduced into primary and secondary schools. With regard to Dr. Jamali's observation regarding textbooks, Mr. Massaquoi observed that science clubs were extra-curricula activities.

[43] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur of the Budget Committee) said that with regard to the whole of section 2.3, the Committee had felt that the facilities in Member States and especially the National Commissions, should be more fully utilized; in that way a saving could be effected. He thought the United States National Commission could supply other National Commissions free of charge with full infomation about science clubs.

Item 2.342 was *adopted* by 15 votes to 8.[1]

Item 2.35. Draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation [document 5C/64, item 2].

[44] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) asked how the scheme would work; he doubted whether suitable illustrations would be obtained from some of the industrial organizations.

Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that it was a question of collecting inexpensive but valuable material for the popularization of scientific books. The budgetary implications of this item did not exceed $1,000.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.31.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.32.
3. In final form: Resol. 2.331.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.332.

Item 2.35, together with the United States amendment [document 5C/64, item 2] were *adopted* by 9 votes to none.[1]

Item 2.36.

[45] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), considering that temporary exhibitions would not produce adequate results, proposed adding to the resolution a recommendation that the role of permanent scientific museums, such as, for instance, the "Palais de la Découverte" in Paris, should form the subject of an enquiry.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought this a very valuable project, but its realization would unfortunately exceed Unesco's budgetary possibilities.

[46] In reply to a question from Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) about the scope and location of the exhibitions, Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) said that at the present time a certain number of travelling exhibitions organized by Unesco were giving extremely satisfactory results in Latin America. Although organized on a very small scale, they had nevertheless been able to present up-to-date technical appliances, and to interest a very large public, without discouraging it. The Exhibition of Nuclear Physics organized in the Lebanon had also given very encouraging results, which had induced Unesco to extend the experiment to other countries. For the moment, Unesco had to confine its activities in that field to the modest sum of $3,000, and to be content with utilizing existing exhibitions on the widest possible scale.

Mr. MONTEL (France) stated that, as a result of the increasing success of the "Palais de la Découverte" in Paris, various temporary exhibitions had been organized there, and it would be possible to transform them into travelling exhibitions.

[47] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) thought that, in matters of this kind, Unesco should keep a balance between the activities of its several Departments. His delegation was not opposed to item 2.36, but rather had praise for the project; they considered, however, that if it were undertaken by Unesco, it should be taken up and passed on by Member States and National Commissions, without cost to the Organization.

[48] Professor AUGER (Director, Deparment of Natural Sciences) answered that most of those requests had already received satisfaction. The costs of the travelling exhibitions organized in South America were not borne by Unesco, which merely paid the cost of transport to the first town on the continent. It was obvious that the same procedure would be followed in the Far East. An exhibition arranged in France in 1951 on the technical and practical results of modern inventions would also benefit by the advice of Unesco's Department of Natural Sciences.

[49] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) and Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) both emphasized the importance of organizing a permanent museum in certain countries, and proposed that Unesco should, for that purpose, disseminate catalogues of scientific apparatus.

The CHAIRMAN gave an assurance that the Secretariat would examine the question.

Item 2.36 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 2.371.

[50] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked why Unesco was preparing popular scientific articles for publication. He could see some point in Unesco's continuing to act as a clearing-house and continuing to encourage international exchange of popular scientific articles, scripts or films, but doubted if it was really necessary for Unesco staff to be employed in writing popular scientific articles and in preparing scripts for broadcasting by radio or television, the latter in particular, was, he believed, a matter of extreme technical complexity and experimentation. Dr. Beaglehole was extremely sceptical about the value of item 2.371.

[51] Professor SEVERI (Italy) proposed that a clause should be added to the end of the item, indicating that the Director-General should encourage the establishment of international prizes for popular scientific articles.

[52] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) shared the doubts of the New Zealand delegation about the value of the articles and scripts and whether it was worth Unesco's while to write them. Surely that again was a task more appropriate for Member States and National Commissions, and one which need not cost the Secretariat a penny. National Commissions could be invited to examine the question of preparing articles, and perhaps to undertake the task themselves.

[53] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that any objection to the text would run counter to Unesco's aims, for the resolution embodied that concentration and co-ordination of effort which had been consistently advocated. Moreover, the resolution would enable the Department of Mass Communication to devote itself to its essential task.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.3331 and 2.333.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.3332.

[54] Mr. SCHNEIDER, (Director, Mass Communication Department) assured Mr. Cummins that, in the feature service, which was read by some eight million readers throughout the world, perhaps one of the articles most often reproduced was a science column contributed by a member of the Natural Sciences Department. It seemed to him that in order to keep the feature service—or rather the broadcasting service—truly representative of Unesco, members of the Department must draw upon their colleagues in the Secretariat for social, education and cultural materials.

Item 2.371 was *adopted* by 19 votes to 1.[1]

[55] The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the Italian amendment (addition to item 2.371).

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked whether it was the Italian delegate's intention merely to encourage the establishment of national prizes or, on the contrary, to assign certain credits for the encouragement of popular scientific articles by means of Unesco awards.

[56] Professor SEVERI (Italy) answered that he simply desired that interest in those popular scientific articles should be encouraged in each country, without Unesco being burdened by budgetary charges and without its name being always associated with such activities.

[57] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) thought that each country could only distribute national prizes for works appearing in its own language.

[58] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was afraid that Unesco's prestige would suffer if it formed part of the juries, particularly as it would lack the staff to assume that responsibility. It should be made clear that the project would not involve budgetary implications for Unesco nor responsibility for its staff, and that Unesco would not form part of the juries. Accordingly, he recommended that the proposal be referred to the Drafting Committee.

[59] Dr. RABI (United States of America) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the Italian amendment contained an entirely new idea and could not therefore constitute an amendment. Hence, he proposed that it should neither be added to item 2.371, nor sent to the Drafting Committee, but simply regarded as something to be included in other parts of Unesco's Programme, if the idea it contained was considered good. His delegation, for its part, did not think the idea worth retaining, as it feared that it might contribute to international misunderstanding.

[60] The CHAIRMAN proposed to invite the Italian delegation to submit at a future meeting a text clearly indicating that there would be no budgetary implications nor responsibility for Unesco. *Adopted.*

Item 2.372.

[61] After a considerable study of Unesco publications, Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) was becoming rather sceptical about journals with melodramatic titles, not very good covers, and printed in rather bad type. There brooded over the journal *Impact* a spirit of amateurishness, so characteristic of most of Unesco's publications a year or two previously, but since then successfully banished from a large number of them. He asked for whom *Impact* was designed, where it was to go, in how many languages it was to be printed, and whether it was always to be printed in the present imitation typescript. If it was to be properly printed in the future, why had that not been done from the beginning? He was not complaining of the cost, for if the journal were really good, $2,000 for printing, and $2,000 for fees were not excessive.

Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) supported Dr. Beaglehole and his request for information.

[62] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that 2,000 English copies and 1,500 French copies of the review were published. It appeared every three months and was intended for specialists. Although its presentation was not very luxurious, it nevertheless rendered great services. The very limited funds at its disposal did not permit a more finished presentation.

[63] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) said that if the journal was designed for experts, then it did not seem quite good enough. The experts should be able to obtain what they wanted, and not simply in abstract form, from the journals which they habitually received. With regard to a more attractive presentation of the journal, he thought some attention should be paid to the fact that design was not necessarily a question of expense, but also one of taste.

Item 2.372 was *adopted* by 16 votes to none.[1]

Item 2.381.

[64] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) speaking also of item 2.382, said that his delegation adopted the same view as the Budget Committee, and hoped that, in implementing both those resolutions, use would be made of the resources of National Commissions, not only in the distribution and utiliza-

1. In final form: Resol. 2.3333.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.334.

tion of the material, but also in its preparation. In the case of item 2.382, it would be better to ask National Commissions to prepare the material, rather than for Unesco itself to undertake the task.

[65] Professor OZORIO de ALMEIDA (Brazil) thought it would be advisable to widen the scope of item 2.381 by deleting the words "selected by Unesco", but, at the instance of the CHAIRMAN, who remarked that the concentration of Unesco's activities made it necessary to restrict such themes, he agreed to withdraw his proposal.

[66] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) said that the New Zealand National Commission felt that the work done had been extraordinarily valuable but suggested that the Secretariat might take into consideration the advisability of running the scheme on a two-year basis rather than on an annual one. The amount of work involved in the participating countries was really considerable, particularly when the scheme was taken up by a country like New Zealand. The work imposed on Unesco staff must be considerable also.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL answered that the suggestion had already been taken into consideration and that the present text was in fact based on the arguments presented by the New Zealand delegation.

Resolution 2.381 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 2.382.

[67] The CHAIRMAN said that, in an amendment [document 5C/88], the Yugoslav delegation asked for the deletion of item 2.382.

Mr. MARIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained the reasons for the request: in preparing the documentation it was difficult not to include in the enquiry research into the living conditions of the working classes, conditions which changed with scientific progress and varied considerably from country to country. Moreover, the enquiry would be carried out without the help of the representatives of labour organizations, and the workers might rightly consider that it had not been undertaken in an objective spirit. The Yugoslav delegation therefore proposed the deletion of the resolution, and recommended that Unesco should first establish contact with the representatives of labour organizations.

That proposal, seconded by the delegate of IRAQ, was rejected by 11 votes to 5.

Resolution 2.382 was *adopted* without change.[2]

1. In final form: Resol. 2.335.
2. In final form: Resol. 2.336.

Draft resolution presented by the Austrian delegation [document 5C/21]

[68] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) recalled that two things had been stressed again and again in the Commission—the urgent need for closer collaboration between various Sections and Departments of Unesco, and for making National Commissions more interested in Unesco's work. His delegation's project seemed to meet both those needs. The Austrian Government was prepared to support the project, and it had been submitted to the Austrian National Commission, which, though young, was a vigorous one, and eager to have something concrete to work on. They would not wait until 1951 to start work if the project was approved by the Conference. The Austrian Government was prepared to contribute $7,000 to the scheme.

Dr. Zeissl asked, in conclusion, whether Unesco really wanted to see National Commissions doing positive work in collaboration with the Organization. He was presenting a project, in some respects a bold project, which could be studied and put into effect. The Austrian Government and National Commission were prepared to take the responsibility for carrying out the proposed investigation. The Austrian delegation considered the proposal to be a test case.

[69] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board had given as careful consideration as it could, in the limited time available, to the Austrian delegation's interesting project. The Board sincerely hoped that the Austrian National Commission would not misunderstand its attitude, if it recommended to the Commission that the proposal should not be included in the 1951 Programme. The fact that the matter had been brought behore the Conference and had received consideration, would ensure Unesco's interest in the project, and the Director-General and his staff would no doubt watch with great interest the development of the experiment by the Austrian National Commission. He hoped that the Board's unwillingness to support a resolution at the present stage would not discourage the National Commission from doing its part, and that delegates would agree to asking the Director-General to study the question, without pressing for the adoption of a resolution.

The Austrian proposal was seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, IRAQ, LIBERIA and MEXICO.

[70] In reply to a question from Mr. CUMMINS (Australia), Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that he had not mentioned a figure because the Secretariat had not had time to work out an estimate. Nevertheless, $32,000 had been

mentioned, though not as a definite figure Thus, the adoption of the Austrian proposal would involve for Unesco a fairly substantial increase in the 1951 Budget.

[71] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) proposed that the word "organize" should be altered to "study", and asked if that would be acceptable to the Board.

[72] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that, if the Austrian draft resolution were limited to a request that the problem of the pollution of rivers should be examined in 1951, the expenditure envisaged could be considerably reduced.

The CHAIRMAN thought it obvious that the financial aspect of any resolution involving an appropriation must be examined by the Budget Committee.

The Austrian draft resolution, amended by its author, was *adopted* by 8 votes to 5.[1].

BUDGET TABLE III.2.E. [document 5C/5 (II), page 137].

Adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 12.20 a. m.

1. In final form: Resol. 2.337.

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

3. Social Sciences.

SECTION 3.1 (AID TO INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COLLABORATION).

Item 3.11 [document 5C/5 Rev. - Addendum].

[1] *Adopted* without comment.[1]

Item 3.11.

[2] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) wished to congratulate the Director of the Social Sciences Department and his colleagues for their excellent work in bringing the associations mentioned in item 3.11 into existence. In the view of the British delegation, they were essential to the successful carrying out of Unesco's work. They should be encouraged to join a federation such as the Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. If necessary, they might even join that organization until such time as they were ready to form their own.

[3] While associating himself with the congratulations of the United Kingdom delegate, Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) hoped that the Secretariat would not press the associations to form a new organization until it was satisfied that there was a real need for one and until it could be formed on an adequate basis.

Draft amendment submitted by the Italian delegation [document 5C/103].

[4] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained that the Board was leaving it to the Programme and Budget Commission to decide on the draft amendment, which seemed to have no budgetary implications.

[5] Dr. LIU (Head, Statistical Service) said that the project for international statistical education in co-operation with the International Statistical Institute was already under way on the current year's budget, and that the Italian draft resolution was merely intended to continue it into 1951. The specific area for work on this project in 1950 and 1951 was the region of the Middle, South, and Far East, having its centre in Calcutta, where the Statistical Institute had offered assistance for the accommodation of staff and students. No additional expense would be involved beyond that provided for in the budget.

[6] Dr. LAZERTE (Canada), seconded the Italian amendment; the Canadian delegation had some

1. In final form: Resol. 3.11.

knowledge through the Federal Bureau of Statistics of the demands for trained statistical personnel in different parts of the world. He therefore believed that the work of the International Statistical Institute, with the aid of grants from Unesco, could be very useful. Although this project was admittedly not new, some indication of it should be given in the Social Sciences chapter.

[7] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) wished to know whether it would be possible to add any additional organization to the existing list without involving extra cost. The position of organizations other than the International Statistical Institute was rather different, since the Institute was the only one of this type which was already well established and had developed in association with Unesco. If other organizations were to be added, he suggested including in the text the words: "such as".

[8] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) was entirely sympathetic to the Italian proposal, provided it was given its proper place in the budget. He proposed that this amendment should be added as a new item, 3.15 and given an appropriate place in the budget.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) supported the Italian proposal, but agreed with the United Kingdom delegate that it should be included as a separate item, which might bear the number 3.15.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) suggested that, if the Commission agreed to this point in principle, it should be left to the Drafting Committee to formulate it.

The Italian proposal in document 5C/103 was *adopted* with that proviso.

Draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation [document 5C/36].

[9] Professor GINI (Italy) explained that the project was designed to allow Unesco to pay more attention to legal questions within the framework of the social sciences.

[10] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that three associations had been formed to deal with that problem, namely the International Law Association, the International Political Sciences Association and the International Studies Conference (part of whose activities were concerned with international law). In addition, Unesco had a contract in 1950 with the Comparative Law Group to study the differences between Anglo-Saxon and Roman Law.

The Italian amendment, seconded by the delegate of AUSTRIA, was *rejected* by 12 votes to 7.

Draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation [document 5C/72].

[11] Professor GINI (Italy) drew attention to the importance of agrarian law at a time when many agricultural countries were preparing agrarian reforms. The draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation was intended to promote the study of that matter.

[12] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Board had been unable to recommend the adoption of this amendment, which would involve spending roughly another $5,000. He hoped the Italian delegate would not press his point.

[13] Mr. LE BRAS (France) agreed that the problem of research advocated by Italy could not produce practical results unless the work was done very thoroughly. He did not think that such work could be included in the programme for 1951.

[14] Professor GINI (Italy) agreed to withdraw his proposal which, it was *decided*, should be referred to the Executive Board for study and, possibly, inclusion in the programme for 1952.

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/37].

[15] Professor GINI (Italy) pointed out that the draft resolution, concerning an international definition of social service, was connected with the draft resolution in document 5C/33, dealing with social service schools, which had been discussed at the fifteenth meeting of the Commission.

[16] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) hoped that here again the Italian delegation would refrain from pressing its point. Now that the question had been raised, it could be passed on to the Director-General, who would consult with the Social Affairs Department of the United Nations, since this was a matter which was not solely within Unesco's sphere, and possibly even fell outside its scope.

Professor GINI (Italy) accepted Sir John's recommendation and withdrew his amendment.

[17] Mr. DURÁN (United Nations) informed the Commission that the steps proposed by the Italian delegation would in fact be carried out by the United Nations. He read out the text of resolutions passed at the last sessions of the Economic and Social Council, dealing with the training of social workers, contacts with Member Governments in this field, etc.

Item 3.11 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.], as

amended by the Italian delegation (document 5C/103), was *adopted*.[1]

Item 3.111.

[18] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed to insert the words: "as an experiment" towards the end of this resolution. The co-operating body in social sciences in the United Kingdom doubted whether the type of publication contemplated could really meet the needs of the social scientists. The Secretariat had assured him in correspondence that it was proposing only to carry out an experiment, which would not be continued unless the subscriptions received showed that the periodical was really needed.

Sir Charles also proposed amending the corresponding work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 147, paragraph II] by inserting "for a limited period" after "to publish", and by adding to the end of the sentence "and report on the results".

[19] Professor VITO (Italy) asked whether Unesco considered it sufficient to publish periodicals, or whether it contemplated other methods as well. He suggested adding to item 3.111 the words "by various means, in particular" before "through the publication of a periodical". He also supported Sir Charles Webster's amendment.

[20] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), dealing first with Sir Charles Webster's proposal, was anxious to emphasize that, although his delegation was very interested in the experiment, it was also anxious that the journal should not cover ground already covered by existing publications. It should rather concentrate on reporting developments in international co-operation and in providing information concerning contemporary social science literature. The provision of original articles such as appeared in other journals might detract from its value.

As regards the Italian draft amendment, Mr. Weeden wondered whether it was really necessary to include "by various means", in view of the wide range of activities to promote co-operation in the social sciences which were listed elsewhere in the programme.

[21] Mr. LE BRAS (France) supported the United Kingdom delegate's amendment. He thought it would be useful to have a periodical which would provide liaison between existing publications, provided that it did not duplicate their work.

[22] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) wondered whether the proposed publication might not serve as the official journal of the Co-ordinating Committee mentioned in item 3.12; in that way it would be possible to keep the public informed of the work of the international associations.

[23] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) assured the Commission that the Secretariat had never intended to publish the bulletin on anything but an experimental basis. As he had already informed the United Kingdom delegation in writing, the Secretariat hoped to take stock at the beginning of 1951, so as to be able to make a statement before the next Session of the General Conference.

The Secretariat agreed that too many original articles had been included in the first issues, and steps were now being taken to reduce these to about one-third of the total contents. Some such articles were desirable in a publication dealing with international problems in the social sciences. The bulletin was being used chiefly as a means of communication among social scientists, as a news bulletin for Social Science Associations set up by Unesco, and to give the world knowledge of the work being done by this department of Unesco.

[24] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) thought that the Italian resolution, completed by the United Kingdom proposal, resulted in a formula flexible enough to ensure that the new publication would be able to find its proper place among social science journals.

[25] The United Kingdom amendment, seconded by the delegates of FRANCE and ITALY, was *adopted* by 29 votes.

The Italian draft resolution seconded by the delegate of BELGIUM, was *adopted* by 20 votes to 3.

Item 3.111, with these amendments, was *adopted*.[1]

Item 3.12.

[26] It was *decided* to adopt the item in principle and, at the suggestion of Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), to refer it to the Drafting Committee for re-wording.

Item 3.121.

[27] Professor VITO (Italy), seconded by the delegate of PERSIA, recalled the decision taken in the discussion on the Basic Programme that Unesco's task should also be to develop documentation. He proposed adding to the end of item 3.121

1. In final form: Resol. 3.12.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.13.

"in countries where those services are less developed".

[28] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that documentation in the Social Sciences was not as good as the abstracting services existing in the Natural Sciences. An enquiry initiated the previous December had shown that the most useful procedure henceforth would be to develop existing services in English, French and Spanish, since it would be useful to have documentation which could be used everywhere rather than only in a few countries. The text of item 3.121 had been carefully drafted, and the Secretariat thought that it provided the best solution in present circumstances.

Replying to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Dr. ANGELL added that it would cost something like $25,000 to set up additional agencies.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) was sure that the Board would not think it appropriate to include such a project in the 1951 Programme.

The Italian amendment was *rejected* by 15 votes to 8, and item 3.121 was *adopted* as it stood.[1]

Item 3.13.

[29] Mr. LE BRAS (France) proposed that the item should be deleted: the proposed surveys would not provide any fresh general information about instruction in the social sciences. If detailed surveys were contemplated, they would have to be conducted by foreigners in each of the countries in question, and the expense involved would be out of proportion to the results to be expected.

[30] Mrs. ROSS (Denmark) agreed with Mr. Le Bras as regarded the effects of the change in question, but not its causes. In any case, the project would be very expensive to carry out. Instruction in the social sciences was a rather new phenomenon in many countries, and she doubted whether methods were sufficiently developed to make a study in ten countries useful. Unesco should be able to obtain the requisite information in other ways, for example from the Universities.

[31] Mr. HERRING (United States of America) supported item 3.13 as being practical, basic and not too ambitious It should be possible to carry out this project within a limited time on the money allocated in the Budget. The methods of instruction at present being used were of great importance for later work.

[32] Professor VITO (Italy) supported the French proposal and emphasized the differences between the study of the social sciences and the natural sciences. A study of the different methods would be a very long task requiring co-operation on a large scale, but such an idea could be accepted in connexion with item 3.111; that is to say, one of the chief tasks of the periodical issued by Unesco might be to investigate systematically and gradually, over several years, methods and developments in the field of the social sciences.

[33] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not think that the circulation of information by means of a periodical could take the place of the suggested surveys. He recalled that the social sciences were still very little developed in many countries, and remarked that the countries benefiting under the Technical Assistance Scheme were asking not only for technical experts who could help them to develop their economy quickly, but also for specialists on economics and the social sciences. The survey would be restricted to ten countries only because of the shortage of staff and funds, and those countries would be selected with due regard to the varying stages they had reached in the development of social science instruction.

[34] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) recalled that this question had been discussed by the meeting of experts when the first international association of sociologists was called in 1939. At that time it had seemed to them exceedingly important.

Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) was in favour of retaining item 3.13.

Mr. LE BRAS (France) admitted the force of the Director-General's arguments and withdrew his delegation's proposal.

[35] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that the co-operating body in his country was also greatly interested in this problem, but doubted whether an adequate survey of ten countries was possible under the existing budget provisions. There were very great difficulties to be met, many of them political. He was prepared to withdraw the amendment he was proposing to make, if the Director-General was willing to withdraw item 3.13 and redraft it; but if the item were maintained, he would suggest reducing the number of surveys to four pilot surveys made in association with the national co-operating bodies. This might also reduce the expense involved, and would show to what extent it would be possible to undertake further accurate and scientific surveys.

[36] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) agreed that it would be a good idea to associate the National Commissions in this study. Such an idea had been in the mind

1. In final form: Resol. 3.141.

of the Secretariat all along, in connexion both with that item and with item 3.11. The matter had already been discussed with the Officers of the International Associations in the Social Sciences, who were agreed to undertake this work and confident that they could carry it out in ten countries.

[37] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) said that the Australian co-operating body was also very interested in this project, but concerned, like that of the United Kingdom, with the problem of accuracy in covering such a wide field. It might be better to undertake a smaller number of surveys over a more restricted field, and he proposed that the Drafting Committee should be instructed to devise some way of limiting and concentrating the work.

[38] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) wished to support the United Kingdom amendment, but wanted to know by what methods the countries to be surveyed would be selected. Would their own wishes be taken into consideration? He emphasized the political implications of any such survey.

[39] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) thought that if the Australian proposal to limit the sphere of enquiry were accepted, it might be possible to undertake more than four pilot surveys. Like the delegate of Iraq, he emphasized the political complications that were likely to arise.

The United Kingdom amendment, providing for the restriction of the field to be surveyed and for the limitation of the number of surveys to be undertaken, was *adopted* by 13 votes to 11.

Item 3.13, thus amended, was *adopted*.[1]

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/73].

[40] Presenting the resolution, which concerned the establishment of an International Social Science Institute, Professor VITO (Italy) referred to a letter from the International Association of University Professors suggesting that such an institute should include not merely a research centre, but also the study of international methods of teaching. Unesco had so far given encouragement to the International Association of University Professors, and he hoped that this support would not be withdrawn. The project in question had no budgetary implications. If necessary, he would be prepared to modify the amendment by adding that support could be given within the limits prescribed for research centres by the United Nations.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.15.

[41] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) regretted that the Board could not support the wording of either amendment. They had already considered suggesting a similar kind of institution and had asked the Director-General to study this matter for possible inclusion in a future programme. He was aware that the United Nations had the matter under consideration, and the Executive Board felt that, until a decision had been reached by the United Nations on laboratory and research centres in social science, it would be inappropriate to insert such an organization in the Unesco programme. He hoped the Italian delegate would be willing to consider a modification of his terms, which would enable the Director-General to carry on in 1951, if the Economic and Social Council came to a decision in 1950.

Sir John therefore submitted a possible alternative text for the consideration of the Italian delegate, as follows:

The Director-General is authorized to co-operate with the United Nations in planning an international institute in the field of Social Sciences in the event that the Economic and Social Council decides in 1950 to develop further such a proposal.

Professor VITO (Italy), seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, BRAZIL, CANADA, FRANCE, the NETHERLANDS, PERSIA, SWITZERLAND and URUGUAY, accepted the suggestion of the Chairman of the Executive Board, which was *adopted*.[1]

Item 3.14.

[42] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) wished to present an amendment similar to that proposed on the previous point. He thought it would be very difficult to send officers to cover the social sciences in the areas proposed, and he also thought it would be better to complete the experiment in one country before starting on others. In any case, if this was an experiment, the cost should be reduced to the minimum, and although he doubted whether one person alone could do very much, he proposed the following text: "to extend the scope of the Field Science Co-operation Office in the Middle East in the field of the social sciences". "South Asia" could be substituted for "the Middle East", if preferred. Further, the requisite changes should be made in the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 148, paragraph v] where the provision of $6,000 for special services for the second Office should be deleted.

On the suggestion of Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) agreed to alter the last words of his amendment to read

1. In final form: Resol. 3.17.

"to include the social sciences" instead of "in the field of the social sciences".

[43] Mr. AKVERDI (Turkey) paid tribute to the work of the Field Science Co-operation Office in the Middle East but feared that, if its activities were extended to the social sciences, a great burden of extra work might be imposed on the Office, with which it would be unable to cope with the limited resources at its disposal. In the circumstances, he proposed that item 3.14 should be deleted.

[44] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the proposed experiment would be of no value if it were restricted to a single Field Science Co-operation Office. Owing to the shortage of funds, it was impossible to make the experiment simultaneously in all the existing Offices, but it was essential to be able to compare the results secured in at least two of them.

[45] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that Unesco would be able, with very little extra expense, to extend the work of the Co-operation Offices hitherto confined to the natural sciences, to include the social sciences. He therefore thought that the Executive Board's proposal should be approved, and suggested that, if it was impossible to use the Middle Eastern Office for the experiment, its place should be taken by that at Montevideo.

The Turkish delegation's proposal that item 3.14 should be deleted was not seconded and therefore lapsed.

The United Kingdom amendment, seconded by the delegate of the UNION of SOUTH AFRICA, was *rejected* by 21 votes to 11.

Item 3.14 was *adopted* without change in the French text, and subject to a slight drafting change in the English.[1]

BUDGET TABLE III. 3. B [document 5C/5 (II), page 146].

[46] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur of the Budget Committee) read out the comments of his Committee contained in Annex III to document 5C/BUD/1.

Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Social Sciences Department) agreed that a large number of members of the Secretariat were working on that section of the Programme. Nevertheless, the Social Sciences Department was largely a research department, and most of the work was in fact handed over to competent outside organizations. The proportion of secretaries employed was not unduly large.

As regarded the provision of secretarial services to outside organizations, such assistance had been given only in the initial stages of their existence, and they had undertaken their own work once they were established. He did not recall that the matter had been raised in the Budget Committee, nor that any provision had been made in the Budget for secretarial assistance.

The question of the periodical had already been dealt with. As to the honorarium of $100 paid for original contributions, that did not seem excessive for contributions by outstanding authorities.

SECTION 3.2 (STUDIES OF SOCIAL TENSIONS).

Item 3.21 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Addendum].

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Item 3.21 Draft amendment submitted by the Yugoslav delegation [document 5C/100].

[47] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that the amendment was intended to extend the pilot field investigation to include ethnic groups, for the mere fact that different races were living side by side within one country did not necessarily entail tensions between those races.

[48] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) warmly supported item 3.21; he thought it extremely important as far as certain countries in the New World were concerned, in which there were to be found side by side native yellow peoples, black-skinned descendants of African slaves and, finally, white immigrants. He suggested that the investigation in question should be carried out in Brazil, where the intermixture of the population was proceeding with a remarkable absence of tensions, and where Unesco would find a rich field for study and could be assured of efficient help from the Brazilian authorities.

[49] Dr. BARÓN CASTRO (El Salvador), while agreeing on the importance of this proposal, pointed out that it referred only to an investigation to be carried out in one country in Latin America. He feared that this would give insufficient indication of the situation in other countries, since the racial preponderance varied very greatly from one South American country to another. A pilot investigation in one country alone would not be applicable to all the others, and he thought that the countries having a preponderance of white, negro or native ethnic groups should be selected for investigation.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.16.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.21.

[50] In this connexion, Mr. LE BRAS (France) raised the question of pilot investigations in general. He wondered what constituted a "pilot investigation". A classification of "types" should be drawn up, a certain number should be selected, and the proposed investigation should be organized to deal with those types. There was no doubt that the pilot investigation to be carried out in Brazil would be extremely interesting, but none the less the findings would not be universally applicable, since they would relate only to a specific country at a given time.

[51] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) emphasized that the project in question was intended to provide only a pilot investigation which could be completed in 1950, and following which further countries could be selected in later years.

[52] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) thought that in this sense the project would be very useful. As the delegate of El Salvador had said, there were very different racial problems in the different countries, and Dr. Bernal Jiménez considered that the study should be restricted to the country in which the problem was most characteristic. For example, in the Argentine, in Uruguay and in Chile, where the white population was predominant, there was no real racial problem, whereas in other countries, especially in Peru where the original native races predominated, it was considerable. He therefore proposed amending the end of item 3.21 to read: "the factors favourable or *unfavourable* to harmonious race relations".

[53] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that much research had already been done in those countries where race relations were bad, but very little where they were good. That was why this resolution had been drawn up without mentioning unfavourable factors.

[54] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) maintained his amendment, since he felt that studies also existed which covered both good and bad relations, and since no harm could be done by adding the words to the text.

[55] The Colombian amendment, supported by the delegates of ECUADOR, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, BRAZIL and GUATEMALA, was *adopted* by 14 votes to 11.

The Brazilian proposal, supported by the delegates of LEBANON, URUGUAY, FRANCE and COLOMBIA, was *adopted* by 14 votes to 2.

The Yugoslav amendment, seconded by the delegates of BURMA and FRANCE, was *adopted* by 22 votes to 2.

It was *agreed* to refer the item to the Drafting Committee for revision.[1]

Item 3.22.

Draft amendment submitted by the Yugoslav delegation [document 5C/100].

[56] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that his delegation suggested the deletion of item 3.22 for the following reasons: Yugoslavia had just undergone industrialization without suffering any social tensions due to the speed of the process. On the contrary, it had been carried out in a propitious atmosphere, and had resulted in a rise in the standard of life of the working class. The Yugoslav delegation therefore felt that the introduction of modern techniques was not in itself a cause of social tensions, which arose only if there was interference from foreign capital and foreign technicians. On the other hand, the social tensions caused by the unequal status of large and small States in their relations with one another were a constant threat to peace. The Yugoslav delegation therefore proposed the new wording contained in document 5C/100.

[57] Mr. ARON (France) pointed out that it would be possible both to maintain the Executive Board's proposal, while adding to the programme the study suggested by the Yugoslav delegation. For his part, he was not inclined to delete item 3.22 as it stood, and he thought that the Yugoslav proposal might be combined with the amendment the French delegation had proposed to item 3.27.

This view was supported by the delegate of BELGIUM.

[58] Mr. HERRING (United States of America) recalled that the Commission was concerned with planning research projects, and that it was important to keep that aim well in view.

[59] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) thought the first and second parts of the Yugoslav amendment should be considered separately. The second point was in reality a major political problem which would require years of study.

[60] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that the proposal would have budgetary implications if it was divided into two separate parts. In reply to a question from Professor VITO (Italy), he added that contracts with non-governmental organizations were contemplated in the Budget [document 5C/5 (II), pages 151-152, paragraph 11].

Replying also to a question from Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), Dr. ANGELL explained that the Budget provision was really a

1. In final form: Resol. 3.22.

combination of two proposals from the Secretariat, which they had combined at the request of the Executive Board. Studies had already been carried out in European countries and found very useful, and they had thought it would be a good idea to extend them to other countries in a lower stage of industrialization. This explained the fee contracts, which applied to the Far East, the Near East and Latin America. The task of studying how to obtain a smooth transition to modern technology in the more backward countries was one which they thought would be more usefully left to the non-governmental organizations. The Secretariat was studying which of these should be employed for the purpose, and he would prefer not to state at the present stage which ones would finally be selected.

[61] Item 3.22 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

The CHAIRMAN postponed consideration of the Yugoslav proposal (document 5C/100) until the next meeting.

Appointment of a Sub-Committee (Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Material) (*continued*).

[62] At the request of the Canadian delegation, it was *decided* that the membership of the Sub-Committee appointed at the Fifteenth Meeting should be enlarged to include a representative of Canada.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.231.

NINETEENTH MEETING

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 9 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].
3. Social Sciences (*continued*).

SECTION 3.2 (STUDIES OF SOCIAL TENSIONS) (*continued*).

Item 3.22. Draft resolution submitted by the Yugoslav delegation [document 5C/100] (continued).

[1] The CHAIRMAN remarked that, as the proposed resolution was a separate one and not an alternative to item 3.22, its budgetary implications had to be considered. In accordance with the rule laid down by the General Committee, the Chairman asked the Yugoslav delegate if he could give the Commission any idea of the budgetary implications of his proposal. He had understood him to say at the morning meeting that his delegation was willing to divide the proposal into two parts. If, however, the text were split after the words "relations with one another", the second part in itself would not constitute a motion.

[2] Mr. MARIĆ (Yugoslavia) confined himself to recalling once more that a certain number of items in Chapter 3 (Social Sciences) had been rejected. The funds which had been allocated to them could be used to finance these studies, whose cost it was difficult to estimate.

[3] The CHAIRMAN observed that, even if the draft resolution were passed, its adoption could only be provisional, as it would have to be referred to the Budget Committee. He asked whether Mr. Marić wished to maintain his resolution as a whole.

[4] Mr. MARIĆ (Yugoslavia) was not opposed to the division of his motion into two parts, of which the second was chiefly intended to explain the first, but pointed out that the text of the amendment as a whole explained the proposal more clearly.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that the Yugoslav delegate was in a rather unfair position: he had agreed that the Commission should vote on item 3.22, although, as a matter of regular procedure, he could have asked that a vote should first be taken on his amendment.

He had had every reason to believe, when he presented his amendment, that it might benefit from the funds, amounting to $26,100, provided under item 3.22. In the present circumstances it was quite clear that sums of such magnitude could not be provided. The funds which might finally be allocated for carrying out the Yugoslav amendment would be in the neighbourhood of $13,000-$15,000.

[6] Mr. HERRING (United States of America) thought that the Yugoslav draft resolution should be considered in the context of the whole section on studies of social tensions, because it introduced a somewhat different point of view. In item 3.22 and the other items relating to those studies, a certain similarity of attitude could be discerned. It should also be remembered that a good deal of preliminary work on the subject had already been done. Before, therefore, attempting to make any change in the emphasis, the meeting should consider the work to which Unesco was already committed. It would be unwise, without some preliminary study, to shift the emphasis that had been developing in the tensions project, as well as in research connected with it.

[7] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) thought the proposal to study political tensions was interesting in theory but could not be achieved in practice. He wondered whether such a study would contribute to international harmony or would, on the contrary, increase friction between States; whether it would not lead to Unesco's being the opposite of a factor for harmony between nations.

[8] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) felt some uncertainty about the Yugoslav proposal. In the first place, and in view of the complex character of international relations, it should be drawn up in much more general terms, for example by inviting Unesco to study the social tensions arising from interference of one State in the politics of another. He also wondered how such a proposal could be carried out in practice. It would involve preliminary enquiries which Unesco was not in a position to undertake, any more than it was entitled to condemn political or economic domination by any given country. He would therefore vote against the project, which could not be carried out.

[9] Mr. FEBVRE (France) agreed with Mr. Herring in considering that the Yugoslav proposal implied a change of principle in the concepts which had inspired the tensions project. The French delegation reserved its position pending the submission of its amendment to item 3.27, but wanted to make it clear that its abstention was not based on a question of principle. The delegation merely considered it difficult to undertake an enquiry of such magnitude.

[10] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation felt obliged to vote against the Yugoslav resolution, primarily because of the inclusion of the second half; by including it, objectivity was lost by prejudging the issue.

[11] Mr. MARIČ (Yugoslavia) stressed the need to face the problem under discussion, which was of capital importance for the defence of peace. Unesco should not allow itself to be held up by considerations of secondary importance. There was nothing to prevent an impartial and objective study being made of the relationships between different States and of the flagrant inequalities which were brought to light by commercial, political and cultural treaties. If this study gave proof of constraint, it was both proper and necessary to expose the fact.

The Yugoslav draft resolution (document 5C/100) was *rejected* by 18 votes to 7.

Item 3.23.

[12] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) took the view that this item belonged either to Science or to Education, and that it was out of place in the present context.

[13] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was glad that that question had been raised, since it enabled him to deal with the general problem of the co-ordination of Unesco's tasks. Although there were many separate specialized departments, Unesco had one general mission. He thought that item 3.23 was entirely in its right place. So far, Unesco's Department of Social Sciences had not developed in the way that, as Unesco's conscience, it should have done. In any case, the Commission had just approved item 3.22, and item 3.23 was merely a complementary text which would be indispensable in the application of the scheme for technical assistance.

Resolution 3.23 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 3.24.

[14] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) asked why the study had been restricted to countries in process of industrialization. It seemed to him that there were other areas far more deserving of such a study.

[15] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the item had its logical place in a group of resolutions specially concerned with problems of industrialization. There were already two items

1. In final form: Resol. 3.232.

on that subject, and it was both right and logical to study the incidence of industrialization on population problems.

[16] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) still did not see why the study was restricted to countries in process of industrialization.

[17] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) drew attention to item 3.25, which referred to the study of problems in over-populated countries; thus the matter had not been neglected.

[18] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), on behalf of his delegation, proposed an amendment, to include the words: "the effect of population problems on education, science and culture in countries in process of industrialization". The reason for that proposal was that the United Kingdom National Commission was somewhat concerned to see Unesco entering into such a very wide and complex field as that of population problems, having regard to the fact that a number of other bodies, including the United Nations, had done a good deal of study there, and also to the fact that this project did combine two distinct types of problems—that concerned with demographic studies and that concerned with cultural and sociological studies. For the same reasons, the United Kingdom delegation also had some reservations about item 3.25. Before putting the amendment formally, the delegation would like to know whether in fact there was close co-operation with the United Nations on the matter.

[19] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) had spoken that morning with a member of the Secretariat, who had just returned from attending the Population Commission at Lake Success; that person had talked the question over thoroughly with the Population Division at the United Nations, which quite agreed that Unesco should undertake the studies and in fact was anxious it should do so. There was no problem of overlapping or disagreement about division of labour. A meeting about the studies was planned for early July and the United Nations representative had consented to be present at the meeting.

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) was satisfied with the Secretariat's answer to his query.

[20] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) asked whether the study of population problems did not fall within the scope of WHO and whether Unesco should not work in co-operation with that Agency.

Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that the resolutions were all under the heading of Social Tensions, and that Unesco would not concern itself with the health aspect, or similar aspects, of population problems.

Item 3.24 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 3.25.

[21] Professor VITO (Italy) believed that, to be clear, the item should have added to it some such words as: ". . . tensions resulting from over-population and obstacles to the movement of goods, capital and population".

That amendment was seconded by the delegates of BELGIUM, EGYPT and LIBERIA.

[22] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought that the Italian delegate's view was justified, but that the factors under consideration were included in the idea of over-population. It would appear more logical to adopt a general formula and to speak merely of the different factors of over-population.

[23] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) having asked the delegate of Italy whether he was agreeable to the word: "including" being inserted in his amendment before the word "obstacles", Professor VITO (Italy) agreed.

[24] The CHAIRMAN read the text of item 3.25 as amended:

To organize or to continue the study of tensions resulting from over-population, including obstacles to movement of goods, capital and population. . .

The amendment was *adopted* by 18 votes.

[25] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) thought that the resolution did not give a sufficiently complete list of the causes of social tensions. The question of frontier zones, for example, had not been dealt with. Some frontiers separated countries where social and demographic conditions were fairly similar, while others separated countries of which one was over-populated and the other under-populated, and whose social customs showed very marked differences. There were also certain countries which had a tendency to overstep the limits of their territory. The Dominican delegation asked that the resolution should be amplified on those lines.

[26] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL regretted that that proposal, interesting though it was, could not be carried out, for budgetary reasons.

[27] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that allowance was made in the proposals approved within the framework of the Basic Programme for

1. In final form: Resol. 3.241.

inclusion of the Dominican Republic's proposal at a later date. Dr. Sánchez might therefore put his suggestion before the Director-General as a specific item for a future programme.

[28] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) had not thought that his proposal might have budgetary implications. In view of the explanations given, he agreed to withdraw it for the time being, on the understanding that it could be brought forward again as soon as budgetary conditions made it possible.

[29] Professor PHOTIADES (Executive Board) stated that, for budgetary reasons, the Executive Board had had to adopt the same attitude, reserving that proposal for later study.

Item 3.25, as amended, was *adopted*.[1]

Item 3.26.

[30] In reply to queries by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, IRAQ and LIBERIA as to why Japan had been mentioned specially in that item, Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that the resolutions concerning Japan appeared under different chapters of the 1951 Programme, there being two in the section on Social Sciences. In other words, all the draft resolutions concerning the activities of Unesco in Japan during 1951 were repetitions of the 1951 Programme. The relevant text would be found in section 4 of Part IV of document 5C/5 (I), Rev.

Item 3.26 was *adopted* unchanged.[2]

Item 3.27. Draft resolution presented by the French delegation [document 5C/102].

[31] Mr. FEBVRE (France) pointed out that, when the question of social tensions had arisen, the French delegation had unreservedly supported the proposals submitted to it, which aimed at throwing light on the effect of states of tension on the individual or on the psychology of the individual. The delegation had thought that such studies would produce valuable results. But if they were to study the incidence which social tensions might have on peace, it was very clear that the major tensions would have to be studied, although these had hitherto been excluded from the programme of studies. Such a study was indispensable if the surveys were to make any contribution to the cause of peace. Those were the reasons that had inspired the French draft amendment, which could not have large budgetary implications.

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) seconded the French draft amendment.

[32] Professor PHOTIADES (Executive Board) feared that this extended study would involve additional expenses which were not provided for in the budget.

[33] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) observed that his delegation had supported the French proposal, although it was perhaps unnecessary, as presumably the Secretariat would in any case do what was proposed in the amendment. The study was a scholarly one, and if certain conclusions were reached through it, he supposed that they would be stated, irrespective of any political or social challenge that they might raise. It would be the duty of those making the syntheses to put down the truth.

[34] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) also supported the French proposal. It was both logical and natural that studies should have been carried out hitherto on a micro-sociological level, but the same work should now be carried out on a more general scale.

[35] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) was rather perplexed by the turn of the discussion, because, as Professor Piaget had said, Unesco had been working on a micro-sociological level in studies of "stereotypes"—the mistaken ideas which some people had about others. If the French draft resolution were adopted, he feared that it would prevent the Secretariat from making a synthesis of those studies, which was exactly what it wanted to do. Item 3.27 was not a prospective but a retrospective resolution. The Secretariat wished to bring together in final form the separate studies which had been made.

[36] Baron Van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) considered that, in view of the explanations given by the representative of the Director-General, in future at any rate the emphasis would have to be put on major tensions.

[37] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) did not think that the French resolution ran counter to what Dr. Angell had said, but that it merely emphasized certain aspects of the study. Dr. Jamaly considered that the word "alone" should be deleted. He also wondered whether the syntheses should be made in 1950, or whether it would not be better to wait until the following year.

[38] Mr. MARIĆ (Yugoslavia) thought that the French proposal was very important and touched on a basic problem, but he regretted having to raise certain objections of principle. In the first place, the proposal did not specify which studies were to be synthesized; secondly, if these studies were entrusted to a sociologist who was not im-

1. In final form: Resol. 3.242.
2. In final form: Resol. 3.25.

partial, his conclusions would have no objective value. Again, if the accent was to be put on major tensions, it seemed difficult to include ideological conflicts. For the most part, ideologies merely provided a pretext for the pursuit of some interest. Thus, in the seventeenth century, Spain had launched a vast programme of expansion under the Catholic banner, against the will of the people, whilst Cardinal Richelieu, advised by Father Joseph, did not hesitate to ally himself with the Protestants. Many more recent examples could be given to show that ideologies were, in reality, merely secondary causes. It was entirely possible to ensure and maintain peace in spite of ideological differences. Yugoslavia, a Socialist State, could perfectly well live at peace with other countries without abandoning any of her doctrines.

In the same way, it was not necessary, in order to ensure peace, to take into consideration the social tensions caused by conflicts between the different classes: these were internal phenomena which played no part in international relations. The real threat to peace lay in the inequality of relationships between States and in the struggle for power between groups of nations.

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was in agreement with the capital importance that the French proposal sought to give to major problems, whenever it was a question of the contribution which Unesco could make to the maintenance of peace. It was, however, important not to forget the synthesis already made by the Department of Social Sciences. It would be a pity if Unesco were deprived of the possibility of publishing these documents, which were of considerable value, even though they bore on minor problems. They included, moreover, studies, whose conclusions should not be overlooked, on the problems of race and over-population and on the impact of technical progress. If the Conference thought the moment had come to make a synthesis of more essential problems, it was for the Conference itself to draw up a list of definite problems to be included in that category.

[40] Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) merely wished to remark that the Yugoslav delegate's comments on Spanish policy in the seventeenth century were not in accordance with historic facts.

Mr. MARIĆ (Yugoslavia) had never intended to criticize the religious views of the Spanish people. He had spoken of the foreign policy of the Spanish monarchy, which was not at all the same thing.

[41] Mr. FEBVRE (France) found himself in the difficult position of having to defend himself on two fronts. He must, however, state from the outset that he had neither the intention nor the time to follow the Yugoslav delegate in an excursion into history.

The ambitions of the French delegation in drawing up this modest amendment, which was designed merely to take account of contemporary facts, had not been so vast. He was therefore a trifle surprised at the assurance with which the Yugoslav delegate had asserted that ideological conflicts, class strife or the antagonism of rival myths should not be considered among the causes of major tensions. That was precisely the question raised by the French amendment: were those conflicts, rivalries and antagonisms potential causes of war, or not?

With regard to the Director-General's preoccupations, the French delegation wished to make it clear at once that it was not in the least unaware of Unesco's activities, and had absolutely no intention of obstructing the synthesis of the sudies of social tensions already made, or in process of completion. The French delegation merely asked that major tensions should be added to that programme of studies. Apart from that, it was perfectly willing that the final drafting of the text should be entrusted to a drafting committee.

[42] The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat felt that the matter was not just one for the Drafting Committee, and he would therefore put the proposal to the vote.

[43] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) considered that everything the French delegation wanted was already contained in item 3.27, to which its amendment merely gave weight.

[44] The French draft resolution (document 5C/102) was *adopted* by 15 votes to 10, thus becoming part of item 3.27.

[45] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board would like to add, at the end of item 3.27, the words: "especially on racial problems".

That amendment, formally moved by the delegate of PAKISTAN and seconded by the delegates of FRANCE, AUSTRIA and BRAZIL, was *adopted.*

[46] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) suggested that the French delegation might like the word "synthesis" in the plural instead of the singular, if that was in accordance with their intention: the matter could be considered by the Drafting Committee.

[47] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) noted that the French delegation was in no way opposed to the idea of disseminating the conclusions

of the studies already begun. He wondered whether the delegation would agree to an amplification of its amendment on the following lines: "to disseminate wherever suitable the conclusions of those studies and syntheses ".

[48] The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of France whether his delegation intended, by its proposed resolution, to eliminate the second portion of item 3.27, which provided for a dissemination of conclusions.

Mr. FEBVRE (France) entirely agreed to the synthesis and dissemination of those studies, but pointed out that it would be necessary to await the results of some of them which had not yet been completed.

[49] The CHAIRMAN said that, if the Commission agreed, the point would be met in the sense which had been given by the delegate of France, and the text would include a final section on the dissemination of conclusions.

Item 3.27 was *adopted*, with the amendments proposed.[1]

Item 3.28.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/71].

[50] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Italian draft resolution had been transferred to the chapter on *Cultural Activities* (item 4.125).

BUDGET TABLE III.3.C. [document 5C/5 (II), page 150].

Adopted without comment.

SECTION 3.1 (AID TO INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COLLABORATION) (*continued*).

Item 3.13 (continued).

[51] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) asked whether he might raise a question on item 3.13, concerning the surveys to be undertaken in ten countries on methods of teaching in the social sciences. That item had been adopted at the morning meeting, but after a short discussion the Commission had restricted the survey to four countries. Professor Piaget feared that this ill-considered assessment had resulted from the speed of their debates, and that the Commission was now in the position of one who, having decided after much reflection to buy a car, begins by provisionally buying only the two front wheels. However, the resolution had been adopted. He wondered whether there was any possibility of putting it to the vote again.

In accordance with the CHAIRMAN's ruling, a vote was taken on whether item 3.13 should be reconsidered, and Professor's Piaget's proposal was *rejected.*

SECTION 3.3 (STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION).

Item 3.31.

[52] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), on behalf of his delegation, proposed an amendmend which it considered very important. It consisted of substituting for the first two lines of item 3.31 the words: "to encourage the study of various types of inter-governmental co-operation with a view to exploring methods ...", and of adding at the end: "... and of the regional organizations which are directed to the support of its purposes". The United Kingdom delegation's view was that if item 3.31 were left as it was, it would tend to a dispersion of effort. If "federalistic systems" were left in, an entirely different class of organization would be included. It was felt that the simpler resolution would enable the Secretariat to make a complete study of the various types of inter-governmental co-operation between sovereign States.

The proposed amendment was seconded by the delegate of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA and supported by various other delegations.

[53] In reply to a question from Dr. WALKER (Australia), Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that "regional organizations" meant all regional organizations such as the Council of Europe, OEEC, etc.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) having asked whether the United Kingdom delegation dismissed the possibility of a world federation, Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) replied that he did not think that was relevant to the point in question.

Item 3.31, as amended by the United Kingdom proposal, was *adopted.*[1]

Item 3.32.

[54] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) said that his delegation had some doubts about this item, which would certainly result in a difficult and delicate investigation. He wondered whether the Secretariat had any particluar organization in view and whether the members of that organization were willing to be the victims of certain investigations.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.26.
2. In final form: Resol. 3.27.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.31.

[55] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that there had been informal consultations with senior officials of the United Nations and several of the major Specialized Agencies, who had shown active interest. There was reason to believe that plans could be worked out for a study of one of the Specialized Agencies of the kind proposed.

[56] Mr. HERRING (United States of America) moved the deletion of item 3.32 on the grounds that, at the present stage of the work of the Department of Social Sciences, it was perhaps hardly appropriate to undertake a study of that kind, and that the corresponding work plan did not seem very satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN inferred that the United States delegation would not make a formal motion for deletion, but would simply vote against the item.

[57] Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) asked whether the English word "semantic" was equivalent to "linguistiques" in the French text, and the CHAIRMAN replied that the Drafting Committee would study that point.

Item 3.32 was *adopted* unchanged.[1]

Item 3.33.

[58] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the French delegation had submitted an amendment (document 5C/102) requesting the deletion of the item.

Mr. FEBVRE (France), explained that it was a question of eliminating an experiment which was both too ambitious, since there were insufficient data available for a thorough study, and too expensive, since the fund allocated for the purpose in 1949 had amounted to $30,685, while those proposed for 1951 amounted to $59,147.

Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) thought, on the contrary, that that study, which was to deal in particular with the factors affecting the constitutional and administrative development of certain Specialized Agencies, was of great importance to the progress of international co-operation.

[59] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that he would support the French amendment; if it were lost, he had an amendment to propose on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation which felt that Unesco should not undertake such a task without much greater planning.

[60] The CHAIRMAN read out the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation:

To invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in agreement with the Specialized Agencies, to prepare a plan for a comparative study. . .

Mr. HERRING (United States of America) and Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported the delegate of the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would treat the French motion as a substantive one.

Mr. FEBVRE (France) was anxious to show good will and therefore supported the British amendment.

[61] Mr. DURÁN (United Nations) announced that there were three bodies of the United Nations that could undertake the proposed study, if the motion of the United Kingdom delegation were carried. One was the Administrative Committee of Co-ordination, the second the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, whose work was to implement Article 13 (*a*) of the Charter, whereby the General Assembly was authorized to initiate studies and make recommendations for the purposes of promoting international co-operation in the political field. If the study were adopted by the Interim Committee, it would have a direction and a significance completely different from the direction which Unesco intended to give to it. The third body was Ecosoc, particularly the Social Commission; that Commission would probably not be prepared to undertake a study of the nature proposed in item 3.33. Therefore Mr. Durán did not think that the Secretary-General of the United Nations would welcome the United Kingdom amendment.

[62] Dr. WALKER (Australia) did not consider the United Kingdom amendment as a programme resolution; it was an instruction to the Director-General to write a letter. Also, it did not fall within the general programme of the work of the Social Sciences Department, since it would contribute nothing, as far as Unesco was concerned, towards arousing the interest of social scientists in the problems of international co-operation. Further, as the United Nations representative had pointed out, and as Dr. Walker knew from his own experience of the United Nations, it was extremely unlikely that any of the three bodies mentioned by Mr. Durán would welcome the United Kingdom amendment with much enthusiasm. Dr. Walker therefore opposed it.

[63] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the United Kingdom proposal invited the Secretary-General, in agreement with Specialized Agencies, to prepare a plan, because the United Kingdom delegation felt that for such a study, plans should be made by all the bodies concerned. If those bodies did not want to be

1. In final form: Resol. 3.32.

considered, then the study would be of no use. He did not see why the Secretary-General could not be asked to have a committee to do that planning together with the Specialized Agencies.

[64] The United Kingdom amendment was *rejected* by 15 votes to 11.

Item 3.33 was *adopted* by 17 votes to 4.[1]

Item 3.34.

[65] The CHAIRMAN recalled that, also in document 5C/102, the French delegation had requested the deletion of this item.

Mr. FEBVRE (France) explained that the French delegation considered the text to be too ambitiously worded and disproportionate to the results that might be expected. However, since the studies had already been carried out, the French delegation would not oppose their publication, but asked that these "systematic" studies should not be indefinitely expanded.

[66] Mr. HERRING (United States of America) thought that the study seemed an appropriate one for Unesco to undertake and in the spirit of the resolution already adopted by the Commission. The work that had already gone into the study should be borne in mind; it would be a pity if the good start that had been made were lost.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported the French delegation's viewpoint.

[67] Dr. WALKER (Australia) shared to some extent the French delegation's concern over the working, but did not support its suggestion that item 3.34 should be deleted. He wondered whether Mr. Fèbvre would be prepared to maintain the item if the words "to conduct systematic studies, etc.", were replaced by the words "to encourage and assist the conduct of case studies, by social scientists . . .".

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) supported the views of Mr. Herring and Dr. Walker.

[68] The Australian amendment was *adopted.*

Item 3.34, as amended, was *adopted.*[1]

BUDGET TABLE III.3.D. [document 5C/5 (II), page 155].

Adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 11.35 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 3.33.

1 In final form: Resol. 3.34.

TWENTIETH MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

2. Natural Sciences (*continued*).

SECTION 2.1 *(continued)* (DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION).

Draft resolution presented by Italy [document 5C/35 (Rev.)].

[1] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) had no comment to make, since the Italian draft resolution had no budgetary implications. He still thought, however, that it was unnecessary to include this new item in the 1951 Programme, and he hoped that the Italian delegate would leave the matter for the Director-General to study, and would not insist on maintaining his proposal.

[2] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the Italian delegation's original proposal [document 5C/35] had had certain budgetary implications which were not involved in the new proposal. He thought that the project would be of much value both to Unesco and to research workers.

[3] Professor COLONNETTI (Italy) thanked the Director-General for the favourable manner in which he viewed the new Italian proposal, and emphasized that it was for Unesco to render that valuable to science throughout the world.

The resolution was seconded by the delegations of BELGIUM, URUGUAY, SWITZERLAND, NETHERLANDS, FRANCE, DENMARK and PAKISTAN, and was *adopted* by 26 votes to none.[1]

Grant-in-aid to the World Federation of United Nations Associations.

[4] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Commission had referred to the Budget Committee a project concerning a grant-in-aid of $10,000 to be made to the World Federation of United Nations Associations. The Budget Committee had returned the project, stating that a resolution on the matter must be formulated by the Programme and Budget Commission, but reserving the right to reduce or even to reject it. Since the Commission had declared in favour of the principle, the Chairman asked the Drafting Committee to draw up a resolution for transmission to the Budget Committee.

4. Cultural Activities.

Item 4.1 [document 5C/5 (I) (Rev.)-Addendum].

Adopted without discussion.[2]

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES (4.1).

SECTION 4.11 (INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION)

Items 4.11, 4.111 and 4.1111.

[5] Professor CASTELLI (Italy) proposed that resolution 4.1111 should be worded as follows:

To broaden the geographical basis of the federations, associations and *international centres* constituting it.

[6] Professor SYME (United Kingdom), seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA and GREECE, expressed his delegation's congratulations to the Secretariat for this section and those following it. The International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies had been constituted with the encouragement of Unesco only fifteen months previously, and had already shown remarkable vitality. The policy of grants-in-aid to such representative bodies was one which the United Kingdom strongly supported.

[7] Mr. CAIN (France) supported the United Kingdom delegate's point of view and stated that the French delegation attached special importance to the work done during the last two years by the Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. He hoped that the necessary material means would be granted to the Council to enable it to carry out the decisions included in the Basic Programme.

Items 4.111 and 4.1111 were *adopted*, including the Italian amendment.[1]

Item 4.1112.

[8] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) said that the Australian co-operating bodies had noted that the programme paved the way for setting up an institution for Pacific studies, and wished to point out that such organizations already existed. They suggested that the Secretariat should seek advice from the co-operating bodies in the various South-East Asian States before proceeding further.

Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured Mr. Fletcher that such a request was quite in conformity with the decision taken on the matter by the Executive Board.

Item 4.1112 was *adopted* without change.[2]

Item 4.1113.

[9] Dr. GIORDANO (Uruguay) supported this resolution, as his country was greatly interested in any project for the study of indigenous languages. A congress had recently been held in Uruguay to study the indigenous cultures of certain Latin American countries with special affinities, i.e., Paraguay, the Argentine and Uruguay.

[10] Dr. BARÓN CASTRO (Salvador) realized that the project was a very beneficial one, but wanted particularly to emphasize that this was not unexplored territory and that studies had been made in the subject since the period of Spanish domination. They were however incomplete. He asked the Secretariat to provide more detailed information as to which languages in particular interested Unesco, suggesting that those which were on the point of dying out should be given priority.

[11] Mr. CAIN (France) proposed the deletion of the words in parentheses: "(particularly for the field study of the native languages of America)"; as item 4.1113 was more general, he thought it would be better to include that phrase in resolution 4.112.

That proposal was seconded by the delegations of PAKISTAN, DENMARK, YUGOSLAVIA, IRAQ and PERSIA, and item 4.1113 was *adopted*, subject to the deletion of the words in parentheses.[1]

Item 4.1114.

[12] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) wanted

1. In final form: Resol. 2.164.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.111 an 4.1111.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.1112.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.1113.

to know whether Unesco intended to enter the field of publishing bibliographies and dictionaries as a continuing, or as a new, activity. He thought this could normally be more usefully left to the commercial organizations.

[13] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the bibliographies were not prepared by Unesco but by the international organizations that were members of the Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies; publication would be undertaken by a commercial firm. Unesco's role was simply to help those international organizations to prepare the bibliographies and get them published, without directly participating in the work.

[14] Mr. CAIN (France) proposed the form of words "to contribute to the publication of".

[15] In reply to ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), who feared that the term "to contribute" might involve financial obligations, Mr. THOMAS pointed out that in any case a grant-in-aid had been provided for that undertaking.

Item 4.1114 was *adopted*, subject to the amendment proposed by the French delegation.[1]

Item 4.1115.

[16] Professor SYME (United Kingdom), supported by the delegates of IRAQ and SWEDEN, was uncertain to what extent a general informative review was really required. He was anxious not to restrict the terminology of the resolution, nor the activities of the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, and he therefore proposed to delete the words "specialized" and "a general informative review", leaving the text of the resolution as: "to stimulate the publication of reviews. . . ".

The United Kingdom amendment was *adopted* by 28 votes to none.

[17] Professor CASTELLI (Italy) proposed adding the following words to the resolution: "and particularly to assist this undertaking by the publication of hitherto unpublished texts".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered the Italian proposal an excellent one, but he pointed out that it would no doubt have fairly large budgetary implications, if it were desired to make that activity really effective.

The Italian proposal was seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, the NETHERLANDS, FRANCE, AUSTRIA, PERSIA, SWEDEN, LEBANON, IRAQ and BRAZIL.

Item 4.1115, thus amended, was adopted.[2]

1. In final form: Resol. 4.1114.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.1115.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the vote was a provisional one, as the resolution had budgetary implications and the final vote could take place only after the project had been sent back by the Budget Committee.

Draft resolution presented by Italy [document 5C/71].

[18] Mr. SAPORI (Italy) explained that the object of the proposal was the drawing up of a list of lawyers' statements, business letters, trade practices, correspondence between traders, personal memoirs, etc. which were dispersed in the various archives and libraries. He thought that a committee of experts belonging to the countries possessing most of those archives might be set up on the occasion of the Congress of Historical Sciences to be held in Paris. Those experts could then draw up, by correspondence, a general work plan and later on, in six months' time, for instance, a consultant might be appointed to examine the information received from the various archives and libraries, with a view to its publication.

Professor Sapori considered that the work would be valuable and would bring out the various factors which had given rise to the unification of the present capitalist system. He thought that the list would be a useful working instrument for research workers, as the latter experienced great difficulty in consulting such widely dispersed documents; it would also be a valuable contribution to the preparation of the Economic History.

In conclusion, he said that the Italian delegation had endeavoured to reduce to a minimum the expenditure which would be entailed by the project, and he pointed out that the Budget Committee had considered that it would be sufficient to add $1,000 to the grant-in-aid made to the International Committee on Historical Sciences in order to carry out the work.

[19] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board was bound to advise against the inclusion of this new resolution in 1951, even if the expense was small, since it could not be given urgent priority.

[20] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur of the Budget Committee) announced that his Committee had originally estimated the cost at $5,760. They had since been notified by the Italian delegate that, as amended, his proposal would actually mean a reduction in the Budget, but no details were yet available.

[21] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) suggested that the Italian wishes might be met if the matter were referred to the Inter-

national Committee of Historical Science which was meeting in Paris in August. It could then, if desired, be considered by the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, but it would be premature to include this study in the Unesco programme at the present time.

[22] Professor SAPORI (Italy) maintained his proposal, for he considered that the expense involved was very slight in comparison with the importance of the proposed work.

The proposal was seconded by the delegations of FRANCE, LIBERIA, the NETHERLANDS, IRAQ and AUSTRIA.

[23] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the Italian resolution were adopted, corresponding economies would have to be made in the chapter on Cultural Activities, as no additional financial charge could be introduced into the budget.

The Italian proposal was *rejected* by 20 votes to 10.

Item 4.112.

[24] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) wished to add the words: "particularly for the study on the spot of the indigenous languages of America".

He stressed the political and social interest of this study, as well as its scientific interest. Although much work had been carried out on these lines, the documentation was far from complete.

[25] Mr. CAIN (France) thought that, as it had previously been decided to delete from item 4.1113 the phrase concerning the native languages of America, it was necessary to include that phrase in resolution 4.112, as had been suggested.

[26] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) complained that several of the resolutions were very vague. He thought that the term "certain other parts of the world" was ill-defined and should be deleted.

[27] Mr. BOSMAN (Costa Rica) suggested adding: "especially where such cultures are in danger of extinction" after "Africa". He was thinking in particular of certain languages like the Bushman language, which must be studied soon, as it was in danger of dying out.

[28] Mrs. PECSON (Philippines) opposed Dr. Beaglehole's proposal, which she felt sure was not intended to exclude the Philippines, but which would have that effect if the text were restricted to "America and Africa".

[29] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) protested against amendments which he feared would diminish the budgetary appropriation available for the study of African languages. Africa was not given the same status in this field as South America, to which so many of the cultural and social science opportunities of this programme were being devoted. In South America there were twenty-one Republics, all of them capable of carrying out their own researches. It was Spanish culture wich had pushed out the indigenous cultures there, and it was the paramount duty of the peoples of South America themselves to preserve those cultures in their own countries, whereas in Africa there were only three independent States able to carry out such work. Unesco should do much more for the peoples of Africa. He would vote against the amendment.

[30] Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) was unable to see how the study of dying languages could be of greater importance to Unesco than other matters. This was one which could be better left to universities and other research centres, and which was not an integral part of Unesco's programme.

[31] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) opposed the proposal of the New Zealand delegate to delete tha last words of the resolution, since it would too greatly restrict the activities.

Sor far as Dr. Lazerte's reference to the dying languages was concerned, Professor Sommerfelt pointed out that it was not merely a question of studying the languages, but the cultures and mentalities of which they were the expression and which could be studied only through that medium. Such studies were of extreme importance to peace and understanding in the world.

[32] Mr. CAIN (France) considered that the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies was fully qualified to decide upon the programme and introduce the necessary clarifications. He therefore proposed simplifying resolution 4.112 by substituting the following text:

To associate the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies in the execution of Unesco's Programme, particularly in the co-ordination of study and research in connexion with native cultures.

Dr. Lazerte's proposal, which was not seconded, *lapsed.*

Mr. Cain's proposal, seconded by the delegates of the UNITED KINGDOM, AUSTRIA, NETHERLANDS, MONACO, EGYPT, IRAQ, VENEZUELA, DENMARK and EL SALVADOR, was *adopted* by 26 votes to 3.[1]

[33] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) expressed the views of his delegation concerning section 4.11 (International Co-operation).

1. In final form: Resol. 4.112.

His delegation shared the views of other speakers about the valuable contribution made by the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, and also appreciated Unesco's improved methods of dealing with non-governmental organizations as a whole. However, the programme could be presented differently another year. These international councils had their own work to do, although they could also be most useful to Unesco, and conversely. But in future a useful distinction could be made between subventions and the series of contractual items covered by resolutions in this programme.

Decisions concerning certain items in section 4.11 might be better left to the discretion of the specialist bodies, as was done in the case of ICSU in Chapter 2. Under the present method of setting out the resolutions and the budget, it was not clear what Unesco was doing for these organizations, nor they for Unesco, and Mr. Odegaard suggested the adoption of a clearer method another year.

[34] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the present programme had been worked out when the policy of grants-in-aid and contracts was still under discussion, but he assured the United States delegate that the Secretariat was favourable to his idea and that the 1952 budget would be presented in the new form which he advocated.

SECTION 4.12 (INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH).

Item 4.121.

[35] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) strongly recommended these resolutions, which gave expression to a deeper philosophical relationship between East and West. He hoped that the discussions would be carried out in the true spirit of Unesco.

[36] Mrs. PECSON (Philippines) supported Sir Sarvepalli. She thought the discussions should provide an effective means of cementing the bonds of friendship established between East and West, and hoped that they might one day lead the world to forget the lines:

> For East is East, and West is West,
> And never the Twain shall meet.

She proposed adding to item 4.121 the words: "and dissemination of the results".

[37] Dealing first with resolution 4.12, Professor SYME (United Kingdom) proposed that "and National Commissions" be inserted between "international" and "organizations".

Further, he suggested that 4.121 might be simplified and clarified if "scholars" (savants) was substituted for "thinkers and philosophers" and "cultural and" omitted from the second line.

[38] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) objected that scholars were not the same as philosophers and thinkers, and proposed the maintenance of the original text.

[39] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) pointed out to the delegate of the Philippines that the dissemination of results was mentioned in resolution 4.124.

[40] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that the budgetary appropriation for resolution 4.124 did not altogether cover the proposal made by Mrs. Pecson, since a somewhat modest figure had been fixed by the Secretariat for that item. The Director-General felt that, if the Commission agreed that the matter was of great importance for all Unesco's activities in 1951, it would be necessary to increase the credits which had been provided for the execution of item 4.121 and for the dissemination of the results of the discussions.

[41] He pointed out in that connexion that it would perhaps be wise to consider a review of the budgetary provision for certain other resolutions, and he recommended that compensatory adjustments in respect of particularly valuable resolutions should not necessarily be made in the budget relating to the same chapter, but should be available in any other part of the programme.

[42] Mr. CAIN (France) was gratified by the Director-General's remarks. He noted that the chapter on Cultural Activities would not be discussed until the other Departments had explained in detail their different activities, and he considered that it should not be affected by that state of affairs. He therefore supported the Director-General's idea concerning the possibility of allocating compensatory adjustments as between the more and the less urgent programme activities, and he thought that the meeting might rescind certain decisions already taken.

[43] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) thought that the text of item 4.121 was not sufficiently clear. In his opinion, though it might be possible to speak of a specifically Western philosophy, civilization and thought, it was more difficult to speak of an Eastern philosophy or thought, for the East was much more diversified. He suggested that the item should be modified so as to give expression to that diversity.

[44] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL saw no objection to increasing the number of national bodies interested in the question, and he thought the matter could be left to the Drafting Committee.

Referring to Mgr. Maroun's suggestion, he said that the Western countries might also say that they did not all have the same philosophy; in his

view, the text proposed by the Executive Board was preferable, as it avoided all discussion on the matter.

Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) explained that he had proposed the amendment because of the deletion suggested by the British delegation.

The British amendment was *rejected* by 29 votes to 23, and item 4.121 was *adopted* in its original form.[1]

Item 4.122.

[45] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) felt that the enquiry proposed in item 4.122 should not be given high priority. For one thing, it placed an undesirable burden on the Secretariat. Rather than that the Secretariat should carry out the work with the assistances of consultants, it might be better to leave it to the philosophers themselves, that is to say, to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. He would have preferred the resolution to be deleted.

This proposal, seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, DENMARK, ITALY, NEW ZEALAND and SWEDEN, was *rejected* by 30 votes to 8.

[46] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) remarked that philosophy proper was only taught—and that inadequately—during the last year of secondary education, whereas certain kindred subjects which exercised great influence on the training of citizens, such as ethics, civics and political economy, were studied for several years. He therefore thought that, instead of saying the "teaching of philosophy" in schools, it would be better to speak of "humanistic studies or social sciences", as the latter terms were more truly related to the subjects taught in schools. While recognizing the principle of undenominational education to which Unesco should adhere, he hoped there would be some mention of religion, which played such an important part in education.

[47] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the teaching of social sciences, to which Anas Khan had referred, had been considered in the chapter on Education, and that resolution 4.122 in fact concerned philosophy proper, which was the completion of secondary education and one of the main subjects of higher education.

[48] Dr. GIORDANO (Uruguay) proposed the following amendment: "an enquiry into the influence of philosophy on the training of the citizen".

[49] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) emphasized the great value of the teaching of philosophy for the improvement of international understanding. It seemed to him obvious that the enquiry could be entrusted to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, but he stressed the fact that the subject of the enquiry was of primary concern to Unesco.

The proposals put forward by the delegates of Afghanistan and Uruguay were not seconded and lapsed.

[50] Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) supported item 4.122, but wished the English text to be changed to "development of the citizen" instead of "moulding of the citizen".

[51] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) thought no more should be attempted than to give a perpective of teaching philosophy in educational institutions. Citizens should not be taught so much the differences in the philosophies of East and West, as given a synoptic vision of them.

[52] Mrs. ZAMBRANO (Guatemala) felt that philosophy was a subject which should attract people with a special vocation. She could not agree with previous speakers that a preoccupation with philosophy was derogatory to religious formation or meant neglecting it.

Item 4.122 was *adopted* in its original form by 27 votes to 1.[1]

Item 4.123.

[53] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) proposed that the words "the main interpretations in" should be replaced by the words "the evolution of", in order to avoid giving the idea that the concept of law had changed its meaning from one period to another and that the philosophy of law was necessarily emphemeral and inconsistent.

[54] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) agreed that the wording of the resolution was too all-embracing and vague, and he announced that he would oppose it unless it could be made more concrete. The sum provided for the non-governmental organization in document 5C/5 (II) (page 172, paragraph v) seemed inadequate in comparison with that made available in other sections for similar enquiries. In any event, Dr. Beaglehole did not feel that this was a task for Unesco, but one which could be better passed to a non-governmental organization such as the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, or a more specifically legal body.

[55] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) stressed that the Commission was trying to think in wide terms. Some of the projects on the

1. In final form: Resol. 4.1211.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.1212.

list under consideration might seem unrelated, but they were not so in reality. The Commission should bear in mind that it was discussing the programme for 1951 and not for 1950, and Mr. Odegaard believed that such activities as these were essential to philosophy and humanistic studies. A study of the present-day communities was an appropriate subject for Unesco, both from the historical point of view, and from the philosophical; an attempt should be made to find areas of agreement, or at least to appreciate other cultures. This was merely a shred of a much bigger idea, namely to attempt an analysis of major concepts which might serve as a bridge of ideas.

The concept of law throughout history was admittedly a tremendous subject, yet the project was not to write a global history, but to find points of contact. He hoped that better use would be made in future of the analyses of fundamental concepts which Unesco had undertaken in the past, and on which he trusted that it would continue to work.

[56] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) expressed his support for the arguments of the delegates of the Lebanon and the United States of America, and his opposition to the New Zealand proposal. It was important to bear in mind the importance of law in Unesco's activities. Indeed, all human activities were to some extent regulated by law. Most of the more important universities had Chairs to study the history of comparative law for practical purposes, as well as the causes of the differences in its development in different cultures.

As to the fears expressed by Dr. Beaglehole, he pointed out that, under point 4.12, the Director-General was authorized to undertake the necessary research "in co-operation with the appropriate international organizations". Even now Unesco was in process of discussing closer relations with the International Law Association—a relationship which had a very important bearing on that whole question.

[57] Mr. CAIN (France) thought that the financial means provided for the carrying out of the enquiry during 1951 would prove inadequate. To enable such an enquiry to be fully successful, it was necessary first to determine precisely the lines on which it was to be conducted. He suggested that that task should be entrusted to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, so that the next General Conference might have before it all the necessary information and thus take a decision enabling a fitting enquiry to be carried out.

[58] Dr. TRONCOSO SÁNCHEZ (Dominican Republic) opposed the proposal of the Lebanese delegate. The main interpretations of the concept of law were a more useful subject of study than the question of whether it was evolving or not.

[59] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) was much impressed by the arguments of the United States delegate and was therefore ready to support the resolution, but he was also impressed by the French arguments. An enquiry of this sort was more properly a subject for historians and philosophers, preferably with a knowledge of ancient and modern languages, than for jurists alone. He therefore proposed an amendment to the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 172, paragraph v] to read: "that the whole of the planning and execution be entrusted to an appropriate non-governmental institute".

[60] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it would not be sufficient to amend the work plan; he recommended Professor Syme to support Mr. Cain's proposal not to maintain item 4.123 in the 1951 Programme.

Professor SYME (United Kingdom) accepted the French proposal. That proposal was *adopted* by 24 votes to 5.

[61] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that that decision would enable a saving of $4,000 to be made. He thought it useful to recall, in this connexion, the suggestion made by the delegation of the Philippines concerning the dissemination of the results of the discussions mentioned in item 4.121.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission would take that suggestion into account when voting on the budget relating to that chapter.

Item 4.124.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Item 4.13.

[62] The CHAIRMAN drew the Commission's attention to documents 5C/PRG/2 and 5C/PRG/2 - Annex, relating to the Project for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind. He pointed out that the French and British delegations had presented a new proposal on that subject and that the Netherlands delegation had recommended the deletion of item 4.13.

[63] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) said that the plan for this work had aroused much interest and also much criticism in his country, and he supposed the same had been the case in other countries also. It was felt that Unesco's pre-

1. In final form: Resol. 4.1221.

paratory work had reached a stage where it could be handed over to private enterprise, Unesco merely acting as a catalyst. That suggestion was strongly opposed by the Netherlands National Commission, who argued that Unesco would not be committed by continuing the work as before, and that the Secretariat's costs would, in any case, be reduced in the coming years. Even though the Commission was only discussing the programme for 1951, however, Professor Nielsen felt sure that the expenditure of $24,000 a year would continue well beyond the three years which had been scheduled.

In his personal view, the whole idea of the History was one of genuine concern to Unesco, the more so since it might induce schools to pay increased attention to a subject outside their normal curricula. Nevertheless, he was concerned with three points:

(1) The mutual indebtedness of the culture of all peoples had been over-stressed in the past. Professor Nielsen stressed that danger particularly because, in the discussion of item 4.112, the idea of competition between different cultures had been touched upon. There was a risk that the question might be raised as to whether full justice had been done to any one culture. The Commission should avoid anything which might further increase political tension.

(2) He was profoundly shocked at what seemed to be the theme of Volume VI, *Synthesis and Conclusion*. He asked whether Unesco really wished to forecast what should be the combined world civilizations of the future. Unesco should be the servant of world culture, not its director.

(3) The work when finished should not be issued as Unesco's official version of world history. Unesco should furnish the conditions in which the cultures of the world could meet. Any judgment of values must be the responsibility of the author. That should be the decisive point in deciding whether or not Unesco should sponsor the scheme. The final form must be such that no one could invoke the authority of Unesco for any interpretation, otherwise the horrible prospect would have to be faced of the General Conference trying to evaluate the cultural contributions of different countries, as it at present evaluated the importance of different points of the programme. Unesco should confine itself to the more modest role of initiator of the project, leaving the foreground to the commercial publisher, if necessary without even having its name on the title page.

[64] Mr. FEBVRE (France) read out the following project which the French and United Kingdom delegations had jointly drafted:

4.13 Te proceed immediately with the project for a Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind by appointing, with the approval of the International Council of Scientific Union and the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, a Commission to undertake on behalf of Unesco, full responsibility for the preparation and execution of the work, and also:

4.131 To prepare an abridged work . . .

Further, to amend the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 172, paragraph VI] as follows:

Under authority of Programme Resolutions 4.13 and 4.131, to request a Commission of not less than 10 members to prepare a revised plan for a work on the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind taking into account the plan prepared by the Committee of Experts, and such other suggestions as may have been received; to conduct correspondence and call conferences and meetings on the subject; if necessary, to appoint directors and writers in connexion with the project; and to report for the informations and comments of the General Conference. To administer the programme activities two posts (one grade 14 and one grade 4) and travel for holding consultations on various aspects of the work are required ($24,000).

Mr. Febvre recalled that the question had already been discussed on numerous occasions by different organs of Unesco, and that an international committee of experts had been convened to discuss the problem. He did not feel obliged to reply forthwith to the various objections that had been raised in that connexion, as the purpose of the projects submitted by him was the appointment of a committee, whose members would be specially chosen for their competence, to discuss all the questions relating to the problem. In Mr. Febvre's view, that task was one of the most important that could be undertaken by Unesco for the achievement of its objects.

[65] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) said that it was very important that this work should be carried out by a body of scholars, and that Unesco should not be responsible for the text. This matter had been given exceptionally careful consideration by the three co-operating bodies in the United Kingdom, because they felt that, if the work were well done, it would greatly enhance the importance of Unesco in the world, but that if it were badly done, Unesco would run just those risks which had been mentioned by Professor Nielsen, and which would be disastrous.

The United Kingdom delegation therefore wanted the whole project replanned in conjunction with the two Councils set up for the purpose.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Draft resolution on educational problems in non-self-governing territories [document 5C/OXR/5, Add. 1].

[1] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) wished to pay tribute to the authors of the report on the use of indigenous languages in education [document 5C/OXR/5, Annex I]. That document was extremely useful and should be widely disseminated. The Belgian delegation hoped that Unesco would continue its work in that field. It wished to draw the Commission's attention to the "Journées d'études coloniales" recently held in Brussels, which might provide the Organization with useful information on education.

As regards the proposed measures for the eradication of illiteracy in non-self-governing territories [document 5C/OXR/5, Annex II], the Belgian delegation particularly appreciated the fact that the authors of the document had taken into account the variety of aspects of that problem occurring in the various territories concerned. There should, in fact, be no uniform campaign; rather, efforts should be made to safeguard the traditional values of each of the territories, while enriching them with the experience of the more developed countries.

The Belgian delegation expressed its satisfaction that Unesco was collaborating with the United Nations, and particularly with the Trusteeship Council, in seeking a solution to those general problems.

[2] Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt) associated himself with the remarks of the delegate of Belgium. He thoroughly approved the Executive Board's recommendations for the continuation of work in the future, but felt that a small clause might be added at the end of the first or second paragraphs of the recommendations of the Executive Board on page 2 of document 5C/OXR/5 Add. 1, as follows:

With special reference to conditions under which a national language has been subordinated to that of the administrating Power and the effect of such subordination on national culture and national institutions.

He explained that the word "national" did not refer to any small tribal language, but to a recognized national language which had been subordinated to that of an administrating Power. His delegation did not wish to indicate whether the effect of such subordination had been good or bad, but left it to the Secretariat, in its survey, to ascertain the effect.

[3] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) recalled that the question of non-self-governing territories had first been under consideration after the San Francisco Conference, and it was very fortunate that the United Nations had been requested to keep in mind the educational development of people in those territories, as well as other aspects. He welcomed document 5C/OXR/5 - Annex III as a very important contribution to the consideration of the whole matter, and hoped that Unesco would give much attention to the problem. He asked the Secretariat to give the Commission some idea of the cost of the study and the length of time which it was likely to take, and also of the manner in which it would be related to the entire fundamental education programme.

[4] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), replying to the question about the cost of the study, referred to paragraph I on page 86 of the Budget Estimates, where there was an item of $3,000 for fees for studies of the use of the mother-tongue in education. The Budget Committee had pointed out that that item was not related to a programme resolution, but it was related to the study under discussion and the money could therefore be transferred to the latter. It was estimated that the cost of the whole project in 1951, including that $3,000, would be $34,000.

With regard to a plan of work, it was intended to use the $3,000 for preparatory studies and working papers for a conference of experts on indigenous languages and for the fight against illiteracy. It was proposed to hold that meeting in 1951, convening experts representing, not only the non-self-governing territories and administrating Powers, but also other Member States. It was planned that the Conference would divide into three groups: (1) to study the problem arising from the presence both of a native language and

of a second language; (2) to consider the problem of the fight against illiteracy; (3) to examine psychological and social questions arising from the first two problems.

With regard to the question of the time involved, the Secretariat thought that each of the three divisions of the Conference might do work which would lead in later years to authoritative volumes on each of the problems. The relationship of the study to fundamental education was very close, and much of the work already done in fundamental education would assist in carrying out the project under discussion.

[5] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported the amendment proposed by the delegate of Egypt, as his delegation attached great importance to the preservation of national languages, which helped people in the non-self-governing territories along the road towards independence and self-government.

[6] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) congratulated the Secretariat on the reports contained in Annexes I and II to document 5C/OXR/5. Those reports constituted a statement of methods. They not only set forth the problems peculiar to non-self-governing territories—which they thus kept before the conscience of the nations — but also indicated methods for the handling of those problems. France had always taken an interest in the education of the native population for which she was responsible, and was now actively engaged on the problem of "basic French" in those countries where the native languages were as yet inadequate. She was also endeavouring to make the indigenous languages an instrument which would enable the native populations to attain a higher level of education. The French National Commission had already collaborated with Unesco at the exhibition of school textbooks held in Paris, and it intended to ask the Secretariat for advice concerning the teaching of indigenous languages. The French delegation hoped that the studies undertaken by the Organization would be actively pursued, so that definite results might be made available to Member States requesting them.

[7] Mr. WAHAB (France) pointed out to the Egyption delegate that Arabic did not come within the category of indigenous languages. Moreover, he considered that Arabic was adequately taught in all countries in which it was used. In North Africa, for instance, it was taught on a footing of equality with the French language.

[8] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated that the matter had not been considered by the Board, but his feeling was that the amendment proposed by the Egyptian delegation was out of the general spirit of the resolution moved by the Board. In view of the importance of the amendment, delegates might wish to have before them the text of the amendment in French and English, before taking even a provisional decision.

It was *decided* that the text of the draft amendment presented by the Egyptian delegation should be distributed to the Commission in time to enable it to be discussed at the first meeting on Monday, 12 June.

Subject to that amendment, the resolution of the Executive Board [document 5C/OXR/5 Add. 1] was *approved*.[1]

[9] The CHAIRMAN stated that the Persian delegation had submitted a draft resolution proposing a grant-in-aid of $10,000 to the World Federation of United Nations Associations to enable it to continue its work in agreement with Unesco's Department of Education.

Grant-in-Aid to the World Federation of United Nations Associations (*continued*).

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL entered a reservation with regard to the amount of the grant-in-aid proposed by that resolution. He also mentioned that the wording of the text under discussion did not seem to be in accordance with the practice, adopted by the Executive Board, of stating the purpose of each resolution in the text submitted.

[11] The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the United Nations to inform the Commission whether seminars on teaching about the United Nation were organized by the latter.

[12] M. DURÁN (United Nations) stated that no seminars on teaching about the United Nations had hitherto been organized by the Secretariat of that body. In the past, the United Nations had been greatly helped by seminars organized by Unesco, WFUNA and by Member States. In 1951, however, the United Nations was planning to promote a number of national seminars, with the collaboration of Unesco, in Brazil, Chile, the United States and other countries where the United Nations had information centres; the seminars would be run by National Commissions, national education authorities, teaching associations and national branches of the United Nations, so that the only cost to the United Nations would be that involved by sending materials for the work of the seminars.

[13] At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) agreed to draw up a new

1. In final form: 9.3.

text of his draft resolution which would be re-examined at the first meeting on Monday, 12 June.

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part II].

4. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES (*continued*) (4.1).

SECTION 4.12 (INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH) (*continued*).

Item 4.13 (continued).

[14] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) spoke in support of resolution 4.13. He recalled an objection made that morning to the effect that the main purpose of the history was not scientific, but aimed at propaganda. A careful perusal of document 5C/PRG/2, however, could leave no doubt that the main purpose of the work was scientific, seeking to describe the victories of mankind in its long and tedious march towards progress. He saw no objection to representatives of ICSU and CIPSH participating in the preparation of the work as, on the contrary, their participation would ensure Unesco against any accusation of subjectivity in the work. It was easy to find fault with the project, but if it were not approved, it would mean the loss of much valuable work done in the past two years. He was strongly in favour of the appointment of a board of editors, consisting of the best talents available and containing representatives of the most important cultures. Sir Sarvepalli thought the scheme before the Commission had every chance of success and he therefore recommended it for acceptance.

[15] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) withdrew the objections previously made by his delegation and whole-heartedly supported the Executive Board's proposal, as amended by the delegations of France and the United Kingdom.

[16] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) supported the proposal made by the French and United Kingdom delegates at the previous meeting. The value of a "History of Mankind", available to the general public, seemed to him indisputable, and it would be entirely fitting for Unesco to demonstrate that universal co-operation had developed in time as it was now developing in space.

[17] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) agreed with Professor Carneiro. The publication of such work seemed to him to be justified both from a general point of view, on account of the importance of its aims, and from Unesco's point of view, since it would show the continuity of the Organization's work. It would, indeed, be the fruit of a project that had been long meditated by previous Sessions of the Conference and given definite shape by a committee of experts. The Franco-British proposal for the expansion of the responsible Commission would further ensure the excellence of the proposed publication.

[18] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) wondered whether works already published on the same subject should not be considered before embarking on a work of such magnitude. He therefore proposed that resolution 4.13 should be replaced by the following text:

The bibliographical study of works, suitable for the educated public as well as experts, on the scientific and cultural history of mankind.

[19] Mr. CIASCA (Italy) supported the proposal made by the French and British delegates. The Italian delegation also proposed that the abridged work contemplated in the resolution should simply be a historical summary, which could be referred to after consulting the larger work.

[20] Mr. POELHEKKE (Netherlands) wondered whether Unesco was really qualified to decide on the authenticity of a history of mankind from its beginning. Experience showed how difficult it was for historians to find a common denominator even in the case of national history. Whatever official sponsorship Unesco might give to the proposed work, it would nevertheless remain the work of a particular scholar, whose statements other scholars might refute, in all objectivity, by virtue of the freedom of thought that was a recognized right of every individual. He did not doubt that the experts called in by Unesco would be worthy of the confidence of scientific circles; but he was afraid that the proposed work might entail Unesco's official sponsorship of a world history, a task which an organization only four years old seemed hardly fitted to perform.

Dr. Poelhekke therefore proposed the deletion of item 4.13.

That proposal, seconded by the delegates of ECUADOR, YUGOSLAVIA, SWEDEN, LIBERIA and AUSTRIA, was rejected by 21 votes to 7.

The amendment proposed by Anas Khan seconded by the delegates of ECUADOR and the NETHERLANDS, was *rejected* by 15 votes to 7.

The alternative text drafted jointly by the French and United Kingdom delegations and submitted by Mr. Febvre at the previous meeting, was *adopted* by 24 votes to 2.[1]

1. In final form: 4.123.

Item 4.131.

[21] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) and Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) emphasized the educational value of the history textbook contemplated in that resolution, and hoped that the project would soon be carried out.

[22] Dr. POELHEKKE (Netherlands) said the arguments he had put forward in connexion with item 4.13 seemed to him even more applicable to item 4.131, and he therefore moved its deletion.

[23] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) supported Dr. Poelhekke's proposal on the grounds that it was premature to consider an abridgement before the fundamental work had been published. He considered the resolution to be superfluous in the 1951 Programme.

[24] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was afraid that it would be impossible for the Secretariat to carry out during the same year the project mentioned in resolution 4.13 and the textbook contemplated in resolution 4.131. But, if it were decided to give up the preparation of the textbook during 1951, he hoped that the decision would not be interpreted as a final relinquishment.

[25] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) agreed with the Director-General that resolution 4.131 was premature.

The Netherlands proposal to delete item 4.131, seconded by the delegate of ITALY and others, was *adopted* by 19 votes to 8.

At the request of Mr. CAIN (France), it was stated that the Department of Cultural Activities would nevertheless continue to seek a satisfactory solution to the educational problem entailed by the absence of textbooks dealing with the history of mankind.

BUDGET TABLE III.4.C (document 5C/5 (II), page 170).

Approved, subject to further examination by the Budget Committee of the financial implications of the amendments adopted by the Commission.

ARTS AND LETTERS (4.2).

SECTION 4.21 (ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE ARTS AS A WHOLE).

[26] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation wished item 4.211 to be maintained, on condition that no funds be allocated for the publication of special pamphlets and a bulletin under that resolution: that is to say, item 4.211 should simply authorize the Secretariat to carry out clearing-house activities with Member States by correspondence. Mr. Thompson made that proposal because, under resolution 4.212, his delegation would propose an amended text [document 5C/104], the purpose of which was to relieve the Secretariat of any considerable budgetary provision in respect of exhibitions of children's art.

A new resolution (also contained in document 5C/104) would authorize the Director-General to organize a pilot seminar for art teachers, and it would have budgetary implications.

The total result of the United Kingdom's three proposals would not be to increase the budgetary allocation of Section 4.21, but it was desired that funds hitherto allotted for publications and exhibitions should be used instead for the pilot seminar. The reason for the proposal was that the United Kingdom public had been very greatly impressed by Unesco's seminar work and had noticed that some of Unesco's most successful projects and publications had been begun by seminars. Certain resolutions regarding the teaching of the arts and the role of the arts in general education, had been in Unesco's Programme for some time, but the United Kingdom National Commission felt that very little concrete result had so far been achieved, and it wanted Unesco to study the question with the aid of practising art teachers in a number of countries.

[27] Mr. CAIN (France) agreed with the United Kingdom delegate. He mentioned that, at the meetings of the French National Commission, the painter André Lhote had on several occasions expressed the hope that Unesco would consider studying certain problems that concerned living artists, and would not confine itself solely to the study of artists of the past.

[28] Mr. ODEGAARD (United States of America) announced that his delegation had decided not to support item 4.211, and he warmly supported the new draft resolution proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

[29] Senator PECSON (Philippines) was sure that the United Kingdom delegation had the best intentions in limiting the scope of resolution 4.211, but she pointed out that special publications were very important in certain areas, and she was against postponing for another year activities which could be carried out in 1951. The effort to prevent tensions from arising was a race against time, and anything which Unesco could do to bring the world together was worth while. She would therefore oppose the United Kingdom proposal.

[30] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) observed that the whole purpose of his delegation's three proposals, contained in document 5C/104, was to ensure that nothing was published before the

proposed seminar had taken place: the results of the seminar would determine the nature of the pamphlets. In its new resolution, the United Kingdom delegation made it plain that it did envisage that Unesco should publish the results of the seminar in 1951 and that it should also plan a series of publications and pamphlets in 1952.

[31] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities), while recognizing the value of the British proposal, pointed out that the effect of the suppression of a budgetary allocation for item 4.211 would be the complete absence of publications on the arts in education.

[32] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) repeated that his delegation wished there to be no budgetary implication for publications under resolution 4.211. It did not thereby intend to reduce the Secretariat to impotence, considering that it would still carry out very useful work under clearing-house activities.

Item 4.211 was *adopted.* [1]

Item 4.212 was *adopted* in the amended form proposed by the United Kingdom delegation in document 5C/104. [2]

[33] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom), presenting the new draft resolution submitted by his delegation in document 5C/104, explained that it was intended to hold a seminar for those who taught visual arts in schools; it was envisaged that the seminar would be on a comparatively small scale, not necessitating any considerable increase in the appropriation. It was intended that the necessary funds should be found as a result of the amendment adopted for item 4.212. It was hoped that the seminar might be the first of a series of seminars held in other countries on other arts.

[34] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) thought that the Executive Board would oppose the United Kingdom resolution if it involved a budgetary increase, but if not, would leave it to the Programme and Budget Commission to take a decision.

[35] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand) asked how much money could be saved by the amendment to item 4.212, and also how much the seminar would cost.

[36] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) thought, from the information given by the United Kingdom delegate, that a sum of $10,000 should cover the expenditure necessitated by a seminar grouping about thirty persons and working in co-operation with the local and central authorities of Great Britain.

[37] The new draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom delegation in document 5C/104 was *adopted* in the following form:

To organize in the United Kingdom, with the assistance of the central and local authorities, a pilot seminar for art teachers.[1]

Item 4.213.

[38] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) announced that her delegation had studied carefully the interim Report on the Freedom of the Artist contained in document 5C/PRG/3 and doubted the wisdom of the standard contracts proposed therein. In the opinion of her delegation it was sufficient to fix certain rules for relations between the artist and the public authorities. On page 6, it was recommended that Unesco should encourage courses in universities: the Danish delegation considered that a good idea, but thought it more important to hold such courses for teachers in elementary schools.

[39] Miss BAXTER (United States of America) referred to the United States proposal for an alternative resolution contained in document 5C/54. This proposal was based on the belief that the work of creative artists was one of the most important factors in enabling the people of the world to get to know each other. Hitherto, artists had not done much for Unesco, nor had Unesco done much for them, and there had been a lack of emphasis on the contribution of artists to international understanding. It should also be recognized that the greatness of art and music was developed in a high degree in countries which were scientifically and technically under-developed. Unesco's questionnaire, sent out to artists in all Member States, had received an extraordinary welcome in the United States and had led to the proposal for the holding of a congress in New York. The report of the Meeting of Experts on the Freedom of the Artist, held at Unesco House in February 1950, had been given wide circulation, and the United States National Commission recommended that the five main topics discussed by the Committee should form part of the basis for the agenda of the New York Congress. The topics were the following: (1) insufficient aid from publics authorities and from the State; (2) inadequacy of financial arrangements; (3) legal and economic difficulties on the international level; (4) high price of artists' materials; (5) censorship. It was the purpose of the Congress to provide a focal point for the work already done by

1. In final form: Resol. 4.211.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.212.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.213.

Unesco and by its questionnaire, and to co-ordinate the results.

The United States proposal was intended to replace the existing resolution 4.213, and the $3,000 allocated for that resolution could be used to plan the programme and agenda for the proposed Congress.

[40] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) seconded the United States proposal and welcomed all work carried out for the benefit of the creative artist. He pointed out that writers and artists contributed to the spiritual heritage of their countries and had a right to expect protection and freedom.

[41] In reply to a question from Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur, Budget Committee) stated that the maximum cost of the United States proposal would be $3,000, and that the sum might even be reduced by a saving in travel costs.

[42] Mr. CIASCA (Italy) seconded the American proposal. In view of the practical problems entailed by the freedom of the artist, the Italian delegation would like definite regulations to be drawn up, governing the production of works of art, while at the same time ensuring for their authors the greatest freedom of expression.

[43] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that, subject to a more detailed examination of the budgetary implications, the Secretariat could undertake in 1951 the preparation of an International Arts Congress. It seemed to him, however, that the American delegation's proposal raised two important questions: (1) The financing of such a congress could not be covered by Unesco's budget. To what extent were Member States willing to contribute? (2) The meeting in New York of a congress of almost world-wide scope, at the time of the United Nations General Assembly, would involve almost insuperable accommodation problems.

[44] Miss BAXTER (United States of America) stated that the size of the congress had been fully realized by those who had discussed it in the spring in Washington with people associated with the United Nations. Although nothing definite had been said, it was evident that there was great interest in the project, but the United States National Commission had not felt that it could go further in the matter without knowing Unesco's attitude and that of its Member States represented at the General Conference.

[45] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) announced that his delegation was prepared to support the United States' resolution as it stood, but trusted that the congress would not be devoted to the establishment of a Charter, but to practical matters, such as censorship and impediments to the free circulation of artists and works of art.

[46] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) considered that the holding of a world congress of artists would probably be the most effective method of dealing with the problem of the freedom of the artist, but he emphasized that such a congress should be free of all political considerations.

Mr. CAIN (France) also supported the American proposal.

The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States of America in document 5C/54 was *adopted*.[1]

SECTION 4.22 (THEATRE).

Items 4.221, 4.2211 and 4.2212.

Adopted without comment.[2]

Item 4.2213.

[47] A United Kingdom proposal to delete the words "with a view to making the theatre a more effective instrument of adult education" in resolution 4..2213 was *adopted*.

With that amendment, item 4.2213 was *adopted*.[3]

Item 4.2214.

[48] Referring to his delegation's proposal to delete item 4.2214, Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) stated that the aim of the proposal was to prevent Unesco from sponsoring activities whose fruition was doubtful.

[49] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the deletion of item 4.2214 would not diminish Unesco's financial charges, as international theatre weeks were financed in each country without any contribution from the Organization.

[50] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) would also regret to see that resolution deleted from the programme, as certain national centres, and particularly the Belgian National Centre, were actively interested in the organization of international theatre weeks.

[51] Mr. CIASCA (Italy) proposed that the question should be referred for discussion to the next session of the International Theatre Institute.

The United Kingdom delegate withdrew his

1. In final form: Resol. 4.214, 4.2141, 4.2142.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.221, 4.2211 and 4.2212.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.2213.

proposal, and resolution 4.2214 was *adopted* without change.[1]

[52] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained his delegation's point of view concerning the cinema in education and particularly in popular education. He was surprised that Unesco had not given a more important place in its programme to cinematographic art, and asked that the Executive Board should consider suitable measures for remedying that state of affairs. *Agreed.*

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.2214.

TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

4. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

ARTS and LETTERS (4.2).

SECTION 4.23 (MUSIC).

Items 4.23 to 4.232.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Item 4.233.

[1] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) observed that this was a proposal to issue various publications containing discographies. He asked what steps had been taken to keep in touch with publishing firms in the United Kingdom, United States, France and other countries which were already publishing works of that character.

[2] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that these publications were a part of the collection begun the previous year. The catalogue had been published in French. The English edition had just been issued and had been distributed in the United States. A second series would be published in the near future, and this would be followed by classical music of the East.

[3] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) said that her delegation believed the only possible justification for having the resolution in the Programme would be from the point of view of publishing anthologies from the Far East, for Western music had been recorded, and very well catalogued. Unesco was looking for economy, not for additional things to do. The United States delegation therefore opposed the resolution.

[4] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) asked whether the scheme could not be carried out on a purely commercial basis, if the Commission thought that that type of activity might produce revenues which would offset the original publication costs.

[5] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked whether the catalogues would give the purchaser any guidance in the choice of recordings, or whether they were merely lists.

[6] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the arrangements for these publications were on a commercial basis under contracts between Unesco and publishing firms. Under the terms of such contracts a part of the income from sales came back to Unesco. However, sums thus recovered did not appear in the budget of the Department of Cultural Activities, since they were allocated to the publications fund established under a resolution of the Fourth Session.

Clearly such catalogues must be critical in nature and indicate, in the case of India for example, the nature and origin of folk or religious music and its connexion with religious and cultural traditions.

The catalogue of Chopin's works had had a great commercial success and it should be pointed out

1. In final form: Resol. 4.23 to 4.232.

that the whole collection was of exceptional interest, as there was nothing similar in existence.

[7] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) understood that a catalogue of the works of Mozart was in course of preparation. He could not see how this could be an improvement on the Morfeld catalogue, and regretted that preference had not been given to a catalogue of the works of Haydn.

[8] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) agreed with Dr. Fawzi. He had heard something of the work which was done or being done on so-called Indian music, and he thought it would be much better to leave it alone.

[9] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) stated that, in view of the comments made, his delegation would not vote against the resolution, but wished it to be recorded that the United Kingdom delegation opposed the preparation of catalogues for composers like Beethoven, whose recorded works must surely have been catalogued in many places. The delegation believed that Unesco had a great part to play in cataloguing, for example, the works of American folk-music composers and Chinese music; but it seemed hardly consistent with Unesco's role to compile discographies of great composers.

Item 4.233 was *adopted* by 9 votes to 7.[1]

Item 4.234.

[10] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of the resolution. At first sight its object was laudable; yet it stated that the work was to be carried out in agreement with commercial gramophone companies. It seemed to the United Kingdom delegation that if there were works of recognized worth of which there were so far no commercial recordings, even though commercial companies might be lacking in high ideals, they would nevertheless be alert enough for profit to make such recordings themselves.

[11] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) supported Professor Syme. Swedish experts and the Swedish National Commission were very sceptical towards the last four resolutions in the section, because they did not think it fitting for Unesco to associate itself with commercial interests of that kind. As to the particular resolution under discussion, if the music was of recognized worth, Professor Düring thought commercial companies would ensure that it was recorded in time.

[12] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that, as the International Council of Music had indicated, there still remained a large number of works of great worth which had not so far been recorded, either because they had been overlooked or because it had been thought that their commercial possibilities were not sufficiently great. Eastern and folk-music were instances. The International Council of Music had listed some fifty works which would be recorded and would bear a special Unesco symbol, and a number of copies would be bought at cost price by Unesco for National Commissions.

[13] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) was agreeable to the recordings proposed by the International Council of Music whose choice would, he hoped, be made in the most strictly objective spirit, but he was not quite clear what was meant by "a collection of records of musical works of recognized worth".

[14] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) gave details of the official and private bodies of various countries represented on the International Council of Music. It was incorrect to assume that the criterion of merit was selection for reproduction by a commercial concern. For instance, many pictures by the greatest masters had not yet been reproduced and innumerable books of the first importance were still untranslated.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) associated himself with the United Kingdom delegate, and would vote against the resolution.

Item 4.234 was *adopted* by 18 votes to 6.[1]

Item 4.235.

[15] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) moved the deletion of the item for the same reasons as those which had prompted him to propose the deletion of item 4.234.

[16] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) pointed out that the countries whose folklore was little known had special interest in this project, through which there could be made available to the people those artistic and educational works best fitted to reveal to them the soul of the more primitive civilizations.

[17] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) also supported the resolution. At the Congress of Arabic Music, held at Cairo in 1930, the only work of any value had been the recording of the music of the Delta. These priceless records had never been published, and he therefore urged most strongly that provision be made for their publication under the present project.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.233.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.234.

[18] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) similarly supported the resolution, and did not think that the objections raised to the preceding item really applied to resolution 4.235.

[19] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) asked whether any studies had already been undertaken and what were the countries for which it was proposed to undertake such studies.

[20] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that Unesco was proposing to co-operate with the International Folklore Archives whose headquarters were at Geneva. Albums would largely consist of reproductions of recordings of which only one original had been recorded on some non-resistant substance.

[21] The Swedish motion to delete the item was not seconded and lapsed.

Item, 4.235 was *adopted* by 22 votes to 1.[1]

SECTION 4.24 (VISUAL ARTS).

Item 4.241. Draft amendment presented by Italy [document 5C/46].

[22] Presenting his delegation's amendment, Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) explained that they felt it desirable to organize the exhibitions in such a way that they would be representative of the various artistic cultures and strengthen international understanding.

[23] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (Vice-Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board had had an opportunity of discussing the amendment. Every effort would of course be made to ensure fair representation, but the amendment called for a committee of experts, and as far as possible, Unesco was trying to reduce the number of such committees. As the amendment had budgetary implications, the Board could not support it.

[24] Mr. CAIN (France) supported the Italian motion.

Mr. de TONNANCOUR (Canada) was also in favour of the amendment, and hoped that in the selection of reproductions, consideration would be given to the geographical factor.

Item 4.241, with the Italian amendment, was *adopted* by 14 votes to 5.[2]

Item 4.242.

[25] Mr. de TONNANCOUR (Canada) remarked that, valuable as were the albums mentioned in item 4.242, their range was limited, as they were designed to reach only a chosen public and the bulk of the population in any country was unaware of their existence. To reach this majority more far-reaching media must be provided, and with this in mind, the Canadian delegation proposed that item 4.242 be amplified as follows:

To continue to promote the reproduction of works of art in album form, more particularly of Renaissance painting, and, in addition, of art films and filmstrips.

[26] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the budgetary consequences of this resolution had not yet been calculated.

[27] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not intend to move the deletion of the item, but it did wish to record its grave dissatisfaction with the way in which the resolution had been implemented in 1949 and 1950. The first album was concerned with the works of Masaccio, and it was known from bitter experience that the manner in which Unesco strove to secure the co-operation of National Commissions in distributing it did not in fact encourage that distribution; on the contrary. Professor Syme asked whether the arrangements with publishers in respect of those portfolios were henceforth on a satisfactory footing. He put the question because of the grave delay which had occurred in connexion with the Masaccio album. Secondly, he asked what was the present form of contract between Unesco and publishers; thirdly, what contracts Unesco had so far entered into, and fourthly, what were the future plans for the project.

[28] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) said that her delegation supported the views of the United Kingdom delegate. She drew attention to the difference between the English and French texts of item 4.242 as printed in 5C/5 (I) Rev. The French text contained a sentence which was entirely omitted from the English edition.

[29] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) reminded the meeting that delegations had received a circular letter in March 1950 explaining the distribution procedures for albums of reproductions. The Masaccio album had been published by an Italian firm and made available to National Commissions through Unesco at a 40 per cent rebate on the list price. In the case of the Raphael album and later publications of the same kind, there would be detailed agreements with the publishers concerned, so that Unesco would not encounter the same difficulties in distribution. A standard contract was under consideration and would be submitted in the near future.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.235.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.241.

The Canadian amendment, seconded by the delegate of BRAZIL, was *rejected* by 10 votes to 3.

[30] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) suggested that item 4.242 be drafted in the following terms:

To continue to promote the publication of albums of reproduction of works of art, more particularly of works of recognized worth of which there are no reproductions in existence available to the public.

Mr. CAIN (France) thought the principle contained in that amendment should be accepted.

[31] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) pointed out that, in the form in which it appeared in document 5C/5 (II), the French text of item 4.242 said nothing about specially favourable treatment for Renaissance painting. The Commission must be on its guard against the danger of restricting the programme of reproduction of works of art.

[32] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) thought that the explicit mention of the importance of reproductions of Renaissance paintings was entirely justified. It could not be disputed that the artistic output of that period of civilization ought to be widely disseminated.

[33] Dr. POELHEKKE (Netherlands) thought that, once it was decided to draw up a programme of reproductions to be made, Renaissance art would qualify for priority, on account of its educational value.

The Yugoslav amendment to item 4.242 was seconded by the delegate of FRANCE and *adopted* by 16 votes to 7.

[34] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) announced that her delegation wished to make a comment on the original resolution, or, alternatively, to add the following words to the Yugoslav amendment:

. . . and to draw the attention of the National Commissions of Member States to the desirability of encouraging the publication of albums of national paintings and sculpture, both historical and contemporary.

The amendment was proposed because of the decision taken by the meeting of representatives of National Commissions to draw the Director-General's attention to projects in which National Commissions and Member States could take part.

[35] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the programme contained a series of resolutions addressed to Member States. He asked whether the United States delegate would therefore be willing to draft her resolution in the form of an appeal to Member States which might read: "Member States are invited to encourage . . ." If this were agreeable to the Commission, the text could be referred to the Drafting Committee.

Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) accepted the Director-General's amendment and suggestion.

The United States amendment, modified accordingly, was *adopted*.

Item 4.242, as amended by Yugoslavia, was *adopted*.[1]

Item 4.243.

[36] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) said that his delegation and the New Zealand National Commission were very interested and enthusiastic about much that was included in the resolutions on the arts, but wished for information on certain points. With regard to item 4.243, he asked how Unesco could "continue" a publication that had not yet been started. Secondly, it was stated in the Work Plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 180, paragraph XII]:

. . . to continue quarterly publication by commercial firms of the *International Arts Review*. . .

He asked how negotiations were progressing. If some capable firm with a world-wide organization had actually undertaken to produce the Review, he wondered how far contracts had gone.

[37] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the resolutions concerned the 1951 Programme. The decision to publish this review had been taken in 1949 with a view to publication in 1950. The organization of the new venture had required prolonged negotiations and extensive material preparations. The first number would therefore appear at the end of 1950. The review was designed for a very wide circulation. Initially it would be published in English, French and German only, and would appear simultaneously in France, Great Britain, the United States and Switzerland. Negotiations with publishers were in progress and contracts would be signed during the month of July. The printings planned were 10,000 copies for the United Kingdom, 10,000 copies for France, 10,000 copies for Germany and 100,000 copies for the United States; in the last case it was estimated that requirements would rise to 300,000 copies in the second year. Selling price would be $1 and Unesco would recover considerable sums through sales. In this connexion it should be pointed out that, while the proposed expenditure was to come from the budget of the Department of Cultural Activities, any revenue from sales would go to

1. In final form: Resol. 4.242.

the Publications Fund. Even supposing that no more than two-thirds of the copies printed were disposed of, the receipts passed to Unesco and turned over to the Publications Fund would amply cover expenses.

[38] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) expressed the interest of the United States National Commission in the plan to produce a review devoted to the use of artistic material as a means of furthering international understanding; it readily appreciated the fact that the launching of journals of that type was not easy. The concern of the delegate of New Zealand was quite understood, but it was hoped that the latter would be willing to give favourable consideration to resolution 4.243, which the United States delegation wholeheartedly supported.

Item 4.243 was *adopted* by 26 votes to none.[1]

Item 4.244, Draft amendment submitted by Italy [document 5C/41].

[39] The draft amendment was seconded by the delegate of FRANCE and *adopted*.[2]

Draft amendment presented by the French delegation [document 5C/80].

[40] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) stated that her delegation supported this amendment to item 4.244, and would like to bring the Board's attention to an error in the English text, namely, that the word "new" should be changed to "additional" or "supplementary".

[41] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (Vice-Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board was in entire sympathy with the principle of the resolution. The clarification proposed by the United States delegate could be left to the Drafting Committee.

The French amendment in document 5C/80, seconded by the delegate of BRAZIL, was *adopted*.

Item 4.244, as amended, was *adopted*.[3]

Draft amendment presented by Italy [documents 5C/40 (Rev.) and 5C/40 (rev.) (Corr.)].

[42] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Board had not had the advantage of being able to consider the revised proposal of the Italian delegation, but he thought he could properly represent its views in the light of what members of the Board had thought about the original Italian proposal. There was firstly the budgetary question, and it was clear that if the proposal did involve increased expenditure, the Board would have to advise the Commission not to include it in the 1951 Programme. But apart from that, the fact that Unesco had such an immense field in which it was bound to work made the Board feel that the Organization should not, for the time being, involve its limited resources of manpower and money in anything which could be regarded as appropriate to some other organ of the United Nations, and domestic architecture did not, in the Board's view, deserve first priority in 1951. The Board therefore very much hoped that the Italian Government would feel that, in bringing the matter before the General Conference and to the attention of the Director-General, enough had been done at present, and that the Italian delegation would not insist on having even the revised version of its resolution inserted in the 1951 Programme.

[43] Mr. MAGGIORA (Italy) appreciated the hesitation of the Executive Board, but could not do otherwise than draw attention yet again to the prime importance of any proposal on town planning. He mentioned that the proposed amendment was supported by the representative of the United Nations.

[44] Mr. CAIN (France) was also of opinion that, whatever the force of the Executive Board's arguments, it was impossible to pass over so important a proposal in silence. He hoped that the Commission would recognize this and that, after consultation with the International Union of Architects, it would refer the proposal to a drafting committee with a view to its being given the place to which it was entitled in the 1951 Programme.

[45] It was *decided* to bring the draft resolution to the notice of the Executive Board and the Director-General, with a view to its inclusion in the 1951 Programme.

SECTION 4,25 (LITERATURE).

Item 4.251.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Item 4.252.

[46] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) said that his delegation proposed the deletion of the item. The Sixth Session of the Conference should, for every reason, be kept as short and business-like as possible. The subject suggested in the resolution would lead either to platitudes or to endless discussions. He was not at all certain that the best artists and writers had not, in their time, even in their youth, already spent many hours and days talking about it, in houses, in studios and in cafés. The best of them had gone away

1. In final form: Resol. 4.243.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.2441.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.244.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.25 and 4.251.

and produced works of art, the inferior, he suspected, had gone on talking; the inferior should not be encouraged.

[47] Mr. BOCCA (Monaco) thought it would be both less costly and more effective to organize a discussion on the part played by the artistic sense in the development of man by including it in the investigation and consultations to be organized under the terms of item 4.213.

[48] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) asked whether the United Kingdom delegation took the view that its motion would imply the cancellation of the contract concluded, under the terms of a decision of the Fourth Session of the General Conference, between Unesco and the International PEN Club, to assist the latter in organizing conferences and publishing literary information. If this were the case, it would mean an abrupt and radical change in Unesco's policy.

[49] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) replied that the Commission had already passed item 4.251, which was of a general nature. The resolution to which his delegation took exception was of a particular nature, namely organizing a discussion—he might say, of an indefinite nature—at a definite time, namely, at the Sixth Session.

[50] Mr. CAIN (France) felt that the adoption of item 4.251 made it possible to give a reassuring answer to the questions raised by the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities.

The proposal of the United Kingdom delegation to delete item 4.252 was *adopted* by 19 votes to 2.

Item 4.253 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev. - Corr.] *and 4.254.*

[51] Mr. CAIN (France) remarked that in items 4.253 and 4.254, on the same subject, there were drafting ambiguities. The French delegation had accordingly produced a revised version of the two texts, reversing their order and striking out certain repetitions. The United Kingdom delegation had agreed that the new version was more logical and clearer.

The revised French version of draft resolutions 4.253 and 4.254, which was accepted by the Executive Board, was *adopted* and referred to the Drafting Committee.[1]

Item 4.255.

[52] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) explained that the draft amendment proposed by his delegation [document 5C/27] sought to fill two gaps: firstly, many Arabic- and Persian-speaking scholars and writers were still unknown in the West; secondly, the translation into Persian of standard works of Western culture was of major importance to his country.

[53] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) observed that the matter was clearly important and difficult, and illustrated the danger of any such resolution as the one which the Executive Board had had the courage to put forward, because whenever certain parts of the world were selected, suggestions were bound to be made—quite justifiably—that other parts of the world should also be included. The only advice the Board could give was that, in its opinion, the total amount of money provided in the Budget for the purposes of the resolution under consideration should not be exceeded. It was for the Commission, however, to decide whether some arrangement could be made whereby the scope of the Board's proposal could be extended.

[54] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur, Budget Committee) said that another amendment had been put forward by the Italian Delegation. The Committee felt that one, or possibly both, might be included in the project for the translation of great books, by means of a re-allocation of funds.

[55] Presenting his delegation's amendment [document 5C/45] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) said that the translation and publication of the Italian classics had been formally agreed and would be carried out as part of the 1951 Programme. Following a communication to that effect from the Secretariat, the Italian National Commission had convened a committee of experts to prepare a programme. There was no need to stress the regrettable impression which would be produced on that committee and on Italian public opinion by the suppression of this resolution. The Executive Board probably felt that the Italian classics were sufficiently well known outside Italy. This unhappily was not so, because so few people knew Italian.

[56] Moreover, another of Unesco's motives in suggesting this project was that it wished to improve the translation of the classics. Unesco should therefore undertake a pilot project in this field, and for that purpose Italian classical literature was particularly suitable. It was essential that Unesco should provide assistance and apply the means of scientific supervision at its disposal for the organization in each Member State of a series of translations of classics. The Italian

1. In final form: Resol. 4.252 and 4.253.

National Commission had already entered into agreements with the National Commissions of France and a number of South American countries. Mr. Pilotti would therefore urge that Unesco should make the very moderate financial effort called for and discharge one of the fundamental tasks laid on it, whose execution, incidentally, had been proceeding in Italy for a considerable time past.

[57] Mr. CAIN (France) felt that the Persian and Italian proposals were of the very essence of Unesco's work. The Secretariat would undoubtedly be giving much attention to the problem of translation, and the publication of the *Index Translationum* was a major achievement. There was also no doubt, as the Italian delegation had pointed out, that it was Unesco's responsibility to arrange pilot projects. It would not be financially responsible for the publications, but its supervision would make it possible to put a term to the dispersal of effort in unsystematic translations and organize collections calculated to enrich the culture of the international public. It was obviously impossible for Unesco to abjure the performance of a task which clearly deserved priority.

[58] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) feared lest the adoption of proposals explicitly restricted to Persian and Italian literature might open the door to a series of perfectly legitimate claims. While recognizing the outstanding value of the literatures of the two countries, he felt that Unesco should refrain from committing itself in advance and confining its activities within predetermined limits to the exclusive benefit of the literature of specific countries.

[59] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) attached great importance to such translations. He fully supported the proposal of the delegate of Persia.

[60] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL warned the Commission against the danger of adopting the solution which seemed the easiest, but which the sheer looseness of its terms of reference and the vastness of its scope would make impossible in practice. It must not be forgotten that the 1951 Programme was in some sort a basic programme. Further, the limits imposed by the budget made it impossible for Unesco to undertake everything at once. It was therefore essential to lay down a basic programme taking into account certain logical priorities. It went without saying that once these initial tasks were completed, Unesco would continue the fulfilment of the general programme which was clearly assigned to it, but the budgetary limits to which it must conform obliged it to concentrate on specific objectives and take a firm decision regarding what was to be done under the 1951 Programme.

[61] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) quite frankly thought that what the delegate of Italy had said was true; the Board did in fact consider including the Italian language as one of those into which and from which translations might be made, and it was true that that fact had been publicized in Italy; the Commission should recognize that fact. Secondly, the reason why the Board had proposed the resolution was because it thought that Arabic was one of the languages which was too little known and therefore it was one from which and into which translations should be promoted by Unesco; in the case of South American literature, there were enough existing translations into Spanish from other languages, but the Board felt that the need for translation from the literature of Latin America into other languages was sufficiently pressing to justify its selection from among all the other possibilities. Sir John could only, on behalf of the Board, beg the Commission to follow the Director-General's advice, and have the courage either to increase the amount of money for the item, and the number of works which should be translated in 1951, or else maintain the text as submitted by the Board.

[62] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) said that her delegation appreciated the practical problems to which the Director-General had made allusion; it therefore supported his views and those of the Executive Board.

[63] The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Italian and Persian delegations proposed to maintain their amendments.

[64] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) replied in the affirmative. His amendment amounted to no more than a request for the continuance of a pilot project under a resolution of the Fourth Session of the General Conference on which practical work had already been begun in Italy. Its effect on the budget was very slight, the sum in question being about $2,000 only.

[65] Mr. SADIGHI (Persia) also proposed to maintain his amendment, which was the logical complement of item 4.253 already adopted by the Commission.

[66] Dr. POELHEKKE (Netherlands) supported both the proposed amendments and wished to know whether Dutch literature had been included in the general translation programme.

[67] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activites) said that no project for the

translation of classics written in Dutch had yet been considered.

[68] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) felt that the decision to be taken by the Commission could be expressed more simply if the Italian and Persian draft resolutions were combined in a single compromise paragraph indicating the necessity of concluding arrangements with the States concerned for the translation and publication of a selection of classical and modern works in Arabic and from Latin American and Italian literature, but without prejudice to the later extension of this programme to Persia and other countries.

[69] The compromise amendment of the Cuban delegation for the amalgamation of the Italian and Persian proposals was *adopted* by 21 votes to 10, referred to the Drafting Committee, and sent to the Budget Committee for examination.

Item 4.255, thus amended, was *adopted*.[1]

Item 4.2551.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

BUDGET TABLE III.4. D (I) [document 5C/5 (II), pages 176 and 177].

[70] A proposal by the FRENCH delegation for the posting to item 4.255 of the $4,000 saved on item 4.123 was *adopted*.

Budget table III.4.D (I) was *adopted*, subject to that modification.

SECTION 4.3 (MUSEUMS).

Items 4.31 and 4.311.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item 4.312.

[71] After withdrawal of a French amendment [document 5C/63], which the Executive Board was unable to accept, item 4.312 was *adopted* without modification.[4]

Item 4.33. Draft amendment presented by France [document 5C/82].

[72] Mrs. RUSSELL (United States of America) asked what the budgetary implications of the adoption of the French resolution would be, to which Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that there were none.

[73] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that in that case the Board would have no objections.

[74] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) supported the French draft amendment, while enquiring whether Unesco had already made any plans; he observed that, in Western Europe at any rate, there were already a certain number of exchanges of art exhibitions. Such a plan might be more useful if, instead of thinking in the first instance of Western Europe, Unesco were to think more of some of the peripheral regions of the world.

The French amendment to item 4.33 was *adopted*.[1]

Item 4.34.

[75] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) said his delegation felt very strongly that *Museum* was a well-organized and well-conducted publication and that Unesco deserved every credit for it.

Item 4.34 was *adopted* without change.[2]

New item.

[76] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) presented a new draft resolution proposed by his delegation [document 5C/39 (Rev.)].

[77] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) had no comments to make on the revised version submitted by the Italian delegation.

[78] The Italian draft resolution was supported by the delegates of FRANCE, NETHERLANDS, PERSIA, AUSTRIA, GREECE and YUGOSLAVIA, and *rejected*.

SECTION 4.4 (HISTORICAL MONUMENTS).

Item 4.41.

[79] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) presented an amendment from the United Kingdom delegation, namely, instead of "an international committee to serve as an advisory body", to insert:

> To appoint, in consultation with National Commissions and international organizations, a panel of experts from which consultants may be selected to advise Member States on particular problems associated with the conservation. . .

It must not be forgotten that the problems of different regions of the world were different according to country and climate. It would be expensive and unnecessary to have an international committee. All that was required was the setting

1. In final form: Resol. 4.254.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.254.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.31 and 4.311.
4. In final form: Resol. 4.312.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.33.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.34.

up of a panel, and the sending of experts to countries that needed them.

The United Kingdom amendment was seconded by the delegate of AUSTRALIA.

[80] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) wished to emphasize that if the Commission adopted the draft amendment, it would be going directly against the decisions taken at the Third Session at Beirut and the Fourth Session in Paris. The meeting of experts on sites and monuments of art and history held in Paris between 17 and 21 October 1949 had presented a report on the international protection of cultural treasures in the event of armed conflict and had adopted a declaration of principle set out in ten articles which would be found in document 5C/PRG/6. The formation of a permanent international committee to be the successor of the Museums Office had been deemed one of Unesco's essential tasks. All over the earth vast treasures of human genius, of priceless worth, were threatened with destruction. The permanent international committee which it was proposed to set up would involve only infinitesimal expense (about $8,000) compared with the importance of what it could accomplish. Such a committee would ensure the liaison essential between all the countries affected, and the speaker wished to urge most strongly that Unesco should not reverse its policy in a problem of such importance.

Mr. CAIN (France), Dr. POELHEKKE (Netherlands) and Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) concurred.

[81] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) although impressed by these arguments, was nevertheless still of opinion that this was a task for experts, and that the United Kingdom's draft was better than the original.

[82] The United Kingdom amendment was *rejected* by 20 votes to 7.

Item 4.41 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

Item 4.42.

[83] In this connexion the CHAIRMAN drew attention to the study included in document 5C/PRG/6, to which the Brazilian delegate had referred during the discussion on the previous item.

Item 4.42 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

Item 4.43.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Project for an International Convention for the Protection of Historic Monuments and Art Treasures, submitted by Mexico [document 5C/22].

[84] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) recalled that the monuments of art and history, which were the common heritage of the whole human race, were in danger through lack of the financial resources necessary to enable experts and laboratories to assemble scientific data. The Mexican delegation accordingly proposed the adoption of an international convention under the terms of which each signatory country would introduce a tax of approximately $3, payable on arrival by all tourists, who would receive in exchange a card affording them free entry to all national museums in the country. Funds secured in this way would be allocated for the preservation and restoration of monuments of archaeology, history and art. A contribution equivalent to not less than 20 per cent of the yield of the tax would be paid weekly to Unesco's International Committee of Museums and Monuments. A conservative estimate of Unesco's revenue under this proposal would be $6,000,000. Thus the project was one whose repercussions on the budget took the form of substantial receipts, while its urgency and importance were such that there was no need to emphasize them.

[85] The Italian delegation having presented a draft international convention for the protection of monuments, centres of historic interest, cultural institutions and works of art, in the event of armed conflict [document 5C/11], it was *decided* to adjourn the discussion.

The meeting rose at 0.40 a.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.41.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.42.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.43.

TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Consideration of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

4. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

SECTION 4.4 (HISTORICAL MONUMENTS) (*continued*).

Draft international conventions for the protection of historic monuments and art treasures, submitted by Italy and Mexico [documents 5C/11, 5C/11 Add. 1, 5C/22 and 5C/22 Add.].

[1] The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to decide whether the draft conventions submitted by the Italian and Mexican delegations should be referred to the Director-General for consideration and later circulated to Member States.

[2] In connexion with document 5C/11, Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) explained that the draft had been framed by the Italian Fine Arts Association, in consultation with the National Commission, on the basis of another draft prepared by the International Museums Office in 1936. The draft was designed to secure the preservation of historic monuments and cultural treasures, both movable and immovable, in the event of armed conflict.

Mr. Pilotti recalled that, at the end of the 1914-1918 War, the Netherlands Government had convened a committee of technical experts at The Hague, which had drawn up the "Hague Rules", on which any later draft conventions were to be based. Moreover, at the beginning of the last war, in 1940, the Netherlands Government had approached other governments with a suggestion for a convention to secure the preservation of historic monuments; this scheme had not borne fruit, owing to the rapid development of events thereafter.

The draft convention submitted by the Italian delegation was accompanied by a draft resolution (document 5C/11 Add. 1), requesting the Director-General to submit the draft convention to Member States. Mr. Pilotti said that the Secretariat had already done excellent work in connexion with the preservation of works of art, by preparing a draft declaration for signature by Unesco's Member States (document 5C/PRG/6).

[3] Mr. de ICAZA (Mexico) stated that the Mexican delegation wished to add to the international convention it had proposed (documents 5C/22 and 5C/22 Add.) the following draft resolution:

The General Conference authorizes the Director-General to consider an international agreement by which the signatory States would undertake the following commitments:

(1) To issue cards to tourists in order to secure for them free access to public museums and monuments on payment of a single fee;

(2) To employ the funds thus obtained for the protection of works of art and historic monuments and for the establishment and improvement of museums; and

(3) To transmit to Unesco a sum in proportion to the amount obtained by the sale of these cards, for the purpose of establishing an international fund to assist in the implementation of the recommendation put forward by the Committee of Experts on Sites and Monuments of Art and History.

[4] The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that it was not required to discuss the drafts submitted to it in detail. It simply had to decide whether they should be referred to the Director-General for study.

[5] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) supported the draft conventions submitted by the Italian delegation, which met the requirements of the moment. He also thought that many points in the Mexican proposal deserved serious consideration.

[6] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) pointed out that, in its comments on the Programme (document 5C/5 (I), Rev., page 88), the Board had proposed that the General Conference should draw up a priority list of the principal problems on which it wished the Secretariat to prepare such conventions. Sir John noted that the Italian and Mexican delegations had gone much further, since they themselves had prepared drafts. The Executive Board had, however, intended that the General Conference should not discuss the wording of the conventions in question, but should decide whether to submit them to the Director-General for study.

[7] Dr. GIORDANO (Uruguay) said that his

delegation gave its full support to the Italian proposal.

[8] Mr. CAIN (France) thought that both the drafts submitted to the Commission were equally important. The Mexican proposal, however, raised a new question, requiring long and difficult study, but which might produce very valuable results. The Italian proposal was more immediately practicable, being based on the very detailed work which had been carried out by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and by the meeting of experts at The Hague. Mr. Cain entirely favoured the latter proposal.

[9] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) also supported the Italian proposal.

Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) was likewise in favour of the Italian draft, which would very suitably supplement the conventions prepared in Geneva the previous year for the protection of persons. He was also sympathetic to the Mexican draft, but it seemed to him to be less urgent than the Italian proposal.

Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) supported the Italian proposal, but wondered whether it would not be advisable to combine the two.

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL felt sure that the Italian delegation would have no objection to the Secretariat's preparing a single combined text containing the best of both proposals, and circulating it to Member States.

He pointed out that both proposals would affect the budget. The Italian one would necessitate consulting experts, particularly a military expert and a jurist; the Mexican one involved establishing contacts with the International Tourist Association and consulting a legal expert, entailing expenses estimated at $500.

Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) had no objection to the amalgamation of the two drafts.

[11] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) mentioned that he had received instructions from his Government to give warm support to the Italian proposal. He had no objection, however, to considering other proposals, and entirely agreed with the Director-General on the procedure to be followed.

[12] It was *agreed* that the Mexican proposal should be sent to the Director-General for study, with a view to its transmission to Member States.

[13] The CHAIRMAN pointed out a slight difference in the wording of the two draft resolutions: the Italian text laid down that the Director-General should be instructed to submit the draft convention to Member States, while the Mexican text requested him first to study the document and transmit it to Member States.

[14] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the Italian delegation would not object to a revision of its texts by the Drafting Committee, as it was to be amalgamated with the Mexican draft.

[15] It was *decided* to refer both the Italian and Mexican proposals to the Drafting Committee for combination along the lines suggested in the discussion.

BUDGET TABLE III.4.E. [document 5C/5 (II), page 185].

Adopted without discussion.

LIBRARIES AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES (4.5).

Item 4.51. Draft resolution jointly presented by France and Switzerland [document 5C/26].

[16] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Board was favourably disposed towards this suggestion, but would nevertheless prefer the Director-General to be auhorized to consider the question from the point of view of its budgetary consequences.

[17] Mr. CAIN (France) did not believe that such assistance would involve additional expenditure, since provision was already made under item 4.51 for work on Unesco's part in preparation for a meeting of representatives of various associations.

[18] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that item 4.51 related to a joint meeting in which a number of associations would take part; the meeting contemplated in document 5C/26 would probably not coincide with it. He therefore thought that the adoption of the Franco-Swiss proposal would affect the budget.

The French delegation withdrew its proposal in 5C/26.

Item 4.51 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

Items 4.52 and 4.521.

[19] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a slight amendment would have to be made in the French text of item 4.52, which should read: "Bibliothèques ex-allemandes *en* Italie" instead of "d'Italie".

[20] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) announced that his delegation would withdraw its proposed amendments to items 4.52 and 4.521 (document 5C/104), in favour of the amendments to the same items proposed by the United States delegation (document 5C/107).

1. In final form: Resol. 4.511.

[21] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America), submitting the draft amendments in document 5C/107, mentioned that his delegation wished to make two changes in the new item 4.52 contained in that document. In the English version, the word "parties" should replace "authorities", and the words "without prejudice to the legal situation of these establishments" should replace "pending a satisfactory permanent establishment".

[22] In reply to a question from the DIRECTOR-GENERAL, Dr. STODDARD said that, when the American delegation used the word "parties", it had in mind the German Government.

[23] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that a very special problem would then arise: could the Unesco Secretariat consult States which were not members of the Organization?

[24] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to an alternative text for these items, submitted by the Italian delegation (document 5C/108).

Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) explained that the Italian delegation had proposed the amendment in question because of the difficulties which were arising pending the conclusion of a peace treaty. He mentioned, however, that his delegation was prepared to support the United States proposal as amended.

[25] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) thought the question was very important but raised a difficult problem. It was a delicate matter for a non-political organization like Unesco to undertake negotiations with "interested parties". Professor Düring felt, however, that Unesco might embark on such a course, and he was therefore in favour of the United States proposal. He thought the Director-General should be authorized to undertake negotiations and should enjoy very wide discretion for the purpose.

[26] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) was in favour of any proposal enabling Unesco to take immediate action to secure the reopening of the ex-German libraries in Italy. It was a disadvantage to students to be unable to consult those libraries, and any delay might mean that such valuable property continued to remain in jeopardy. The Swiss delegation was not competent to pronounce on a political matter, but thought that Unesco should act as intermediary and facilitate a solution without itself intervening directly. Those concerned should remember that, in the field in question, the needs of culture should take precedence over any other considerations.

[27] Mr. CAIN (France) agreed with the Swiss delegate. Unesco's work in connexion with those libraries had been very much appreciated and no-one would decline to consider fresh negotiations.

The French delegate was anxious, however, that any motion passed should not differ too widely from the Executive Board's proposal, which had been drafted after a long and thorough study of the question.

[28] In reply to Dr. ZEISSL (Austria), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that: (1) the reopening and maintenance of the libraries would require approximately $60,000; (2) no money had been spent on those libraries in 1949, as the Beirut Conference had hoped that it would be possible to reach an agreement. A grant-in-aid of $5,000 had, however, been made, and $13,000 had been sent to the International Institute in Rome as a contribution to its minimum expenses; (3) a sum of $4,800 for 1951 had been proposed to the Union of Rome Institutes to help it maintain the libraries in question. The United States proposal would mean putting the latter sum at the Director-General's disposal.

[29] Professor SYME (United Kingdom) thought that, in any case, it was important that something should be done for those libraries. The legal position could not be settled for the time being, but the Director-General should be authorized to establish contact with the institutions concerned instead of with the German Government.

[30] Professor UVALIĆ (Yugoslavia) was in favour of Mr. Cain's proposal that the wording suggested by the Executive Board for item 4.52 should, as far as possible, be maintained.

[31] Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) agreed with Professor Syme that contact should be established with the institutions concerned.

[32] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) stressed the need for immediate action to give access to the libraries in question. The situation was becoming a public scandal, although Unesco was not in any way responsible for it. Certain works from the Austrian Institute, for instance, were immobilized in those libraries. That point should be borne in mind, moreover, when any definite action was taken.

[33] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) felt it necessary, in view of the remarks made by certain delegations, to make it clear that his delegation did not intend to include the Bonn Government among the "interested parties".

[34] The CHAIRMAN said that the word

"parties" would in any case have been interpreted in the sense of "authorities at present in command in Germany", and, for the time being would refer to the Allied High Commission.

[35] Mr. CAIN (France) asked that any vote taken on the draft amendments to items 4.52 and 4.521 should deal solely with the question of principle, subject to rewording by the Drafting Committee.

[36] In reply to a question from Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the libraries in question were the Hertziana Library in Rome, the German Archaeological Institutes in Rome and Florence, and the former History Institute in Rome. At the moment, those establishments were unable to carry on their work because they had no money. The purpose Unesco had in view was to make them once more accessible to students and scholars.

[37] Mr. MOHR (Norway) agreed with Mr. Cain that the wording suggested by the Executive Board for item 4.52 was very good and required no amendment.

[38] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) emphasized that any decision regarding property involved questions of law and that the Director-General could not, by himself, settle such questions.

The United States amendment to item 4.52, as contained in document 5C/107 was *adopted* by 27 votes to 6.

[39] Mr. CAIN (France) proposed that the following sentence be added to the new text:

Pending the result of these negotiations, the libraries shall continue to be administered internationally by the Union of the Institutes, under the auspices of Unesco.

[40] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the mention of "under the auspices of Unesco" implied that the proposal would have some effect on the budget.

[41] Mr. CAIN (France) believed that a certain sum had been included in the 1950 budget for those libraries and was still available.

[42] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the sum had appeared in the budget for 1949, not for 1950, and that no money was therefore available.

[43] Mr. CAIN (France) maintained his amendment, though he deleted the reference to Unesco's auspices.

Mr. Cain's amendment was seconded by the delegates of the NETHERLANDS, YUGOSLAVIA and URUGUAY.

[44] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) considered that Unesco could hardly state who should be made responsible for the administration of institutions whose fate was dependent on the peace treaty.

Mr. CAIN (France) had in mind only an interim solution.

[45] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) emphasized that, since the ex-German libraries were administered by the Union of Institutes, the Commission was not called upon to express an opinion on that point.

[46] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) seconded Mr. Cain's amendment, but thought that the word "satisfactory" in item 4.521 should be replaced by "final".

Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought it would be better to omit the word "satisfactory" entirely.

[47] The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in Mr. Cain's proposed amendment, the words "pending the result of" be replaced by: "The Commission recommends that . . ."

Mr. Cain's proposal, thus modified, was *adopted* by 25 votes.

The texts of resolutions 4.52 and 4.521 proposed by the United States delegation in document 5C/107, were *adopted*, subject to the foregoing amendments and to revision by the Drafting Committee, by 23 votes to 1.[1]

SECTION 4.53 (EXCHANGE, LOAN AND PURCHASE OF PUBLICATIONS).

Item 4.531.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item 4.532.

[48] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that the Executive Board's text did not make it quite clear that the Secretariat's work would be to arrange for contact between centres. He suggested an addition along those lines.

[49] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) recalled that the centres set up by the International Federation of Library Associations already arranged for the international loan of books. He hoped that resolution 4.532 would make it clear that international loans were conducted under the auspices of that Federation and called for a general observance of the principle that Unesco should in its various activities collaborate with international non-governmental organizations.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.512 and 4.5121.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.521.

Item 4.532 was *adopted*, subject to revision by the Drafting Committee.[1]

[50] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) felt there was no need for maintaining the proposal presented by the Italian delegation in document 5C/38, as it was covered by the amendment to item 4.532 requested by the Director-General.

Item 4.54.

[51] Professor UVALIČ (Yugoslavia) described his country's attitude towards Unesco coupons. Yugoslavia was in urgent need of books and scientific equipment and found equal difficulty in obtaining French francs and United States dollars. The coupon scheme would therefore be of no use to Yugoslavia unless it could purchase the coupons in its national currency.

[52] Mr. E. J. CARTER (Libraries Division) explained that the Secretariat was continuing its effort to facilitate the purchase of coupons in local currency.

Item 4.54 was *adopted* without change.[2]

SECTION 4.55 (BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DOCUMENTATION).

Item 4.551.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Item 4.5511.

[53] Mr. CAIN (France) presented a draft resolution (document 5C/105) prepared by the French delegation, in agreement with the Swiss delegation, to secure co-ordination in the implementation of Unesco's various bibliographical activities.

[54] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL emphasized that, while that resolution had no direct budgetary implication, it would considerably increase the work of the Libraries Division; it would be difficult to find a place for it in the 1951 Programme, as it would not be covered by any budget item.

[55] Mr. CAIN (France) accordingly suggested that the sum of $1 should be set aside for the resolution.

[56] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) was against the adoption of such a resolution, as it would create a dangerous precedent. He urged that the programme should remain as brief as possible.

[57] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) supported Mr. Cain's proposal. He thought that there was no field in which confusion might prove more dangerous than in bibliography, and that it was important to obtain the assurance that the Libraries Division of Unesco would go into the matter in 1951.

[58] The CHAIRMAN was of the opinion that the text could be inserted in the work plan for cultural activities, without being made into a specific resolution. *Agreed.*

[59] The CHAIRMAN presented a draft resolution jointly submitted by the French and Swiss delegations, in connexion with the universal decimal classification system (document 5C/60).

[60] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) felt that, although such a resolution had no budgetary implications, it would mean a needless expansion of the Programme.

[61] The proposal of the French and Swiss delegations was seconded by the delegates of BRAZIL, NETHERLANDS and PERSIA, and *adopted* by 21 votes.[1]

Item 4.511 was *adopted* without discussion.[2]

Items 4.5512 and 4.5513.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

SECTION 4.56 (PUBLIC LIBRARIES).

Items 4.561 and 4.562.

Adopted, without discussion.[4]

[62] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) recalled that the United Kingdom delegation had presented a draft resolution regarding the preparation of a handbook on public libraries (document 5C/10, point 2). He stressed that the United Kingdom delegation attached great importance to Unesco's work for libraries. It had been pleased to note that Unesco published specialized handbooks to assist librarians, but it also considered it essential to issue a handbook setting forth the principles on which public libraries should be based. It was merely intended that a handbook should be prepared in 1951, to be ready for publication in 1952.

[63] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered the United Kingdom's proposal excellent, and paid tribute to the careful distinction made between preparation and publication, in order to spread expense over two years. He estimated that the

1. In final form: Resol. 4.522 and 4.5221.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.523.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.531.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.532.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.5311.
3. In final form: Resol. 4.533 and 4.534.
4. In final form: Resol. 4.541 and 4.542.

preparation would cost $2,250 and the publication $5,000.

Nevertheless, he pointed out that provision had already been made for additional expenditure under other chapters of the budget, and feared lest the Conference might be unable to keep within the $8,200,000 ceiling, if it went too far in that direction.

He thought that at the next session of the Conference, the question of libraries might be classified among the three or four major concerns of Unesco, and that the allocation of larger funds for that purpose might then be considered.

[64] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) expressed disapproval of Mr. Thompson's proposal on the grounds that it would burden the Programme.

[65] Senator PECSON (Philippines) shared the views of the United Kingdom delegate regarding the need for preparing a handbook on public libraries. It would be most helpful to the Philippines, where a comprehensive scheme for the opening of libraries had been set on foot. But in her opinion its preparation should be left to the initiative of each country, as problems differed with each region.

[66] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposal on account of its budgetary implications, but urged the Secretariat to take the method into consideration.

BUDGET TABLE III.4.F [document 5C/5 (II), pages 190 and 191].

Adopted without discussion.

SECTION 4.6 (COPYRIGHT).

Item 4.61.

[67] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) said his delegation considered it useless to publish two bulletins on copyright; it might be wise to combine the two existing bulletins.

[68] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) supported this proposal. He suggested an agreement between the Berne Union, which published *Copyright*, and Unesco, with a view to the amalgamation of the two bulletins to form the official copyright organ, one part being set aside for Unesco and the other for the Union. The bulletin would be published in French, English and even in Spanish. The funds provided for the publication by Unesco of the *International Copyright Bulletin* would be kept at the same level and used for the publication of pamphlets on copyright.

[69] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) thought the suggestions put forward by Mr. Pilotti and Mr. Bolla were valuable. Nevertheless, the proposal should be considered carefully in collaboration with the executive organs of the Berne Union. It was not for the Commission to take a decision regarding the possibility of amalgamating the two bulletins. Contact had been established between Unesco and the Berne Union, and it would be necessary to await a reply from the latter. If the negotiations were successful, they would also be proof of the co-ordination between Unesco and the Union.

[70] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) explained that he had never contemplated an immediate fusion of the two bulletins, but merely an investigation of the possibility.

[71] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) said that the matter raised by Mr. Pilotti and Mr. Bolla had already been considered by the Mexico Conference, which had discussed the inauguration of the *Copyright Bulletin*.

[72] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) queried the expediency of the proposals. Unesco was intended to be a link between various bodies concerned with copyright and had a definite duty to fulfil in publishing its *Bulletin*.

Item 4.61 was *adopted* without change.[1]

Items 4.62 and 4.621. Draft amendment presented by Switzerland [document 5C/101].

[73] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) drew attention to a typing error in the second line of the French version of document 5C/101, which should read "dans un but d'*entente*" instead of "dans un but d'attente".

He urged that the decision regarding the convening of an inter-governmental conference to frame an international copyright convention should not be taken at the Fifth, but at the Sixth Session of the General Conference, which would have to decide on the advisability of such a meeting in the light of the replies of governments to the "request for suggestions".

The replies of governments would, moreover, have to be considered in collaboration with the Copyright Union and the Literary and Artistic Union, which would be able to offer Unesco valuable assistance. The Literary and Artistic Union had itself expressed a wish to assist in that study.

[74] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) endorsed Mr. Bolla's remarks, and thought that the proposed preliminary work would not lessen the

1. In final form: Resol. 4.61.

interest being shown in a universal copyright convention.

[75] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) paid tribute to the Secretariat's work in preparing the draft Convention, but wondered whether the "advice of an international expert committee" would not involve additional expenditure.

[76] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that, since the Secretariat was apparently unable to draw up a draft convention without the assistance of experts of the various governments, and since it was also wished to save money, interested governments might include a copyright expert in their delegations to the Sixth Session of the General Conference. The meeting of experts could then be held concurrently with the General Conference and would not involve any special expenditure.

[77] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the Swiss proposal had been excellently drafted, and he suggested the following addition:

Member States shall be requested to include among the delegates to the next session of the General Conference specialists who would be competent to consider this problem.

[78] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) explained that the Committee of Experts mentioned in the Swiss proposal was the same as that provided for under item 4.621 of the original text, and should therefore meet in 1950. However, he approved the suggestions made by the Director-General and Mr. Thomas.

[79] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur, Budget Committee) explained that the meeting provided for under resolution 4.621 would not be able to assemble full data and that a second meeting would have to be arranged for 1952, involving a further expenditure of $12,000.

[80] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) therefore pressed his proposal, for he thought that the General Conference of 1951 would be the crucial moment for the question of the convention. *Agreed.*[1]

[81] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested inserting the words "which is to meet in 1950" after "Committee of Experts" in the text proposed by the Swiss delegation for item 4.62.

[82] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) mentioned that his delegation would withdraw its proposed amendment to item 4.62, as its contents were implicit in the Swiss amendment.

[83] The amendment to item 4.62 proposed by the Swiss delegation (document 5C/101) with the addition suggested by Mr. Weeden, was seconded by the delegates of SWEDEN, URUGUAY, YUGOSLAVIA, NETHERLANDS, DENMARK, ECUADOR, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, ISRAEL, AUSTRIA, LIBERIA, ITALY and UNITED KINGDOM, and *adopted* by 33 votes.[1]

[84] The amendment to item 4.621 proposed by the Swiss delegation (document 5C/101), seconded by the delegates of ITALY, LIBERIA, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, DENMARK, PERSIA, SWEDEN and NORWAY, was *adopted* by 27 votes.[2]

BUDGET TABLE III.4.G. [document 5C/5 (II), page 196].

[85] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) proposed:

(1) Cancelling the sum of $1,000 for fees (paragraph I, page 197);

(2) Altering the figure of $6,000 for contractual printing (paragraph I, page 197), which could be halved if the Bulletin were smaller;

(3) Altering the figure of $12,000 for travel (paragraph II.A., page 197), which could be reduced to $1,000 if the expert meeting coincided with the General Conference.

[86] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) said he shared Mr. Thompson's views concerning the importance of the *Copyright Bulletin*.

[87] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities), considered only (1) and (3) of those suggestions acceptable. As to (2), a reduction of the figure from $6,000 to $3,000 would be the death blow to the *Bulletin*.

[88] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) defended the *Copyright Bulletin*, which he considered essential.

Mr. CAIN (France) also thought the *Bulletin* a valuable source of reference, which it would be unwise to curtail or mutilate.

[89] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that the Budget Committee be requested to revise the budget estimates in the light of the foregoing discussion.

[90] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) explained that, contrary to what Mr. Thomas had understood, he had not suggested taking away $1,000 from the sum of $12,000 but reducing the latter to $1,000. Substantial savings could be made by holding the meeting of experts at the

1. In final form: Resol. 4.622.

1. In final form: Resol. 4.62.
2. In final form: Resol. 4.621.

same time as the General Conference. He also maintained his two other proposals.

[91] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the sum provided for printing contracts could not possibly be reduced to less than $6,000.

[92] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) repeated his request that the funds for fees should be cancelled, and called for the submission of the other two points to the Budget Committee.

[93] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) agreed with Mr. Thompson and Mr. Cain that the publication of the *Copyright Bulletin* should be continued. It was the only bilingual publication on the matter in the world, and even the general articles should be treated on the same footing as reference material.

He agreed that some reduction could be made in the sum of $12,000 for travel, but he stressed the need for the Head of the Copyright Division of Unesco to attend copyright conferences held in various parts of the world.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that provision was made in another section of the Budget for the travel of Unesco staff. He again urged the maintenance of the *Copyright Bulletin*.

[94] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) seconded Mr. Thompson's proposal.

[95] It was *decided* that the Budget Committee should consider the sum of $12,000 provided for travel.

It was *decided* by 20 votes to 8 to maintain the sum of $6,000 provided for printing contracts.

It was *decided* by 11 votes to 8 to cancel the sum of $1,000 for fees.

Subject to those changes, the budget table III.4.G. was *adopted*.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

4. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

Annual Unesco awards [document 5C/PRG/4].

The conclusions of the report (section v) were *adopted*.

Draft resolution submitted by France [document 5C/81].

[1] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), stated that the Board had no objection to the adoption of the amendment proposed in document 5C/81.

The French amendment was seconded by the delegates of ITALY, BRAZIL, UNITED STATES of AMERICA, LIBERIA, PERSIA, PAKISTAN and UNITED KINGDOM, and *rejected*.

Draft resolution presented by the Lebanon [document 5C/53].

[2] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) recalled that the General Conference, at its Second Session, in Mexico City, had first adopted a resolution concerning Unesco's activities in the Middle East. In execution of that resolution, the Secretariat had carried out a survey in the Middle East, and a further resolution had been adopted at the Third Session, at Beirut. The Secretariat had then embarked on the establishment of a Liaison Office for the Middle East. It was now essential to extend its field of action to include cultural activities so that the Office might proceed with the type of work which would be its permanent responsibility.

[3] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), although recognizing the importance of integration between Member States themselves and between Member States and the Secretariat, observed that the draft resolution presented by the Lebanese delegation went a step further than the Board had done in extending the scope of Field Science Co-operation Offices to the social sciences.

The Board thought that no further extension of the activities of the Offices should be attempted at present. The extension of their scope to cultural activities would have considerable budgetary implications. The Board had left it to the Programme and Budget Commission to decide whether an addition to the 1951 Programme involving greater expense could be made. He regretted that he could not advise the Commission to adopt the Lebanese draft resolution.

[4] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) was unable to support the Lebanese proposal. If the work of the Field Science Co-operation Office in the Middle East were extended to include cultural activities, substantial extra costs would be entailed and a precedent established for other branches of Unesco's work. Moreover, the proposed extension of the Office's field threatened to result in the creation of regional compartments within the Organization.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to what he had said in his message to the Liaison Office at Havana, emphasizing that division into regions was a handicap, to the extent that it raised obstacles to closer contacts between the area in question and the rest of the world. Nevertheless, regional treatment or rather, "work in one region", was sometimes necessary to offset the shortcomings of certain National Commissions and to associate distant countries with the main stream of international life.

So far, the Middle East had not been in a very favourable position, whereas, in Latin America, for instance, Unesco had organized three seminars on fundamental education and was making arrangements for a fourth in Uruguay, while a Liaison Office had been established at Havana and a training centre was probably to be set up in Mexico. He pointed out that, instead of establishing a Liaison Office in the Middle East in accordance with the decision taken by the General Conference at its Third Session, a single official had been commissioned to travel about the region and send in reports. At the moment, that official was receiving information on all sorts of matters which were beyond his scope. If a centre larger than that already existing was set up in Cairo, it was probable that no further expense would be entailed. It would simply be a question of transferring the existing Office to Cairo and making it responsible for specified liaison work. That step would strengthen the ties between Unesco and its Member States in the Middle East.

[6] Dr. SAGLAM (Turkey) remarked that, if the measure suggested by the Lebanese delegation were carried out, it would mean establishing a sort of regional Unesco without any adequate resources for carrying on its work. Although he agreed that co-operation in cultural activities in the Middle East was necessary, he thought it would be better to keep a co-operation office in being as part of the Secretariat and to stimulate the work of the National Commissions.

[7] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) wished to associate himself with the sentiments expressed by the Director-General. He stressed how greatly the Middle East felt the need for Unesco, particularly in matters of culture. He therefore wholeheartedly supported the Lebanese draft resolution.

[8] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought it necessary, in the first place, to concentrate on increasing the means and resources available to the Field Science Co-operation Offices for work in their own field. It might be possible to consider extending their activities to include the social sciences, a branch of study in which there were certain similarities with the natural sciences in the methods used and the type of research done. He was rather uneasy with regard to the general principle of extending the field of activity covered by the Co-operation Offices.

[9] Professor BHABHA (India) sympathized with the aspirations which found their expression in the Lebanese proposal. There were, however, practical difficulties in extending services which were useful in the universal and specialized domain of science but which, in cultural activities, involved risks, owing to the diversity of cultures. He thought it would be dangerous to deal with cultural matters through the small staff of the Offices, while a larger staff would involve much greater expense. Accordingly he was reluctantly obliged to oppose the adoption of the proposal.

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, when the heads of the Field Science Co-operation Offices had met in Paris a few months earlier, they had informed him that the major part of their work consisted in answering questions on matters not connected with the natural sciences but mainly concerned with cultural activities. Quite obviously, they were unable to give satisfactory replies to such questions. If they were further developed, it would be to the advantage of international understanding.

[11] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) observed that the success so far enjoyed by these Offices suggested that it would be advisable to develop their activities further. First of all, a general study of the question should be made. Although he supported the Lebanese proposal, he pointed out that

the prerequisite for any such extension in the activities of the Middle East Office was complete agreement between the States concerned.

[12] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) supported the Lebanese draft resolution. He felt that the Middle East, with its diversity of cultures and traditions, was particularly well suited for the project and he had been surprised that priority had been given to the natural sciences.

[13] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) remarked that the discussion was being conducted on two different levels, for while some delegates were concerned with the budgetary implications of the Lebanese proposal for 1951, others were interested in the question of principle involved in decentralization.

As regards the latter aspect, any decision now taken would furnish a precedent. It would therefore be necessary, as a preliminary, to consider the question of the decentralization of the Organization. Considered logically, it was important, for financial reasons, to avoid taking a decision counter to the principle of decentralization. The question of principle should be settled first. There were definite advantages to be derived from decentralization, but there were also the dangers of "parochialism" in cultural matters. So far as science was concerned, decentralization offered the maximum advantages and the minimum risks. It was likely that the converse would be true with regard to cultural activites.

Unesco had evolved a number of administrative mechanisms, several of which had proved very satisfactory, though not all had been tried out. For instance, the Liaison Office for cultural activities in Beirut had served as a model for the reorganization of the Secretariat's Official and External Relations Service. The existing machinery for liaison between the Secretariat and the Middle East was efficient enough to justify a very thorough study before any fundamental change was made.

[14] Mr. de Lacharrière therefore proposed that the Director-General should be instructed to examine the whole problem of geographical decentralization in Unesco and to report to the General Conference at its Sixth Session.

This proposal, seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, LEBANON, NETHERLANDS and PERSIA, was *adopted unanimously*.

5. Exchange of Persons.

SECTION 5.1 (CLEARING-HOUSE).

Proposals for the recommendation to Member States of measures to eliminate obstacles to the free movement from country to country of persons engaged in educational, scientific and cultural activities [document 5C/PRG/10]

[15] The recommendations to Member States numbered 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were *adopted*.

ITEMS 5.1 TO 5.141.

[16] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) was gratified to see that some advance in the exchange of persons was contemplated in Africa, Asia and the Far East. However, he found that the programme was not very adequate and would welcome the provision of more fellowships, by cutting other parts of the Programme. Many of the countries in Asia and Africa had very "soft" currencies; he would therefore suggest that the awards should cover the cost of travel. Perhaps some method analogous to the Unesco book coupon scheme could be devised. He urged Unesco to develop that part of the Programme in future years.

[17] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) noted with satisfaction the provisions of Item 5.12, and urged that greater use should be made in the future of study facilities.

Items 5.1 to 5.141 were *adopted* without change.[1]

SECTION 5.2 (PROMOTION)

Item 5.21.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands [document 5C/23 (rev. 2)].

[18] Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) presented draft resolution submitted by the International Student Service [document 5C/23], and stressed the difficult circumstances under which large numbers of refugee students were labouring. IRO, which had so far assisted the student relief programme, was to be wound up on 30 June 1950. It was extremely important to safeguard refugee students, who represented an intellectual and scientific asset. These students introduced an international element into the universities and would be able to contribute to the Technical Assistance programme. He mentioned that the International Student Service would allow the Fund the use of its administrative services and give it the benefit of the experience it had acquired in the last five years. The necessary financial resources would be derived from private international organizations and from countries in need of specialists and scientists. With regard to the

1. In final form: Resol. 5.13 to 5.18.
2. In final form: Resol. 5.21.

choice of beneficiaries, it would be advisable to pay special attention to advanced students, who would be able either to carry out research or to teach.

[19] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that, as no expense was involved in the proposal the Board had left the matter for the Programme and Budget Commission to decide.

[20] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) seconded the proposal, holding that Unesco could do no less than provide moral support for the project in question. He mentioned that a mutual assistance scheme for students had been instituted in Belgium eighteen months previously, and was beginning to produce satisfactory results. Students at all universities were responsible for selling "mutual aid vouchers", each of which represented a sum of about $1. These vouchers were issued centrally by the university welfare service, and the funds so obtained were allotted to the Sanatorium for students and, in particular, to refugee students.

[21] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) pointed out that many of Unesco's projects did not reach Liberia, on account of its peculiar political environment. He stressed his country's need for exchange of persons. It depended entirely on such exchange for its future development, as it had not the necessary institutions of its own. He asked for information as to how Liberian or other African students could avail themselves of the facilities which might be provided.

[22] Professor VEDOVATO (Italy) agreed with the remarks of Mr. Verhoeven and Baron van der Bruggen, and emphasized the often insuperable difficulties encountered by increasing numbers of refugee students in the countries of Western Europe. He suggested that a request should be added to the proposal of the ISS that Member States should take steps to encourage and help universities to exempt refugee students from paying fees.

[23] Mr. SMITH (International Student Service) thanked the delegates who had supported the draft resolution. He explained that the ISS had, since the war, resettled many German, Austrian and Italian students in the United States, Australia and Latin America. In France alone 500 students had received help, and requests were continuing to come in at a rate beyond the means of the ISS Nor was the work confined to war-handicapped students; the ISS was also helping students stranded as a result of currency devaluation.

[24] After 30 June 1950, help would no longer be forthcoming from the International Refugee Organization, and the ISS was therefore appealing to Unesco, not for money, but for moral support in creating a Committee to be responsible for administering an international scholarship fund. The project would be served by the administrative offices of the ISS in 25 countries, and it was hoped that other international university organizations having consultative status with Unesco would be represented on the committee. The project was already supported by the World Student Christian Movement, Pax Romana and the Association of Jewish Students.

[25] In conclusion, Mr. Smith added that the Committee could be of great help to Unesco in the Technical Assistance Programme by providing trained personnel. A list of such staff had already been submitted to Unesco.

[26] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) seconded the draft resolution. However, the International Universities Bureau was to be established towards the end of 1950, and seemed a very suitable body to undertake the work Unesco was asked to carry out under the terms of that resolution. Unesco should provisionally undertake to implement the draft resolution submitted by the International Students Service.

Professor BHABHA (India) warmly endorsed the draft resolution.

[27] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) asked the representative of the ISS whether the Service had given assistance to Arab refugee from Palestine, many of whom had been stranded, and whether the resolution would cover refugee students from Palestine.

[28] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) endorsed what had been said, and stressed the desirability of referring the matter to the International Universities Bureau as soon as it was established. From the legal point of view, it was difficult for Unesco to help students whose connexions with the government of their native country had been completely severed. He would like the resolution to be more clearly worded.

Mrs. BAXTER (United States of America) agreed with Mr. Abraham about the wording.

[29] Mr. SMITH (International Student Service) felt that the need for the Committee was pressing and that the ISS would be able to meet that need in the very near future, whereas the International Universities Bureau would not be formed until December 1950. The ISS would, of course, co-operate very closely with the Bureau when it was formed.

[30] In reply to Dr. Jamali, he said that the Middle East relief programme did not apply

specifically to the Arab refugees, but an agent was at present travelling in the area to see what assistance could be given to the Arab refugee students.

[31] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Drafting Committee could not prepare a new text unless it was given instructions by the Commission regarding the substance of the resolution.

[32] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) agreed with Professor Carneiro, and suggested that the resolution be amended to stipulate that the members of the Committee should be appointed by the International Universities Bureau which, to his knowledge, was already in existence.

This proposal was supported by the delegates of BRAZIL, LIBERIA and FRANCE, and *adopted*.

The Netherlands draft resolution, thus amended, was *adopted*.[1]

Item 5.22.

[33] The CHAIRMAN said that a decision would be taken later on item 5.22 and on an amendment submitted by the Italian delegation.

Draft resolution submitted by France [document 5C/61].

[34] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) explained that this draft resolution had no budgetary implications. It was intended to transfer to the international sphere a recent French innovation which had proved most successful. It was a very interesting attempt to use these young students as one of the best means of developing international understanding.

[35] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested amending the text to read: "*Member States are requested* to encourage by all possible means the foundation . . .".

Mr. ABRAHAM (France) accepted the Director-General's suggestion.

[36] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) suggested that if an agreement of principle were reached, the drafting committee might review all the resolutions previously passed, whether they were addressed to Member States or to the Director-General. He agreed with the latter on the resolution under consideration.

[37] The French draft resolution, supported by the delegates of BELGIUM, URUGUAY, LIBERIA, ECUADOR, CANADA and PAKISTAN, was *adopted*.[2]

Item 5.23.

[38] Professor BHABHA (India) moved the deletion of the words "for teaching in primary and secondary schools".

[39] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not think Professor Bhabha's proposal could be reconciled with the effort to condense the 1951 Programme in accordance with the wishes of the Conference. In his opinion, it would be dangerous to extend the scope of item 5.23 to cover all grades of teaching, unless additional funds were provided.

[40] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) stressed that it was desirable to avoid confining or rigidly prescribing the Secretariat's activities. He agreed with the view expressed by the Director-General, on the understanding that provision should be made for the project to be carried out in stages, over several years if necessary.

[41] The CHAIRMAN asked Professor Bhabha whether he would agree that interchange between countries should be promoted by taking primary and secondary schools as the first stage.

[42] Professor BHABHA (India) found the suggestion quite acceptable. He emphasized that his aim in moving the deletion had been to leave the Director-General greater freedom.

Item 5.23, amended as proposed by the Chairman, was *adopted* in principle and referred to the Drafting Committee.[1]

Items 5.24 and 5.25.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

SECTION 5.3 (FELLOWSHIP ADMINISTRATION).

Items 5.31 and 5.34.

[43] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom), referring to item 5.31 said that the United Kingdom National Commission had suggested that much would be gained by transmitting to recipient countries, well in advance of their arrival, the wishes and qualifications of fellows, so that the courses they wished to take could be prepared for them.

[44] Sir George hoped that the duration of fellowships would not become crystallized at about six months, but that Unesco would consider offering shorter periods of study to senior students, and even longer ones to junior students.

[45] With regard to resolution 5.34, he held the

1. In final form: Resol. 5.23.
2. In final form: Resol. 5.28.

1. In final form: Resol. 5.25.
2. In final form: Resol. 5.26 and 5.27.

view that general reports on the progress of the fellowship scheme should be submitted to the General Conference periodically, giving information on the use made by the fellows of their studies under the scheme, and stating whether or not Unesco had kept in touch with them.

[46] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) said that there would be greater flexibility in the administration of the fellowship scheme as greater experience was acquired. He hoped that such reports would be submitted to future sessions of the General Conference.

[47] In addition, the Secretariat was considering reproducing by mimeograph certain sections of reports received from fellows, giving Unesco information on the progress of their studies. Some of the reports would be of exceptional interest to specialists.

Section 5.3 was *adopted* as a whole.[1]

BUDGET TABLES III.5.B. and III.5.C. [document 5C/5 (II), pages 207 and 212].

Adopted without discussion.

6. Mass Communication.

SECTION 6.1 (IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATION).

[48] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) expressed his deep appreciation of the document *World Communication, Press, Radio and Film*, published by Unesco's Department of Mass Communication. He felt that the facilities for mass communication were possibly not used to the maximum. He agreed with the Director-General that the ultimate fusion of Mass Communication with Public Relations was inevitable.

[49] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece), seconded by Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium), proposed the adoption of section 6.1 as a whole.

Item 6.11.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item 6.111.

[50] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) viewed with concern the possibility of duplication of work done by National Commissions under resolution 6.111 and therefore moved the deletion of that item. The Director-General could work through the National Commissions and co-operating bodies.

[51] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that there had been no intention of duplicating the work of National Commissions. The consultative committees to be formed under the resolution were to be set up through the National Commissions and would be composed of five or six experts suggested by them.

[52] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) said that, in his opinion, the National Commissions and co-operating bodies were the consultative committees in question and that no further committees should be formed.

[53] Mr. KAYSER (France) emphasized that the item 6.111 was useful, as its purpose was not entirely covered by item 6.11. He thought that technical problems concerning the press and information should be dealt with by experts, rather than by the National Commissions.

[54] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that some National Commissions had set up bodies to consider the problems in question. Where they had not, it was necessary to remedy the shortcoming. He feared that the Australian proposal that Member States should be asked to establish consultative committees either within the framework of the National Commissions or in collaboration with them would lose their effect if too many such recommendations were issued to Member States.

[55] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) wished to maintain his point, but would be satisfied if the words "within the framework of the National Commissions" were inserted, as a safeguard to prevent the National Commissions from being supplanted.

[56] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed that the words "or in close contact with them" should also be added.

[57] The amendments proposed by Mr. Davies and by the Director-General were *adopted*, but the final decision on item 6.111 was held over until a later meeting.

Item 6.12.

[58] In response to a request for information from Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that approximately 85 countries had already been covered by surveys, and that 30 to 34 remained to be covered.

Item 6.12 was *adopted* without change.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 5.31 to 5.34.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.12.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.13.

Item 6.13.

[59] Mr. JUMSAI (Thailand) asked how the results expected from the application of this item were to be used.

Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that the results of the research would be the basis of the Secretariat's work with the United Nations in this field and in particular with the body concerned with the freedom of information and the press. The Economic and Social Council had already commented on information obtained. The Departments of Natural Sciences and Education and the Exchange of Persons Service also made extensive calls upon the results of the research. The Department of Mass Communication was using it to create a body of enlightened public opinion without which full use could not be made of the communication facilities available.

[60] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) wondered whether the subjects for study given in the 1951 pamphlet (such as the influence of films on the public, the influence of comic strips on the younger generation, etc.) were the final subjects for study and whether such subjects were suitable to the purposes of Unesco.

[61] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) recalled that the Programme and Work Plan had been studied in the autumn of 1949 before the 1950 Budget was approved. The subjects were, therefore, suggested as an indication. Before a study was undertaken expert staff would study the scope of a subject, the time it would take and the possibility of having it carried out. Between September 1949 and Spring 1951 a thorough study would have been made, so that there should be no overlapping. It was, as yet, impossible to state what would be the subjects studied.

Item 6.13 was *adopted* without change.[1]

Item 6.14.

[62] Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom) felt that the war-devastated and under-developed countries could profit more by sending their own experts to the more advanced countries than by receiving Unesco missions. He therefore moved the deletion of resolution 6.14 and suggested that the $20,000 budgeted for it should be devoted to assisting war-devastated and under-developed countries in sending their experts to more advanced countries.

[63] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) thought that the two methods of gaining information were by no means mutually exclusive. Requests for Unesco help on problems of mass communication had been received from war-devastated and under-developed countries.

Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom) maintained his motion for deletion.

[64] Mr. KAYSER (France) asked for further particulars from the Secretariat about the measures already taken and the results secured from item 6.14.

Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that 1950 was the first year of Unesco's activities in that field and that two requests for extensive aid had been received: one for a studio engineer and another for an expert in audio-visual aids for adult education and radio broadcasting. Although the results were not available, it would seem that a definite need was being met.

Mr. Moorehead's proposal to delete item 6.14, not being seconded, *lapsed.*

Item 6.14 was *adopted* without change.[1]

Draft resolution presented by Cuba [document 5C/24].

[65] The draft resolution concerning the award of a certificate of a "Unesco journalist" was *rejected.*

Measures to Promote Uniformity of Braille Notation [documents 5C/PRG/9 and 21/EX/12].

[66] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board hoped the Commission would approve the measures for uniformity of Braille notation.

Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) moved the adoption of documents 5C/PRG/9 and 21/EX/12. *Adopted.*[2]

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.14.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.15.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.161 to 6.164.

TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 9 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

6. Mass Communication (*continued*).

SECTION 6.1 *(continued)* (IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATION).

Report on the Project for an International Institute of the Press and Information [document 5C/PRG/8 and Addendum 1].

[1] Mr. KAYSER (France) presented his delegation's amendment [document 5C/PRG/8, Amendment 1] to the draft resolution on page 57 of document 5C/PRG/8. That amendment took into account the reasonable requirements of the Secretariat and of journalists. The problem to be faced was obviously that of the budget. Journalists' organizations were asking for the International Institute of the Press to be financed solely by the profession without any governmental aid. Would it be possible to raise the necessary funds? The amendment, by providing for additional preparation and fresh consultations, was designed to find a solution to that problem. The results would be communicated to the delegation of the Committee of Experts on the Press, which would decide on the expediency of convening a conference to set up the Institute. It would then rest with the Director-General, as a result of such consultations and after conferring with the Executive Board, to convene the Constituent Conference of the Institute. To sum up, the French amendment suggested a procedure, which, without any further allocation of funds, would provide for the collection of the necessary information to enable an important decision to be taken with full knowledge of the facts.

[2] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board was only too anxious that the proposed Institute should be set up as quickly as possible, provided there was sufficient evidence to show it was really needed by the journalists of the world. The French delegation's text was entirely satisfactory from the main point of view which the Board had had in mind, but its essential point was already contained in the original report on page 57 of document 5C/PRG/8. Sir John would leave it to the Commission to choose the text it preferred, but he felt doubts about the advisability of including the words "the delegation of the Committee".

[3] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) had noted that professional journalists' associations were not showing any great enthusiasm for the establishment of the Institute. However, since a comparatively small sum was being requested in the Budget Estimates, he thought the negociations already under way should be continued.

[4] Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom) associated himself with Professor Verniers. There was very little enthusiasm for this project in the United Kingdom, but his delegation agreed to it in principle, and did not find it sufficiently objectionable to oppose it outright.

[5] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL welcomed the French amendment, which he felt would be more likely to meet with the approval of the journalists' associations concerned.

[6] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) enquired whether the French delegation would accept the following wording for the second paragraph of its draft amendment:

To transmit, in particular to the Committee of Press and Publications Experts . . .

Mr. KAYSER (France) readily accepted that wording.

[7] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) moved the inclusion, in the list of items to be taken into consideration by the Director-General, of the clause: "The advisability of including representatives of other news media in his deliberations." This text could also be inserted in the original resolution of the Executive Board.

[8] In reply to a question from Mr. DAVIES (Australia), the DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed that the replies and comments should be communicated, not only to members of the Committee of Experts, but also to its accredited representa-

tives. Accordingly, it might be preferable to word the beginning of the second paragraph of the French amendment as follows:

To transmit, in particular to the Committee of Press and Publications Experts or to its accredited representatives . . .

[9] The French draft amendment, modified in accordance with the suggestions of the Chairman of the Executive Board, the delegate of the United States of America and the Director-General, was *adopted* and referred to the Drafting Committee.[1]

BUDGET TABLE III.6.B [document 5C/5 (II), pages 222 and 223].

[10] Professor SAMBURSKY (Rapporteur, Budget Committee) raised two points:

(1) There seemed to be an embarrassing number of "secretaries" in this Department (35 out of a total of 111 staff); a clearer definition of the term might usefully be adopted.

(2) The Budget Committee had wondered whether Member States could not do more preparatory work by correspondence with the National Commissions concerning the world survey of Technical Facilities [document 5C/5 (II), paragraph 11, page 224], and thereby save the $45,000 involved.

[11] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that the provision for secretarial assistance covered the whole Department, and not just one Division. In view of the very wide field of activities undertaken by the Department, which included research work, negotiations for conventions, work of the nature of a press agency, film and radio institution, he submitted that the figure of 35 "secretaries" out of 111 staff was not an undue proportion.

[12] As to Professor Sambursky's second point, Mr. Schneider stated that the 1950 surveys were already under way with considerable aid from the National Commissions or co-operating bodies in three Member States. In the United States, the Universities of Illinois and Ohio had been most helpful, and the Secretariat had had to pay the expenses of only two trips by field surveyors. Similar work had been undertaken in Canada and the United Kingdom.

Budget Table III.6.B was *adopted*.

SECTION 6.2 (REDUCTION OF OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION).

Item 6.21 [documents 5C/5 (I) Rev. Addendum]. *Adopted* without comment.[2]

Items 6.21 and 6.22 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.]

The examination of these items and of documents PRG/10, 11 and 12 was *reserved* for later consideration.

Item 6.23.

[13] In reply to questions from Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the meeting place of the United Nations Sub-Commission for 1951 had not yet been fixed. The representative of Unesco at the meeting held two weeks previously in Montevideo had been welcomed as bringing a substantial and positive contribution to the conference, and the Secretariat would lose if they failed to send a representative to future meetings, even if these were held in distant parts of the world.

Item 6.23 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

Items 6.24 to 6.28.

[14] On the proposal of Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America), it was *agreed* to insert "categories of" before "persons" in the third line of item 6.26, and to alter "facilities" in the following line to "activities".

Items 6.24 to 6.28 were *adopted*, subject to the foregoing amendments.[2]

Item 6.29.

[15] In response to a question from Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that the keyword in this resolution was "such as". The Secretariat would proceed to undertake such a study only after checking whether it was not already being covered by any other institution. The title was merely an indication of the type of work they were considering.

[16] Mr. KAYSER (France) considered it most important for the Secretariat to undertake in the near future an enquiry into the economic obstacles to the international flow of information.

The Commission *noted* that recommendation, which would be communicated to the Secretariat.

[17] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said the Board had been struck by the difficulty of producing a realistic and business-like draft which would apply for a long period in advance. The Board would greatly welcome any views of the General Conference which would enable the Board in future to produce shorter programmes on mass communication, showing

1. In final form: Resol. 6.171 and 6.1713.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.21.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.23.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.24 to 6.28.

greater confidence in the Director-General and his staff. In future, two or three broad resolutions should be produced, without closer definition, and he hoped that, before the end of the Conference, some delegation might produce a motion to this effect.

[18] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) suggested a course of action which, especially with reference to resolution 6.24, would lead to quick results. Hitherto, scientists travelling from all over the world to the zoological stations in Monaco or Naples were held up for weeks while their apparatus was delayed in the customs. Unesco should aim at obtaining bilaterial agreements with the Governments of Italy and Monaco, similar to the arrangement obtaining in Switzerland with regard to scientists who wished to study on the Jungfraujoch, and who were given full facilities to bring in their apparatus without delay. All that was required was insurance and a guarantee, and Unesco was in a position to supply both of those.

Item 6.29 was *adopted* without change.[1]

BUDGET TABLE III.6.C [document 5C/5 (II), page 228].

Adopted without comment.

SECTION 6.3 (ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO).

Item 6.31 [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Add.].

[19] Professor NAPOLITANO (Italy) thought that Unesco might assist news agencies throughout the world to assemble information of outstanding interest on a number of projects on foot in such areas as the tropics and the arid zones. Unesco might request a number of newspapers to send correspondents, whose living expenses it would pay, while all travel expenses and salaries would be borne by the newspapers which would be entirely free to offer any criticism. Such collaboration would result in free publicity for Unesco's most enterprising activities. Professor Napolitano called for consideration of that idea for submission to the General Conference in 1951.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Italian delegate to submit his proposal in writing for consideration by the Director-General and the Executive Board.

[20] It was *agreed*, at the suggestion of Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India), to refer resolution 6.31 to the Drafting Committee for inclusion of the words: "and other media of mass communication".

Item 6.31 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Add.] was *adopted* in principle.[2]

Items 6.31 to 6.324.

[21] In reply to a question from Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) about the financial implications of item 6.31, Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that none of items 6.31 to 6.325, had in themselves a budgetary implication. The field was so vast, however, that some selection had to be made in order to avoid a vain dispersal of effort. In every case the leading concept in each field had been stressed, but the Secretariat's activities would not necessarily be confined to them.

[22] It was *agreed*, at the suggestion of Mr. DAVIES (Australia), to refer the English text of item 6.324 to the Drafting Committee for clearer wording of the phrase "the solidarity of mankind".

[23] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America), while not wishing to criticize the present programme, expressed the hope that the Executive Board would pay more attention to the steps to be taken to reach the masses by the various forms of mass communication, and to explain Unesco by shows, by articles of fact or fiction, or in any other way.

Items 6.31-6.324 were *adopted*.[1]

Item 6.325.

[24] Mr. JOKA (Yugoslavia) presented his delegation's draft amendment as set out in document 5C/85.

[25] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was inclined to think that the amendment would result in undue emphasis being placed on certain special aspects of Unesco's general responsibilities with regard to information, by limiting the wider concept of freedom of information.

The Yugoslav amendment was not seconded and therefore *lapsed*.

Item 6.325 was *adopted* without change.[2]

Item 6.33.

[26] Mr. KAYSER (France) felt that this item covered an essential activity in the field of information, but unfortunately the present day was not one of prosperity. It was therefore reasonable to enquire what funds Unesco could devote to journalists' missions. Hitherto, a number of newspapers and broadcasting stations had been willing to assist Unesco financially. Unesco's part might therefore be confined to providing the journalists with introductions in the countries where their surveys were to be carried out, and

1. In final form: Resol. 6.29.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.31.

1 In final form: Resol. 6.32 to 6.336.
2. In final form : Resol. 6.337.

to confer upon them the status of Unesco envoys, so as to ensure the collaboration of National Commissions in the countries concerned. By that means, Unesco might avoid restricting the scope of the proposals regarding the dissemination of information.

[27] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that Unesco hoped that the series of articles by Ritchie Calder would be the first of many such series. Expenses had been shared between Unesco and the *News Chronicle*. Initial negotiations for similar arrangements with a number of other newspapers had so far been unsuccessful. Mr. Schneider had to confess that he was not over-optimistic. The *News Chronicle* had agreed to share expenses, because the author was on its own staff and it felt confident of the success of the articles. But other newspapers might not feel the same assurance. Unfortunately, that was his impression, but it would nevertheless not deter him from investigating all other possibilities. He pointed out that while the newspaper sponsoring the articles agreed to share expenses, other newspapers were likely to profit from them; the *News Chronicle* articles had been reproduced in twenty-five countries in Europe and America and in a large number of Arabic newspapers.

No efforts would be spared to secure the maximum collaboration with the press and radio, as suggested by the French delegation.

[28] Mr. KAYSER (France) remarked that if the views of the French delegation met with a favourable reception, the Secretariat could rely on additional support for its efforts to obtain the assistance of the press and radio.

[29] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication), stated that as the *News Chronicle* had, with Unesco, borne the entire expense of Ritchie Calder's mission, it had exclusive rights for the publication of his articles. It had offered them to some forty newspapers and reviews, but hitherto, the articles had for the most part been reproduced free of charge and the revenue from sales was trifling.

[30] Mr. MOOREHEAD (United Kingdom) was very anxious that something should be done to enhance Unesco's reputation. There had been considerable disappointment in the United Kingdom at some of Unesco's press releases. They were often badly worded, it was not made clear what sort of public they were intended to reach, and the general standard was low. There had been an improvement recently which he hoped would continue.

His delegation had, however, been particularly delighted with certain activities of Unesco, especially in the sphere of radio, and more particularly over the Calder mission, which had seemed the beginning of something which could really raise Unesco's reputation in the world. There might, as Mr. Kayser had suggested, be a way of financing such undertakings so as to relieve Unesco, but his delegation were anxious not to press this point too much, since they hoped that this excellent idea would be developed in several other missions, as had been proposed by the Executive Board.

Item 6.33 was *adopted*.[1]

Item 6.331.

Adopted without comment.[2]

Item 6.332.

[31] Mr. KAYSER (France) wondered whether, while Unesco was sponsoring a series of articles, it might not be able to save expenditure by concluding agreements with photographic agencies.

[32] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that for Ritchie Calder's mission, Unesco had shared all journalistic expenses with the *News Chronicle*. But *Picture Post* had sent two photographers at its own expense. However, preliminary negotiations, on the lines advocated by Mr. Kayser, had been undertaken with the *Christian Science Monitor* for a second similar mission, to be carried out in 1950. Whenever Unesco was unable to arrange for free photographic coverage of such missions, it was considering contributing towards the expense of the photographs, which were mainly intended material for filmstrips and for the various exhibitions to be organized by Unesco.

[33] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that advantage should be taken, not only of such missions, but also of the many official visits of members of the Secretariat to build up Unesco's stock of photographs. It was surprising that such excellent opportunities had been missed and that, for the small exhibition that was soon to be opened in Milan, Unesco had been unable to furnish photographs brought back from educational missions, such as those to the Philippines, Afghanistan and Thailand, from the missions in Haiti and Colombia, or from seminars such as those organized in India or Venezuela. The lack of good photographs was greatly to be regretted, and any reduction of a budget already so small would prevent Unesco from carrying out one of its most important activities.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.34.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.35.

[34] Mr. KAYSER (France) wondered whether item 6.632 as it stood really reflected the Director-General's views; if not, it might be advisable to state clearly that it referred to Unesco's activities, for the explanations given in the document dealing with the budgetary repercussions had not made that point sufficiently clear.

[35] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 240, paragraph IV] indeed laid stress on photographs taken during special missions. It would perhaps be well to state specifically that the intention behind item 6.332 was to build up Unesco's archives so that the photographs might be used in Unesco documents and exhibitions.

[36] Mr. KAYSER (France) accordingly suggested adding a statement to the effect that the photographs in question were to be related especially to Unesco's activities.

[37] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) took the opportunity of expressing a view which he knew was shared by several other delegations, of paying a warm tribute to the Department of Mass Communication for the extremely high standard of their work, especially of their publications, which compared most favourably with any others he had seen; he very much hoped that this high standard would be maintained.

[38] *Item 6.332*, together with the amendment proposed by Mr. KAYSER, seconded by the delegates of BRAZIL, NORWAY and EL SALVADOR, was *adopted*.[1]

It was also *agreed* in principle, on the suggestion of Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America), seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BRAZIL, CANADA, PAKISTAN, NETHERLANDS and PHILIPPINES to insert the phrase:

. . . and to stimulate new photographic organizations to make studies of basic Unesco themes.

Item 6.34.

[39] Mr. PEARSON (United States of America) thought that Unesco was in a very good position to produce catalogues of films and filmstrips, which would greatly aid its objectives. A draft catalogue had been begun by Unesco over a year ago; the United States National Commission had appointed a special committee to produce a list for inclusion in the Unesco catalogue, and this had now been forwarded to the Secretariat. It seemed important to list the types of such films and filmstrips which might be of special interest to Unesco, since the language of this resolution was somewhat restricted. There were only a limited number of films on "aspects of the right to education", and the Secretariat should have greater latitude in this matter.

He proposed amending the resolution to read as follows:

. . . To stimulate the production and distribution of catalogues of selected films and filmstrips, and where practicable to publish and distribute catalogues on themes directly related to the objectives of Unesco.

[40] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), while entirely agreeing to the proposal in principle, pointed out the need for restricting the present budget and not forgetting the purpose of the 1951 programme. If this inclusion were adopted, the Commission must agree either to raise the budget for section 6.3 or to drop other items.

[41] Mr. PEARSON (United States of America) replied that the emphasis of his proposal had been on the "stimulation" of that production, which would involve Unesco in virtually no expense, and further, that it was merely designed to give the Secretariat a wider choice in view of the paucity of films on "aspects of the right to education".

[42] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said this particular field was not really so restricted, if taken in the broadest sense of the word. The text of the resolution might usefully be redrafted.

[43] In reply to a question from Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) regarding the meaning of the expression "aspects of the right to education" in item 6.34, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL admitted that the wording was rather unfortunate. The main purpose of the resolution was to bring out the glaring inequalities between the educational systems of different countries. That point should be stated more precisely. Having given that explanation, the Director-General hoped that Mr. Pearson and Dr. Jamali would admit the value of selecting films designed to show up existing barriers to education in certain Member States.

[44] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) suggested giving the text a more precise form, such as "developing consciousness" or "growth of the need for education in the world" or "in under-developed areas".

After a short discussion, Mr. PEARSON (United States of America) agreed to collaborate with Dr. Jamali in producing a draft text for the following meeting.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.36.

Item 6.342.

[45] Mr. KAYSER (France) was well aware of the weighty budgetary considerations that had paralysed the Secretariat's work, but wished to know if an acceptable order of priority could be established at that stage.

He also doubted the necessity of convening a committee of experts. In that connexion, he drew attention to the work plan [document 5C/5 (II), page 243, paragraph XIV] providing a sum of $17,000 for travel on official business to enable Heads of Divisions and senior programme specialists to visit North and South Africa, India and South East Asia, the Middle East and as many as possible of the countries of Europe, where they might talk personally to the heads of press, film, and radio groups. That proposal obviously overlapped with item 6.342, which could be deleted without any prejudice to Unesco's work, and thus make a saving of $8,000.

[46] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that the meeting of experts in item 6.342 was the only one for which provision had been made in the 1951 Programme. He hoped therefore that the Commission would maintain it, particularly in view of the wealth of experience derived from personal contacts and exchanges of views at such meetings.

On account of budgetary considerations, Unesco had unfortunately been obliged to suspend its negotiations for the establishment of a film institute. However, it had not given up all hope of concluding the investigations undertaken and of arousing the interest of some private body in such an institute.

Item 6.342 was *adopted* without modification.[1]

Draft resolution submitted by Venezuela [document 5C/75].

[47] Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela), presenting the draft resolution, pointed out that it was based on two obvious premises: (1) that inter-State help, tolerance and friendship were impossible without mutual understanding; and (2) that the cinema was one of the most effective means of education.

He had been shocked in Italy to find such abysmal ignorance in the Old World about the New, even in a country which had sent so many emigrants to Latin America. In view of the questions he had been asked about his own country, how could Europeans possibly be aware that in one of the Venezuelan cities there was one of the world's most important research centres on malaria? It would be immensely stimulating for his own countrymen to see films of the wonderful cultural heritage of Italy, just as it would be of intense interest to the Italian people to see films of the beautiful landscapes and flora of Latin America. Films could be a most valuable factor in such education, and that was why his delegation recommended that Member States should provide films showing the chief characteristics of each country, to be put at the service of Unesco. Such a phrase might be added to the proposed resolution.

[48] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that, while this was a most useful suggestion and admittedly had no budgetary implications for Unesco itself, it was a case where it was important to remember that Unesco consisted of Member States which should not be asked to undertake anything that each of them was not able to carry out in its own country. The preparation of such a series of films would be very expensive, and the Board had not felt able to recommend it. If, however, the delegate of Venezuela could modify his phrasing to make the resolution more moderate, it might then be added to 1951 Programme.

[49] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that the problem under discussion was one of paramount importance. He had long meditated on what Unesco might do to show the true character of Member States in an absolutely objective spirit, with no ulterior motives of propaganda or disparagement. It was of course essential for Unesco to participate in such a scheme of enlightenment, but it was quite clear that on a budget of $8,200,000, there was no question of giving any such assistance in the near future. However, he thought it might at least be possible in 1951 to encourage certain Member States to produce one short film on educational problems and to send one copy to Unesco, as a beginning of an exchange of films service for schools equipped with projectors. The films could not exactly be termed educational but, rather, short documentaries. If the Conference agreed, the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Venezuelan delegation, might embark on such a scheme; it would be a less ambitious beginning but not without value.

Dr. ARVELO TORREALBA (Venezuela) accepted that suggestion.

[50] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) thought many countries had available documentary films which they would be willing to lend if Unesco were to arrange for the exchanges. He thought this was what the delegate for Venezuela really had in mind. In that case, he asked what was

1. In final form: Resol. 6.373.

the budgetary implication, and whether there was really any objection to the proposal.

[51] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked whether the Commission would agree to a resolution on the following lines:

To produce and select a documentary film for communication to Unesco, with a view to the possible exchange of copies.

[52] It was *agreed*, on the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, that Dr. Arvelo Torrealba should bear in mind the suggestions of Mr. Khushwant Singh and the Director-General when rewording his text in conjunction with the Secretariat.

Item 6.35.

Adopted without discussion.[1]

Draft resolution submitted by India [document 5C/52].

[53] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) stated that his resolution referred in particular to feature programmes. He had already discussed the matter with the Secretariat and been given to understand that there were legal and financial difficulties involved, mainly deriving from problems of copyright.

However, whatever the financial difficulties, India's problem was shared by several other countries in which the press was not an adequate form of mass communication, owing to the absence of newsprint and because of prevailing illiteracy, and in which the film was also inadequate owing to the absence of technical facilities. Such countries—mostly those of Asia—were therefore thrown back on the radio as almost their only way of reaching the masses of the people. Countries like France, Great Britain and the United States were spending much money on putting on good plays. This was the moment to bring to the peoples of Asia the cultural output of Europe.

[54] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that this was the type of activity described in item 6.351. The difficulty there was not so much the Secretariat's own budget, as the nature of the proposition itself. The financial difficulty was, as Mr. Khushwant Singh had said, that of copyright. Nevertheless, the Secretariat could and did intervene wherever possible and on the receipt of requests from Member States, by providing material written by their own staff, to which the copyright problem did not apply. His Department welcomed such requests. Only recently, Unesco had passed on documentary material broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The activities described in the resolution in document 5C/52 were really normal procedure for the Department, but he would try to make available to All India Radio any plays from other broadcasting organizations which were not covered by copyright.

[55] Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) suggested meeting those objections by adding to his resolution "wherever possible".

[56] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) expressed the Board's sympathy for the Indian resolution, the first half of which he thought was really covered by items 6.35 and 6.351. He hoped the Indian delegate would not insist on the inclusion of his resolution in the Programme, but suggested that item 6.351 might be redrafted to include a reference to mutal collaboration.

Mr. KHUSHWANT SINGH (India) accepted Sir John Maud's suggestion, but hoped his delegation would be consulted over the redrafting.

It was *agreed* to reserve the vote for the next meeting.

Item 6.351.

[57] Miss LOY (United States of America) reported that progress had been made in her country as regards film production, and that she hoped more would shortly be made in other States. There had been considerable difficulty in reaching the creative people, but the visit of Dr. Evans to Hollywood before Christmas had made a great impression, and the Screenactors' Guild was now anxious for Unesco material, which it was willing to print in as many copies as would reach its 2,500 or so members. In addition, two film directors in Hollywood, inspired by Dr. Evans, were preparing to make films on the United Nations on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Finally, Miss Loy emphasized the difference between mass communication and public relations, a difference which she felt was not always sufficiently appreciated.

[58] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) assured Miss Loy that the Secretariat was very sensitive to this particular distinction. Nevertheless it was a very fine one, and the line was sometimes difficult to draw.

Item 6.351 was *adopted*.[1]

Draft resolution submitted by Italy [document 5C/48].

[59] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board, left the decision on this proposal to the

1. In final form: Resol. 6.381.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.383.

Commission, since no budgetary implications were involved, but pointed out the difficulty of inserting a resolution in such terms in the Unesco Programme. The International Telecommunications Union, which was the United Nations Specialized Agency dealing with wave-lengths, was not at all sympathetic to the setting up of special wave-lengths for special services. Their policy was rather to obtain international agreement for the reasonable distribution of wave-lengths between different countries and stations. Hence the best thing the Board could urge was that Member States should make use of such wave-lengths as they had for Unesco's purposes, which was in fact the aim of the resolution.

Following Sir John Maud's suggestion, Professor NAPOLITANO (Italy) withdrew his draft resolution.

Item 6.36.

[60] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) suggested rewording item 6.36 to read ". . . *similar* exhibitions. . .".

Resolution 6.36 as amended was *adopted* in principle and referred to the Drafting Committee.[1]

Item 6.37.

[61] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, INDIA, IRAQ, LEBANON, NORWAY, UNITED KINGDOM and SWITZERLAND, moved the deletion of this resolution, on the grounds that the activities mentioned therein were not a part of mass communication, but should be undertaken by the National Commissions. *Agreed.*

[62] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL enquired whether the deletion of that resolution would imply depriving the Secretariat of authority to continue with its previous activities to make Unesco more widely known and to supply information to certain associations. The movement which had already been set on foot in certain French schools was yielding most encouraging results. It was work that did not need to be formally included in the programme, but the Director-General wished nevertheless to be sure that he was correctly interpreting the decision taken by the Commission in thinking that Unesco might be able to continue with such propaganda work.

1. In final form: Resol. 6.39.

[63] Mr. KAYSER (France) thought that the Director-General's interpretation was correct. There was no doubt that that work had yielded excellent results in France. The French delegation had abstained from voting on item 6.37, assuming that the deletion of that item would not imply putting an end to existing collaboration.

[64] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) said his delegation was most anxious to avoid discouraging the Secretariat from any useful activity; they had only feared that the burden was too heavy.

[65] Mr. VERHOEVEN (Netherlands) spoke in support of item 6.37. Several Unesco Centres had already been set up in the Netherlands, and these would be very disappointed if it was decided to give them no encouragement at all. It seemed a pity if these Centres, some of which had financial resources of their own, and some of which were being helped by the Netherlands National Commission, should be discouraged at that stage.

[66] The CHAIRMAN gathered that the Commission was sanctioning the interpretation given by the Director-General and supported by the French delegation, namely, that the vote should not imply any interruption of Unesco's collaboration with National Commissions for the establishment of clubs, associations, "Friends of Unesco" groups and Centres, etc. *Agreed.*

BUDGET TABLES III.6.D [document 5C/5 (II), pages 234 to 237].

[67] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) hoped that funds might be found within the present appropriation to enable the Secretariat to continue reaching the masses and helping those areas where mass communications were doing valuable work. A visit of a representative of the Secretariat could do a great deal to stimulate such organizations, as well as providing the Secretariat itself with most useful information about the areas in question.

The CHAIRMAN having given an asurance that this matter would be borne in mind, Budget Tables III.6.D were *adopted.*

The meeting rose at 0.15 a.m.

TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Examination of the 1951 Programme (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

7. Relief Assistance Services.

SECTION 7.1 (INFORMATION ON NEEDS).

Item 7.11.

[1] Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) observed that his delegation wished to submit some minor drafting amendments to item 7.11, and also to items 7.41, 7.42 and 7.43, which it was suggested should be arranged in more logical order, viz., 7.43, 7.41, 7.42. He therefore proposed that these amendments should simply be referred to the Drafting Committee. *Agreed.*

[2] An amendment proposed by the Yugoslav delegation (document 5C/89), seconded by the delegates of SWITZERLAND and FRANCE, was *adopted.*

[3] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) proposed that items 7.11, 7.31 and 7.32 should be completed by the addition of the following words: "or in other countries experiencing needs revealed during the carrying out of Unesco's ordinary programmes". With that addition Unesco would be able to afford relief in unforeseeable situations (natural disasters, etc.), while a wider measure of co-operation would be feasible with many private relief associations.

[4] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) supported these amendments which had no budgetary implications, since they aimed at an extension of private charity. It appeared that the necessary documentation was already available and could be collected without difficulty.

[5] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), while appreciating Professor Piaget's intentions, wondered whether projects of that kind were not already included under other headings in the Programme, and whether the appropriate place for them was really in the chapter *Relief Assistance Services*, which dealt with the contribution to be made by non-governmental organizations and did not affect Unesco's Budget. If such projects were already included in the programme of other Departments, they should be carried out in close co-operation with the Relief Assistance Services.

The Swiss amendments to items 7.11, 7.31 and 7.32 were *adopted* by 26 votes.

Item 7.11 was *adopted* with the corresponding amendments.[1]

Items 7.111 and 7.12 were *adopted* without discussion.[2]

SECTION 7.2 (DIRECT ASSISTANCE).

Items 7.21 and 7.22.

Adopted without discussion.[3]

Draft resolution of Mexico and Venezuela [document 5C/114].

[6] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) thought that there was no need to dwell on the importance of Cuzco, a sanctuary of colonial culture, whose preservation was a matter of world concern. After appealing to the Economic and Social Council, the Peruvian Government had applied to Unesco, and the purpose of the Mexican and Venezuelan joint proposal was designed to furnish the necessary financial and technical assistance to Peru, once the earthquake damage had been assessed.

[7] Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela) also referred to the importance of Cuzco, the archaeological capital of South America, where remains of Inca civilization and of colonial culture were grouped together. Unesco should take action in this case, since the transmission of man's cultural inheritance intact to future generations was one of the Organization's principal aims.

[8] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) observed that paragraph (*a*) of the draft resolution was already covered by item 7.11. Paragraph (*b*) concerned the work of the Department of Cultural Activities. Paragraph (*c*)

1. In final form: Resol. 7.11.
2. In final form: Resol. 7.111 and 7.12.
3. In final form: Resol. 7.21 and 7.22.

proposed direct assistance and, if the resolution were adopted, the Director-General would request the Executive Board to appropriate a certain sum of money, representing a token grant, for the implementation of the resolution, as had previously been done in the case of Ecuador.

[9] Dr. GIORDANO (Uruguay) and Dr. ALVARADO (Ecuador) supported the resolution, and the latter took the opportunity to express his country's gratitude for the generous assistance it had received in similar circumstances from many countries, mainly on the American continent, and particularly from Peru.

[10] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) recalled that the Board had decided against the inclusion of specific instances of assistance in the Annual Programme. Under the terms of item 7.21, the difficult task of determining the precise cases in which the limited resources at Unesco's disposal should be used could be left to the Director-General and the Executive Board. If the Commission desired to specify the amount to be appropriated for relief to Peru, the resolution would have to be referred for costing to the Budget Committee. The Board did not recommend that course.

[11] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) understood that the first step to be taken depended on the Director-General, who could have the damage assessed and estimate the financial consequences for Unesco. He for his part saw no disadvantage in the General Conference considering the problem at a later stage, the Director-General having entire discretion to take the first necessary steps.

[12] Summing up, the CHAIRMAN said the Executive Board and the Director-General were instructed to make a preliminary study of the matter, which would be brought forward again at the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

Draft resolution presented by Iraq [document 5C/51].

[13] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) regretted that this problem had not received the priority due to it in the discussions. The position of those refugees had to be settled before a new world could be built up. The importance of Unesco's work in Germany and Japan had been discussed at length, but such work was, to say the least of it, equally important in Iraq and Palestine. He therefore hoped that it would meet with the same reception from the Conference. He described the pitiable situation of millions of refugees driven from their homes as a result, not of war, but of decisions voted by the United Nations, the champions of peace and democracy. Without wishing to dwell on the political aspect of the matter, Dr. Jamali felt that the Commission should realize that this was a humanitarian problem. The very ideals of Unesco would be in jeopardy unless speedy relief were given in that part of the world. The Iraqi delegation considered that the problem should be given priority over many other resolutions voted, the implementation of which could wait until the following year without loss. Dr. Jamali concluded by hoping that the Commission would devote to this question the attention it deserved.

[14] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) observed that the Board had considered the matter carefully. It fully appreciated its importance, but unhappily, with the absurdly small resources at its disposal, the Organization could not satisfy such extensive needs, either in the Near East or elsewhere. The amount for direct assistance provided for 1951 out of the Emergency Relief Fund was only $188,000, and the principle had already been adopted that the most effective relief that Unesco could give to victims of disasters was to make enquiries about needs, and then launch appeals to governments and non-governmental organizations to finance the work. The Iraqi draft resolution called for a grant of funds over and above the amounts already contained in the budget for direct assistance and, despite its sympathy with the refugees, the Executive Board had been unable to support the project. The Commission was of course free to adopt the resolution and provide a budget, but the Chairman of the Board proposed that it should adopt the same procedure as in the case of the Mexican and Venezuelan scheme, leaving it to the Director-General and the Board to assign part of the direct assistance credits to that project.

[15] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) recalled that reconstruction problems had appeared in the Organization's programme since its earliest days —indeed ever since the preparatory period. They had been converted into problems of relief assistance, and he had no objection to the change, provided such assistance was made effective. Millions had already been spent on purposes not always in conformity with the Organization's true aims. Professor Photiades called to mind the appeal made by Unesco on behalf of Greek children in the Near East, and urged that that appeal should be renewed in still more striking and eloquent terms. It was not through its ordinary budget that Unesco could furnish relief, but by using its moral influence. It must accomplish its most elementary duty towards those destitute children by rising to the demands of its educational mission.

[16] Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) associated him-

self with what Dr. Jamali had said. The problem of the Arab child refugees from Palestine was a grave one and demanded an urgent solution for the sake of world peace. A comparison had been drawn with the proposal made by the Mexican and Venezuelan delegates on behalf of the historic monuments of Cuzco, but monuments could not be compared with children, whose situation was far more tragic and called for urgent relief. The $188,000 provided for emergency relief re-prepresented only a very small fraction of the total Unesco Budget, and he urged that other activities should be dropped in favour of the immediate action which was indispensable in this matter.

[17] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) had very great sympathy with the Palestine Arab refugees, whose sad plight had come to his notice at the Beirut Conference. He was proud to be able to state that Unesco had already taken direct action to improve the position. The adoption of the amendments to resolutions 7.11, 7.31 and 7.32 made action by Unesco possible in several of those countries on the basis of voluntary assistance. The funds which could be collected in that way were sure to be far in excess of any relief that Unesco could give directly. He therefore recommended that, instead of asking for an increase in the amount set aside for direct assistance, the Commission should pay closer attention to the collection of money from non-governmental organizations.

[18] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) expressed his gratitude for the help given each year by Unesco to the Palestine refugees and to Greek children. Experts had been sent to the spot, and an appeal addressed to Member States. The Executive Board had studied the problem sympathetically and effective aid had been given to the refugees, but such aid was not in proportion to their immense needs. Although he could not expect Unesco to find a complete solution to this distressing problem, Mgr. Maroun advocated the renewal of the Director-General's appeal to Member States. Moreover, he considered that the time had come to give more concrete proof of sympathy by making an appeal to the United Nations, with a view to the return of those refugee populations to their respective countries.

The countries which had opened their doors to the refugees could not continue to help them, and he mentioned the case of the Catholic Reception Committee, in Lebanon, which alone, in the course of two years, had spent 1,200,000 Lebanese pounds for the instruction of refugee children. Mgr. Maroun fully supported Dr. Jamali's statements, and thanked those who had taken such a human interest in that distressing problem.

[19] In answer to Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil), who wished to know the real scope of the appeals which the Paris Conference had addressed to Member States, Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) indicated the origin of the funds obtained in 1949 for refugees in the Middle East; those funds amounted to a total of $113,539, Unesco itself having contributed $38,000. Details were given in the *Report on the Effectiveness of the Reconstruction Programme 1947-1948-1949* (Unesco Publications No. 732, page 66).

[20] With regard to Sir John Maud's suggestion that an appeal should be made to non-governmental organizations, Dr. Drzewieski paid a tribute to the countries which had opened their doors to refugee children, and said that, in 1950, Unesco had allocated to Arab refugee children $60,000 out of the $188,000 of the Emergency Fund set aside for direct assistance. The Emergency Fund for 1951 was still available, but it was difficult to anticipate its allocation at the present time. Efforts were being made to reach a permanent solution.

[21] The CHAIRMAN, who had personally seen heart-rending sights in Beirut, inferred from the discussion, firstly, that the Commission wished to invite the Director-General to renew his appeal to Member States, as Unesco had sufficient moral authority to obtain additional funds for the most urgent needs; and, secondly, that the Commission wished to request the Executive Board, in allocating funds raised, to give first priority to direct aid to refugee children. Lastly, Mgr. Maroun's proposal that an appeal should be made to the United Nations to hasten the return of the refugees to their homes was very important from the humanitarian point of view, but it had political implications, and the Chairman thought that the Lebanese delegate should submit a precise draft resolution to the Commission.

[22] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) agreed with the Chairman's conclusions, but thought that, in order to carry full weight, an appeal should be made by the General Conference and not by Director-General alone. Such an appeal should be launched in favour of children of the Near and Middle East.

[23] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) was very grateful for the sympathy with which his proposal had been received, and agreed to reconsider the question, but emphasized the lack of balance in Unesco's budget, which gave too small a place to direct assistance for countries in need. He feared that Unesco sometimes lost sight of the aims to be achieved by the means at its disposal, and thought that the financial situation should be reconsidered with a

view to allocating a sufficient sum to direct assistance, taking into account the order of priorities to be given to the aims of the Organization. He therefore urged that the Commission should reconsider the matter and re-estimate the sum to be allocated for direct assistance.

[24] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) proposed that the draft resolution should be referred to the Executive Board, with instructions that appropriate steps be taken to increase the funds allocated to it.

[25] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) pointed out that, ever since Unesco had been concerned with the problem, he had not ceased to urge that the attention of Member States should be drawn to the necessity of finding funds, as those in hand were still quite inadequate to meet existing needs. He had pointed that out in particular at the General Conference in Paris in 1949, when launching his appeal on behalf of Greek children. The problem was one and indivisible and had not yet received adequate attention. He had intended to propose that there should be a meeting of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies to study the problem which could not be solved by Unesco alone. If an appeal were made to the United Nations, it would be necessary to emphasize the scale of the problem and the urgency of general measures that would enable a more permanent solution to be found.

[26] Summing up, the CHAIRMAN observed that a solemn appeal, to be made by the General Conference, had been proposed by Professor Photiades; he asked the delegations to confer with one another on that proposal. It had also been suggested that the Executive Board should examine the possibility of granting priority to assistance to refugee children of the Near and Middle East, such action to be financed out of the modest funds at Unesco's disposal for direct aid. Lastly, he asked Mgr. Maroun to confer with Professor Carneiro on the subject of an appeal to the United Nations.

SECTION 7.3 (VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE CAMPAIGNS).

Item 7.31.

Adopted, with the amendment previously suggested by Professor Piaget.[1]

Item 7.32.

[27] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) proposed that the item should mention the needs of refugee intellectuals, as well as of scholarships and other facilities which might be granted them within the framework of Unesco's Programme.

Mr. MOHR (Norway) seconded Dr. Zook's proposal, as he fully appreciated its humanitarian nature.

The proposal was also seconded by the delegates of AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, BRAZIL, INDIA, ISRAEL and others.

[28] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) had no objection to Dr. Zook's proposal, but he did not think that the mention of scholarships would be in place in that section of the programme, as it concerned the Exchange of Persons Service and, in his opinion, would be more appropriately placed in the chapter concerning that Service.

[29] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) approved the United States proposal concerning refugee intellectuals and hoped that the Drafting Committee would be able to draw it up in a more co-ordinated form.

The Belgian delegation has proposed an alternative resolution [document 5C/115] within the framework of the Relief Assistance Services.

[30] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) seconded the Belgian proposal, which did not seem to him to overlap with the United States amendment to item 7.32. He thought the latter would be in its right place in the chapter on Relief Assistance Services.

[31] The CHAIRMAN proposed that it should be left to the Drafting Committee to determine the exact place in which Dr. Zook's amendment should be inserted.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) pointed out that this amendment was likely to have budgetary implications and should therefore be referred to the Budget Committee. Pending that Committees examination, item 7.32 could not be finally adopted.

It was *agreed* to refer the United States proposal to the Budget Committee.

[32] Reverting to the Belgian proposal [document 5C/115], the DIRECTOR-GENERAL was fully prepared to accept the employment of refugee intellectuals under the Technical Assistance Programme and had himself suggested something similar to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Directors-General of the other Specialized Agencies.

[33] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) emphasized the desirability of overlooking no possibilities in connexion with recruitment of technicians and experts for the execution of this Programme. The political difficulties regarding the employment of refugee intellectuals which existed

1. In final form: Resol. 7.31.

in many countries would automatically disappear if it were a question of refugees of that class serving exclusively in under-developed countries. That was why the Belgian delegation was suggesting that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Directors-General of the Specialized Agencies should be asked to include refugee intellectuals in the lists of technicians available to Member States under the Technical Assistance programme.

The Belgian draft resolution, supported by the delegates of AUSTRIA, GREECE, NORWAY, NETHERLANDS and UNITED KINGDOM, was *adopted*.[1]

Items 7.33 and 7.34.

Adopted without discussion.[2]

Item 7.35.

[34] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Official and External Relations Commission had discussed the question of Unesco's future relations with international non-governmental organizations and that, in order to harmonize item 7.35 with that Commission's conclusions, which would probably be approved by the General Conference, the Executive Board had considered it necessary to indicate in resolution 7.35 the facilities which Unesco intended to accord to non-governmental organizations. The text proposed was as follows:

To facilitate the activities of non-governmental organizations particularly active in giving assistance for educational, scientific and cultural purposes, by the establishment of working groups and close co-operation in specific projects.

The proposal, seconded by the delegations of BRAZIL, AUSTRIA and TURKEY, was *adopted* as resolution 7.35.[3]

SECTION 7.4 (INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS).

Draft resolution submitted by the United States [document 5C/65].

[35] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) said that, to meet the wish expressed by the Commission for a concentration of youth activities, his delegation thought it necessary to transfer all the resolutions under 7.4 to the Education Programme. In his opinion, it was not for Unesco to sponsor international voluntary work camps, whatever their aims, as that was rather the responsibility of other organizations. For that reason, the draft resolution submitted by his delegation has deleted the activities of item 7.42 and the mention of libraries in 7.43, as the United States delegation thought that such a task concerned the organizations establishing work camps.

[36] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) approved the transfer of the resolutions in question to the chapter on Education.

[37] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) admitted that the expression "to sponsor" might present certain dangers; he preferred the expression "to give help to". He saw no objection to the resolution's being transferred to the chapter on Education, but would like to have the Secretariat's opinion on the matter.

[38] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) thought the transfer fully justified. He saw no objection to the deletion of resolution 7.42, if the text was thus transferred, since the reference to activities connected with school reconstruction and youth centres might seem restrictive.

Dr. Drzewieski also drew attention to an Italian amendment proposing an enquiry into the educational aspect of youth camps [document 5C/49]. The question of the educational value of work camps had been raised and it had been proposed to ask educators to make an objective report on the matter.

Dr. Drzewieski would regret it if no mention were made of libraries in the resolution seeing that they could be utilized in the work camps during the summer and in the universities during the winter.

[39] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) emphasized the need to establish contact between the administrators of works camps and the Member States on whose territory they were situated. He thought that the active co-operation of Member States could be obtained in the constitution or stocking of the libraries, and the sending of lecturers or educators. He therefore proposed adding to the United States text in document 5C/65 the words: "if possible, with the help of Member States". Professor Verniers also thought it would be better to maintain item 7.41 and to leave the three resolutions in the Section on international work camps.

[40] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) was in favour of transferring this section to the Education Programme, as proposed by Dr. Zook. It would have the advantage of regrouping in the same Department all texts relating to youth activities. He agreed with Dr. Drzewieski that item 7.42

1. In final form: Resol. 7.22.
2. In final form: Resol. 7.33 and 7.34.
3. In final form: Resol. 7.35.

should be deleted, as item 7.41 defined the nature of the work camps with which Unesco should be concerned. He saw no objection to the contents of 7.41 and 7.43 being contained in a single resolution, to which might be added the appeal to Member States proposed by Professor Verniers. Mr. Abraham agreed with Dr. Drzewieski that the mention of libraries should be retained.

[41] Mr. Abraham wished to take the opportunity of drawing attention to the splendid work accomplished in difficult circumstances by the former Department of Reconstruction (henceforth Relief Assistance Services) under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Drzewieski. In Mr. Abraham's view, the activities of that Service were specially likely to bring home to the peoples the help they could expect from Unesco in emergencies.

[42] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) agreed to the retention of the phrase relating to libraries and to the incorporation in his own text of the appeal to Member States suggested by Professor Verniers.

The United States draft resolution in document 5C/65, with that amendment, was *adopted*.[1]

Draft resolution submitted by Italy [document 5C/49].

[43] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) said that the Board had calculated that the Italian proposal would involve the budgetary provision of a sum of about $6,000; it therefore hoped that the Italian delegation would not press for the inclusion of its proposal in the 1951 Programme and would agree that the idea should be reconsidered for a subsequent year.

[44] Mr. MAMELI (Italy) pointed out that no special budgetary provision would be required if Unesco lecturers or officials sent on mission to work camps were instructed to carry out the suggested enquiry.

[45] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) explained that the number of lecturers sent to work camps by Unesco was governed by the funds available; during the current year it had only been possible to visit 30 per cent of the camps. Accordingly, if it were desired to embark on the enquiry suggested by the Italian delegation, it would be necessary to make provision for the despatch of a special delegate travelling with a secretary, to visit the maximum number of work camps and analyse the educational value of each. It was on that basis that the figure of $6,000 had been arrived at.

[46] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to make available on request to all Member States a summary of the main features of reports to the Director-General by lecturers visiting international work camps.

[47] Mr. MAMELI (Italy) was anxious to underline the need to guarantee the fundamental freedoms, as mentioned in his delegation's draft resolution. It was vitally important that Unesco should grant its patronage only in the light of full knowledge, after making sure that the attitude prevailing in each work camp was fully consistent with Unesco's ideals. It therefore looked as though an investigation of the type suggested needed to be carried out as speedily as possible. Moreover, such an enquiry was essential for the preparation of the report which the Director-General had promised to make in this connexion. Mr. Mameli would agree to Professor Vernier's proposal, provided it mentioned the freedoms to which he had referred.

[48] The CHAIRMAN suggested the following text:

The Director-General is instructed to make available to Member States at their requests, a concise report on the educational and human side of the international youth camps visited by Unesco officials on mission and by Unesco lecturers, who should be vigilant to secure respect for freedom of conscience and worship, freedom of work, the right to information and the right of individuals to express their views.

[49] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) having asked for more information regarding the countries where work camps were situated and the prospects of free access to such camps, Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) replied that there were camps in Western Europe, Mexico and Algeria, with prospects of a camp in Morocco during the summer of 1950. In the case of all those camps, Unesco could, so far as its budgets permitted, send a representative on, for instance, a five-day visit, who could speak unrestrictedly to the young people present.

[50] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) having pointed out that Unesco could only send representatives on the invitation of camp directors, Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) mentioned that Unesco had set up a Co-ordination Committee of the main organizations concerned with work camps; this committee decided on the camp programmes, in close liaison with the heads of the organizations concerned.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.364 and 1.3641.

[51] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought that the words " . . . be vigilant to secure. . ." implied supervisory or executive duties, which could not be imposed on the persons who would make the visits in question.

[52] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) suggested that the passage should be worded ". . . a concise report on the educational *aspects* and *the respect for human rights* of the international youth camps", deleting the references to individual liberties.

Mr. MAMELI (Italy) agreed to this amendment.

The Italian draft resolution in document 5C/49, was *adopted* with the amendments suggested by the Chairman and Professor Verniers.[1]

BUDGET TABLES III.7.A AND III.7.C [document 5C/5 (II), pp. 247-248 and 257].

[53] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the comments of the Budget Committee in document 5C/BUD/1 - Annex VII.

Budget Tables III.7.A and III.7.C were *adopted*.

1. Education (*continued*).

Draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom [document 5C/95].

[54] Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) said his delegation did not insist on this draft amendment to item 1.122 being discussed.

Draft resolution submitted by Persia [document 5C/113].

[55] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this resolution would have budgetary repercussions and thus would have to be considered by the Budget Committee before a final decision could be taken.

The Persian draft resolution seconded by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, IRAQ, LIBERIA, MEXICO, PAKISTAN and TURKEY was *adopted* by 15 votes to 1, subject to consideration by the Budget Committee.[1]

1 In final form: Resol. 1.365.

5. Exchange of Persons (*continued*).

Draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands (continued) [document 5C/23 (Rev.)].

[56] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) suggested that reference be made explicitly to "*another* fellowship offered by a private international organization. . ."

The Netherlands draft proposal, seconded by the delegate of BRAZIL, was *adopted* as amended.[2]

6. Mass Communication (*continued*).

Draft resolution submitted by Venezuela [new version of document 5C/75].

[57] The new text of this draft resolution supported by the delegates of AFGHANISTAN, FRANCE, INDIA, ITALY and the UNITED KINGDOM, was *adopted*.[3]

Revised version of item 6.34.

[58] The CHAIRMAN read out the next text proposed for item 6.34.

[59] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL indicated that the *right to education* was the real point of this resolution, and suggested that special stress be laid on the idea.

After amendment on the lines suggested by the Director-General, the new draft was seconded by the delegate of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA and IRAQ and *adopted*.[4]

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 1.355.
2. In final form: Resol. 5.23.
3. In final form: Resol. 6.374.
4. In final form: Resol. 6.371.

TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Draft resolution submitted by Mexico and Venezuela: Technical and financial assistance for the restoration of the archaeological and historic monuments of Cuzco (*continued*) [document 5C/114].

[1] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) reminded the Commission that it had adopted draft resolution 4.42. The catastrophe which had occurred at Cuzco (Peru) was a sufficient cause for sending a technical mission under the terms of that item, subject to approval of the resolution by the General Conference.

[2] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) expressed this information and pointed out that paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) in the draft resolution in document 5C/114 involved no budgetary implications.

[3] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that, in 1951, Unesco would be in a position to organize a mission to assist with the restoration of archaeological sites or monuments as part of the Technical Assistance programme. The Mexican and Venezuelan delegations had proposed that the mission should be sent to Cuzco. The President of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations had sent a telegram to the Director-General, asking Unesco to make some practical gesture of international solidarity to Peru. If the Commission thought fit to select Peru to receive the first mission, and if item 4.42 were kept in the 1951 Programme, there would be no obstacle to carrying out the proposal of the Mexican and Venezuelan delegations. It would, of course, be necessary for the Peruvian Government to send Unesco an official request. In that connexion, the Director-General mentioned that part of the cost of the mission's work would have to be borne by the country to which it was sent. As several delegations had indicated that their governments were anxious that such a mission should be sent to them under the provisions of item 4.42, the decision should come from the Programme and Budget Commission rather than from the Executive Board and the Director-General.

[4] It was *decided* that, provided the Peruvian Government submitted a request, the mission mentioned in item 4.42 should be sent to the city of Cuzco in 1951, and the Director-General should be authorized to notify the President of the Economic and Social Council of that decision.

Draft amendment proposed by the Egyptian delegation to document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. I [document 5C/111].

[5] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) emphasized that, in submitting the document, no criticism was intended of the action of Powers administering non-self-governing territories, many of which had honourable records, as could be seen by the number of such territories which had emerged from that condition to become independent nations, members in their own right of international organizations. It was intended by the Egyptian amendment to direct particular attention to a side of the well-being and development of non-self-governing territories which had not been stressed in the resolution submitted by the Executive Board, and thus to render the enquiry more complete.

Dr. Awad drew attention to the fact that the fostering of minority languages might even hamper development; the language to be encouraged should therefore have the qualities of a national language. The amendment necessarily had its political side, like many other parts of the Unesco programme; but, as the amendment did not imply interference in the internal affairs of States, which was forbidden by the Constitution, he had no scruples in submitting it to the Commission.

[6] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) emphasized the merits of Dr. Awad's proposal. There was nothing in the word "political" or the concept it covered to cause alarm, and no one could doubt that the Egyptian draft resolution was concerned with intellectual "politics". The text which had been adopted before was the result of a request from the United Nations that Unesco should study the question of indigenous languages, through its Member States. The Egyptian delegation's proposal was not entirely in line with that scheme, particularly with regard to political administration and institution. The object of the proposal in question was

probably the same as that of the United Nations in that it was designed to preserve the vitality of indigenous languages, so that they might provide access to a higher civilization.

The term "indigenous languages" was applied to the local languages, but those were not the only ones used in the non-self-governing territories. The language of a great culture or civilization, although not indigenous, should not be ignored by Unesco. Mr. Abraham therefore submitted an amendment to the Egyptian proposal, reading:

Instructs the Director-General to undertake an over-all study of the question of the indigenous or *national* languages of the native peoples.

The French amendment was seconded by the delegate of BELGIUM.

[7] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) fully endorsed Dr. Awad's statement. In the United Nations, some concern had been felt about the unduly slow development of certain non-self-governing territories. One of the means of hastening their development was precisely the encouragement of a national language. In the past, either national languages had been ignored, or local languages had been so encouraged as to divide, rather than unite, the territory. The part to be played by the United Nations and Unesco in leading the territories in question to independence and self-government implied adequate encouragement of national languages, but not of all indigenous languages.

[8] Mr. WARD (United Kingdom), welcoming both document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. I and the amendment submitted by the Egyptian delegation, said that the United Kingdom felt rather sensitive on the question, because there were three indigenous languages in the British Isles—a fact which tended to make the British administrations of non-self-governing territories unduly indulgent towards native languages.

Mr. Ward whole-heartedly agreed with Dr. Jamali on the desirability of fostering national languages only, but drew attention to the extreme difficulty of such controlled development, with all its anthropological and sociological implications. The problem was not confined by any means to non-self-governing territories, and he hoped that self-governing countries would make their experience in the matter available to the Powers responsible for non-self-governing territories.

He suggested that it would be a mistake for the Unesco enquiry to be confined to cases where the linguistic contact was between an occupying Power and the occupied people. It should also cover cases, like the Gold Coast, where a native language had spread far beyond the bounds of its political area through use as a trading language, and any others where a language was becoming widely diffused, whether for economic or social reasons or owing to the superior prestige of another culture. In view of the additional difficulty of telling when an indigenous language became a national language, Mr. Ward felt that the Egyptian amendment might prove restrictive; and for that reason, he wished to associate himself with the motion submitted by Mr. Abraham.

[9] Mgr. MAROUN (Lebanon) supported the Egyptian delegation's proposal. He mentioned that in Lebanon, which was an Arabic-speaking country, two languages were taught in the schools. Neither was regarded as inferior to the other, but the two languages supplied mutual stimulus, the results of which were seen in the intellectual development of the population. National languages should be protected where they were "open" and might assist the indigenous language to survive and develop.

[10] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) withdrew his amendment (document 5C/11) in favour of the French motion, in view of the arguments raised during the discussion.

[11] The text of the resolution proposed by Mr. Abraham was *adopted.*[1]

Unesco's contribution to peace: Draft resolutions presented by Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Belgium, respectively [documents 5C/17, 5C/19, 5C/25 and 5C/67].

[12] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) had no comment on the content of the resolutions before the Commission but on behalf of the Board, thanked the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Belgium for submitting their resolutions, which the Board regarded as a response to its invitation on the final page document 5C/5 (I) Rev.

When the Board had finished preparing the Programme, it recognized that the full effect could be felt only in after years, and that the work of Unesco was, by nature, long-term. The Board had borne in mind the state of the world and had tried to make its projects relevant not only to the 1960's and 70's but to the immediate future. It was the intention of the Board to ask the delegations whether they could suggest any further measures to make a more immediate contribution to the present peace of the world. However, the Board wanted to prevent misunderstanding of any action which the Conference might take.

[13] Above all, the Conference should not give

1. In final form: Resol. 9.311.

the impression that only in the course of its work at Florence had Unesco awakened to the state of the world. No one should be left in doubt that the main concern of the Conference was to design a programme which would make an effective contribution to peace, not only in the fullness of time, but then and there. Through the Mass Communication Programme, through its action through press, radio and film to reach millions in all parts of the world; through its desire to give immediate assistance to the Arab refugees; through the decision to continue its work in Germany—the Conference had borne in mind the present needs of the world and had sought action to have an immediate impact on the minds and spirits of men. Could more be done?

In conclusion, Sir John urged the meeting to respond to the Board's appeal by action. Unesco should not give to those who would misunderstand it, the excuse that at such a time it was content with words.

[14] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that the congress referred to in the Yugoslav proposal [document 5C/19] should have a comprehensive membership and should provide occasion for a fruitful exchange of views; it was important that all shades of opinion should be represented. The congress would have to discover what were the obstacles to cultural co-operation.

[15] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) pointed out that Unesco's Programme as a whole was designed for the maintenance of peace. It was a long-term programme but, thanks to some of the work done in the course of it, the ground had been prepared for more immediate and direct measures. The Belgian draft resolution [document 5C/25] contained three proposals, of which the first two were independent but similar; the third might be applied to either of the first two, or to both. Professor Verniers emphasized that it was advisable that the reports drawn up by the proposed commission should receive only limited circulation.

[16] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) thought the Belgian proposal was very valuable but that the reports in question should be circulated to the maximum number of readers. He therefore submitted an amendment proposed by his delegation [document 5C/67] to the third paragraph of the Belgian resolution.

[17] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) questioned the value of the Czechoslovak proposal [document 5C/17], in view of the educational methods employed, and the treatment of children in general, in Czechoslovakia itself.

[18] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) paid tribute to the ideas underlying the proposals under consideration, but expressed doubts about the procedure proposed. By virtue of its origin, its Constitution, and its Programme, Unesco stood consistently as an advocate of peace. He was afraid that, if any one of the proposals submitted were carried out, it might lead to a sort of analysis of such and such a war or such and such a method of warfare. The important thing was to strike at the very roots of war and violence. Unesco's doctrine was that of non-violence, of refusing to settle disputes by warlike methods. It was Unesco's duty to eradicate the war spirit. Any study of the means of conducting warfare might compromise the success of that fundamental task. Unesco's work for peace was a slow process, to be carried out through the education programme, the study of social tensions, and mass communication. It represented the gradual day-to-day reform of the human spirit.

Professor Carneiro agreed with the views expressed by the Chairman of the Executive Board when he had said that Unesco's work for peace should be carried on as part of the process of implementing the programme. No doubt the National Commissions should be reminded that they also had their part to play in that field and that they should consult together to make their work as effective as possible. The Organization itself had to count on the moral and intellectual impact of its programme and its presence in the world.

[19] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) welcomed Sir John Maud's statement and fully agreed with the opinion he had expressed. If, after two world wars in one generation, there was any intelligence left to the world, all were alive to the danger of war. The San Francisco Conference, in preparing the Charter of the United Nations, has laid down a basis for lasting peace. Action should follow to prepare the ways and means by which the nations could live together in peace, by removing the causes of war.

[20] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) agreed with Dr. Jamali and Professor Carneiro. Since 1814, Sweden had not been engaged in any war and had thus laid herself open to the charge of being too peace-minded. It was her belief that, if nations concentrated on the social, cultural and economic development of their own lands and opened their frontiers to all forms of contact with their neighbours in order to get to know other countries, knowledge would give confidence and trust where lack of knowledge could only breed fear and mistrust. In its programme for promoting the free flow of information, in its work in Germany and Japan, through the Social Sciences programme and

the dissemination of information on the Declaration of Human Rights, Unesco was making a direct contribution to peace. In the discussion in the Swedish Parliament prior to the entry of Sweden into the Organization, the determining factor had been the belief that Sweden could not remain outside an organization whose Programme was so directly contributing to the preservation of peace. Every effort should be devoted to strengthening the Programme and to making it more effective. Peace conferences had no further contribution to make.

[21] Mgr. HOCHWALT (United States of America) wished to associate himself with Sir John Maud's statement. He thought Unesco should not be discouraged at the apparent slowness of the progress made. Tangible results had been achieved, and all had been heartened when the Conference had decided on the continuation of work in Germany and Japan, and by the work on Human Rights. He felt that the United Nations and Unesco provided sufficient conference facilities; but he would suggest that, pending full discussion of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a special sub-committee should be formed to study the problems of maintaining the peace.

[22] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) considered that, if there were practical day-to-day collaboration between the nations, peace would be preserved. The progress achieved in that direction by the execution of Unesco's Programme was slow but sure. Nevertheless, the provisions set forth in the Belgian proposal [document 5C/25] were undoubtedly of value. The Mexican delegation therefore supported that proposal.

[23] Mr. MONTEL (France) emphasized that the desire for conquest and domination and the sense of historical inevitability were at the root of all wars. The Belgian delegation's proposal was limited in scope. Even if the reports in question were circulated to the general public, they would only be preaching to the converted. It was necessary to make a thorough and comprehensive study of the idea of the inevitability of war and lust for domination. For that purpose, a small committee might be convened—for instance, the Executive Board, with the assistance of a certain number of experts. That committee would be responsible for defining such practical and urgent measures as it might be necessary to take. The French delegation supported Mrg. Hochwalt's proposal.

[24] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) stressed the importance of ascertaining Unesco's position on the fundamental issues, in view of the grave responsibility which went with any action by Unesco. Any proposal for action should be severely judged on its merits. The situation was far too serious for expedients. The eyes of the world were turned towards Unesco, whatever action it might propose. A weak and ineffective response to the exigencies of the situation might be disastrous to the Organization and harmful to the cause of peace itself.

Sir George regretted that he could not support the Belgian and Yugoslav proposals [documents 5C/25 and 19]. Never, in the history of the human race, had the outbreak of war been prevented by the fear of it and the knowledge of its effects. Aggressor nations were the last to be deterred by the reports of committees. Furthermore, the report would be issued with spurious authority, as it would not be possible for the experts of the committee to have access to military secrets and the latest discoveries concerning warfare. Finally, serious harm might be done to Unesco by the announcement to a world tired of expedients, of a proposal, having the aura of the dusty air of the meeting room, for yet another meeting and report. The revolutionary approach to the problem of peace or war lay in the programme. On that point, he fully endorsed the opinion of Mrg. Hochwalt. The Belgian and Yugoslav proposals might, in proving the illness of the world, aggravate the symptoms, whereas Unesco's efforts should be devoted to curing the causes.

In conclusion, Sir George associated himself with the proposal that a sub-committee be formed to underline the parts of the programme which would contribute most directly to the cause of peace.

[25] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand) regretted that he could not support the Belgian and Yugoslav motions. The Secretariat's capacity to assume responsibilities for short-term tasks was limited. Unesco should not throw away the benefit of its achievements for untried methods.

Dr. Beeby doubted whether the Belgian proposal would prove effective, because it was unlikely that the seven members of the Commission would be able to acquire the necessary information to give an accurate and impartial report. He agreed with Professor Carneiro that Unesco had discovered its vocation and should not give it up, however glittering the prize.

[26] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that the previous March he had put to the Executive Board the problem which had just been discussed; it was important that the public should be aware of what Unesco was or was not capable of doing. The current discussion was not an encouraging reply. While, on the one hand, the Organization was in a position to lay the foundations of peace slowly but surely in the minds of men, on the other

hand, education, science and culture were directly threatened in 1950. By turning a blind eye to the facts of the hour, out of a desire to cling to its existing programme, the Organization was losing sight of its responsibilities, a fault for which it would have to answer at the bar of history. No doubt the answer the delegations had given was sincere, but it was the first time that there has been such unanimous agreement on the efficacy of the programme. The Director-General left to the imagination of the delegates the feelings of the peoples of the fifty-nine Member States at the overwhelming difference between the budget of $8,250,000 allotted to the programme for the defence of peace, and the amounts to be spent on armaments in those fifty-nine States themselves.

If it was thought that education, science and culture were the best means of defending the cause of peace in a world in which pacifism itself had become suspect, two possible courses were open. Either Unesco could be converted into a modest office for intellectual co-operation, in receipt of the sums necessary for the execution of its programme, or, alternatively, there should be a determined return to the spirit of the Constitution and vigorous action should be taken, accompanied by the provision of appropriate resources.

Contrary to the hopes that the Director-General had indulged, it seemed that Unesco was to be held at the same point for several years to come, and it was useless to contemplate improving the programme for the future if the replies given by the Member States were not to be more encouraging. Either Unesco's Programme was good and the manner of implementing it bad, or the Programme was good and the manner of implementing it passably satisfactory, but Member States were in no position to make a practical contribution to the Organization's work. In either case, the Director-General asked the General Conference to find someone to succeed him for, believing as he did in the principles of Unesco, he could no longer place any confidence in the inadequate activities of Member States.

[27] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) stated that the Director-General's closing words were fresh proof of his deep sense of his responsibilities. They called for a new declaration by the General Conference of its confidence in the Director-General. It was essential to consider carefully the proposals which had been submitted and to examine how far Unesco could operate effectively in a sphere normally the responsibility of governments. The main obstacle to the effort for which the Director-General had asked was that scepticism which had always confronted the champions of peace with hostile arguments. He recalled that efforts to secure peace had sometimes achieved success in the past, and he therefore asked delegates to try to co-ordinate the proposals submitted so that they could be combined in a single declaration or lead to the establishment of a single body.

[28] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) emphasized that the outcome of the current discussion was wholly unexpected. Stressing the disproportion between Unesco's aims and the Organization's means, he remarked that the very fact that the struggle between the forces of peace and those of war was so unequal made it impossible for Unesco to do without Mr. Torres Bodet. If the Organization had the vast resources that were available for war, anyone could direct it but, in the difficulties under which Unesco was labouring, the spiritual strength of Mr. Torres Bodet was essential. He asked the delegates to decline to accept the Director-Genral's resignation. (*Prolonged applause.*)

[29] Mr. MONTEL (France) warmly endorsed Professor Carneiro's declaration. He stressed the need for convening a committee to define as matters of urgency the activities to be carried out.

[30] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) associated himself whole-heartedly with Professor Carneiro's appeal. He begged the Director-General not to lose heart, not to lay down his task. Unesco was not alone in pitting its meagre budget of $8,000,000 against all the forces of war. It stood within the framework of the United Nations. Only part of the work fell to the Director-General and his staff; Member States and non-governmental organizations also played their part. The Director-General was the catalyst who set up a chain-reaction throughout the structure. He urged the Director-General not to leave the Organization when his inspiring leadership was most needed.

[31] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) reverted to his suggestion that a sub-committee should be formed, to add to its tasks that of evaluating the work of the Conference, and to report to the Conference as soon as possible on the efficacy of the Programme. A statement should then be issued so that the world should know that peace and security were the central objectives of Unesco.

[32] The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the Director-General's statement was important, not only from his own point of view but from that of the very existence of the Organization. He asked the delegates to consult together and examine the proposals submitted, working out new plans if necessary.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Resolution on Extraordinary Projects and Resolution on an Expanded Programme on Education about Human Rights [documents 5C/59 and 5C/56].

[1] Mgr. HOCHWALT (United States of America), introducing the two above resolutions jointly with Dr. Zook, dealt with them first from the general point of view. Believing that the Declaration of Human Rights was an extraordinary project which required extraordinary attention from Unesco, the United States delegation thought that additional steps should be taken to bring it to the knowledge of the whole world. In document 5C/97, the United States delegation had listed the advancement of the teaching about human rights as the third major task of Unesco. Unesco should begin by publicizing the Universal Declaration, and the Director-General should intensify his programme to make it known to the world. The United States delegation therefore proposed that a plan of action should be undertaken, whose details would be the responsibility of the Secretariat, but on which it might be possible to indicate certain lines of action which would ensure that the project was applied on a Unesco-wide basis. Mgr. Hochwalt concluded by outlining in general terms the types of activity which might fall under that heading.

[2] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) said the delegates had all been very deeply impressed at the afternoon meeting by the importance of bearing in mind at all times the central objective of peace and security. The United States delegation was doing all it could to bring that about, and the proposed programme had been drawn up to that end. It was worth while realizing that peace and security were problems for all the Member States, not only in 1950, but also for many years to come, and indeed at all times. The Conference should also remember that it was a group representing fifty-nine nations, and that it had to proceed in a democratic manner. The United States delegation had felt on occasion that the Unesco Programme was too diffuse, and Dr. Zook was sure that others had occasionally felt the same about the proposals of the United States delegation. It would be strange if the Unesco Programme were ever really satisfactory to any one nation or to all of them together, and it therefore seemed to him that their task required that they should all work together and never be discouraged.

[3] The United States had identified certain areas which they believed to be of particular importance in that respect, notably Germany, because they felt that peace and security were threatened in those areas. They believed that respect for human rights was the basis for attaining peace and security, and they therefore felt that unusual steps should be taken to implement what was in fact the basic element of Unesco's Programme.

[4] The United Nations were to be congratulated on having formulated the Declaration which Unesco had been privileged to approve at the Beirut Conference. For his part, he almost regretted that it was not Unesco which had taken the lead in the matter, but at least Unesco could extend its application. In that connexion, certain resolutions had already been passed, in particular, resolutions 1.35, 1.352 and 6.31. But that was not yet enough. The Organization must not cease its efforts to go forward with its Programme, which was of such vital concern to peace and security.

[5] Dr. Zook wished to suggest, in the first place, two amendments, originally proposed by the United States delegation [document 5C/66], but temporarily withdrawn at the time the relevant part of the Programme had been under discussion. The first concerned item 1.313, dealing with the preparation in 1951 of a seminar to be held in 1952, and would have a budgetary implication of between $3,000 and $4,000. The second amendment was to insert in item 1.321 the words: "and the teaching about Human Rights" after "the teaching of living languages".

[6] In addition, his delegation put forward the resolution contained in document 5C/56, which proposed the planning of a long-range programme designed to make the Universal Declaration more widely known in the world. The first

part of the resolution was merely intended to encourage the incorporation of the production of basic materials in the schools programme mentioned in item 1.352. The second and third paragraphs dealt with activities which had already been begun and were well within Unesco's scope. The final paragraph was intended to place before Member States plans for which additional sums might be sought outside the regular budget, in accordance with the resolution passed a few days previously.

[7] That should enable the Director-General to request Member States to inform the General Conference yearly of the progress made during the past year, firstly in publicizing the Declaration, and secondly in legislating for its application. The project admittedly had budgetary implications, but its success was of such importance to Unesco that it was certainly worth while putting in a considerably larger sum than was at present allocated for the purpose.

[8] The proposed amendments applied in the main to the educational section, but Dr. Zook suggested that some modifications might also be required in the section on Mass Communication. This task seemed to call for co-ordination, and the United States delegation therefore proposed that a first-class person should be appointed as co-ordinator, and that there should be at least two field teams which would visit different parts of the world and bring the Universal Declaration to the notice of different peoples.

[9] The budgetary implications might be summarized very roughly as follows:

		$
Preparation of a seminar:	approximately	4,000
Textbooks:	approximately	3,000
Expert radio and film script writers:	approximately	20,000
Administration:	approximately	5,000
Travel:	approximately	10,000
Co-ordinator:	approximately	7,500
Field teams:	approximately	18,000
Total:	approximately	70,000

Of that total, $18,000 were already voted under item 1.352, leaving about $50,000 still to be found.

The United States delegation thought it exceedingly important that all Unesco's work in the field in question should be efficiently co-ordinated on the lines suggested. By expanding the project as proposed, the Organization would have an extraordinary project which would be bound to make a very deep impression on the world.

[10] Professor VERNIERS (Vice-Chairman, Executive Board) regretted that he was unable to say what attitude would be taken by the Chairman of the Executive Board with regard to those important and complex proposals. As they had not been submitted to the Executive Board, the latter had not had to take a decision concerning either the principles embodied in them or their budgetary implications. He therefore would be grateful if the United States delegate would clarify certain points of his proposal so that the Executive Board might examine it methodically.

[11] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the United States proposal was undoubtedly one of the most important which had come before the Conference or the Commission. As both Mgr. Hochwalt and Dr. Zook had indicated, the matter at issue was one on which Unesco could appeal to those parts of the population to whom its ordinary programme made no appeal; it was also a basic concept fundamental to the work of the Organization. He agreed that Unesco could not achieve its purposes until human rights were recognized throughout the world. The Director-General and the Secretariat were continually searching for types of activity which would appeal to the mass of the people, and for a large and bold programme which might have a real impact on world affairs.

The Deputy Director-General considered the proposal in question a welcome addition to the programme already under consideration. It remained for the Commission to determine whether they would refer this matter for examination to the Executive Board in relation to the total Programme, or whether they would decide on it themselves. In any event, however, it was clear that if it was to be carried out at all, it must be done on a substantial basis and with adequate funds.

The Deputy Director-General therefore suggested that the proposals should be referred to the Budget Committee, so that the budgetary implications might be discovered at the earliest possible date. It was clear that the proposal would be among those items which would definitely carry costs above the ceiling tentatively set by the Commission at the outset of its deliberations, but he felt it was a project which should not be undertaken unless really adequate funds were available.

[12] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) emphasized the value of the proposals, which would help to strengthen contacts between Unesco and public opinion in a field of considerable social and political value. But he would like to go further than the United States delegate and speak of education in human rights in general. Certainly it was useful and interesting to teach about human rights, but that was an intellectual operation which did not transform the conscience of school-

children. It was necessary to go further and educate them methodically by means of active experience gained in school or out of school, through team-work, so that mutual understanding and tolerance might become a part of their daily lives.

[13] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) enthusiastically supported those proposals, which would be an inspiration to the Conference in that they restored to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights its true meaning, which should be the pivot of Unesco's main educational activities. But those rights implied obligations which could not be overlooked by the Executive Board. However, he was convinced that the additional expenditure would be justified by the results. Increases in the number of seminars and in cultural activities were well-advised proposals which should lead the members of the Commission to support the request for additional financial aid outside the budget.

[14] Dr. WALKER (Australia) thought the proposals amounted to a shift in the balance of the Organization, that was to say, a concentration on certain major projects, including the one under consideration. He personally was prepared to accept such a shift, but it would mean sacrificing other things, and delegates would have to decide, at the late stage the Conference had reached, whether to accept that shift and, if so, what items to sacrifice.

The proposals were of two types: programme resolutions and suggestions concerning working methods and the structure of the Secretariat. Questions concerning the sending of experts and field teams and the appointment of a co-ordinator were administrative points which should not figure in programme resolutions. The elaboration of a work plan was very important, and Dr. Walker was glad to see that the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations was present and would be able to give the Commission the probable reaction and comment of that organization to the suggested programme and to the ways in which it might or might not fit in with the information activities of the United Nations. It was exceedingly important that co-ordination should be maintained with the United Nations, with regard to both the programme and the working methods proposed.

[15] The Australian delegation did not believe that it would be possible to make any real progress in the dissemination of an understanding of the Declaration of Human Rights, unless it were done through the Member States and National Commissions. Unesco could agree on resolutions, but their implementation was necessarily a matter for the individual countries. Unless the national authorities in each Member State accepted the burden of that task, money would merely be spent without any positive results, since the presentation of the question depended entirely on local circumstances and conditions. It was a question on which the Australian delegation held very strong views, and their attitude to the budget vote would be affected by the way in which it was decided to carry out the proposals.

[16] Referring to the remarks made by Professor Piaget, Dr. Walker added that Unesco should prepare, through the normal channels of the Secretariat, a series of systematic recommendations to Member States concerning teaching about the Declaration of Human Rights. Those recommendations should include indications regarding the stage of school education at which such teaching would be profitable. It would be necessary to take into account political tensions, and the struggles and obstacles which stood in the way of the dissemination of the Declaration, and also to consider in what way schoolchildren should be informed of the reasons for the lack of unanimity in signing the Declaration. Such a series of recommendations could be presented to the 1951 Conference for its consideration, and might constitute the first pilot model for such a series, which did not yet exist in Unesco.

[17] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) considered the United States proposals raised three main issues: (1) the question of principle, (2) the concrete activities implied, and (3) the question of cost.

[18] On the first question, the United Kingdom delegation had no doubt that the matter was very important, and that the propagation and dissemination of the Declaration of Human Rights should be given great emphasis and was one of the most fruitful fields for Unesco's activities on behalf of peace and security.

[19] As to the concrete activities required, he submitted that it was hardly possible for the Commission to decide at that point what should be involved, but he thought it might be useful to consider it at the General Conference. In the first place, however, the question should be submitted to the Executive Board, or possibly to a sub-committee, such as the one mentioned at the afternoon meeting, whose task would be to discuss problems having a special bearing on peace.

[20] The third question was a matter for the Budget Committee. Mr. Thompson submitted

that the Programme and Budget Commission could take a decision only on the general principle of what steps should be taken.

[21] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) said that the attitude of his delegation was clear: the first draft of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had been worked out by the Cuban delegation. At the Third Session of the General Conference in Beirut, Dr. Chediak had seconded a similar proposal from the United States, on the grounds that it constituted a further step towards world peace. The Universal Declaration had been accepted by the majority of Member States. That was a considerable advance, but it was still necessary to make that fundamental text a vital force at the present time, when right-thinking people throughout the world were demanding ever more insistently respect for human freedoms. A new stage had been reached. Strenuous and unceasing efforts would be needed, which should not be confined to supplying information to the press but should result in definite measures that could be effectively applied. In that connexion, Dr. Chediak wished to submit an amendment to the American proposal. There were a large number of international organizations receiving financial help from Unesco, and it was only right that, in return, they should make an effective contribution to the task of inculcating Unesco's fundamental ideals in the masses.

Those were the reasons that had prompted the Cuban delegation to present a supplementary proposal to be included in the 1951 programme as new draft resolution 1.353:

The Director-General is instructed to collaborate with international governmental organizations, and particularly the Inter-American Academy of International Comparative Law, with a view to organizing, at their joint cost, a seminar for studying the mission of the United Nations and Unesco and, in particular, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This seminar would be attended by university students and by regional public officials responsible for maintaining contact with international institutions.

The Cuban delegation asked the Commission to refer the above proposal to the Executive Board for consideration, so that the Secretariat might put it into execution.

[22] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) also emphasized that the main objectives of education, science and culture could not be achieved unless the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were applied. He therefore proposed the following amendment to the third paragraph of the United States draft resolution [document 5C/56]:

The Director-General is authorized: to take steps for the establishment in universities and colleges of special Chairs for the study and explanation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, with a view to the incorporation of its principles in the legislation of those Member States that have not yet fully recognized them.

[23] Mr. KAYSER (France) realized the necessity and urgency of disseminating those principles, for that was the natural and normal task of Unesco, whose work programme included innumerable references to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The moment had come to inculcate that fundamental theme in the minds of all men, down to the very humblest, and Unesco should encourage the work of the National Commissions in that direction. He had moreover noted in France and in certain Central American Republics results that were extremely encouraging.

[24] With regard to the budgetary implications, it seemed useless to anticipate that the application of the American proposal would involve considerable expenditure. In fact, a fairly large number of resolutions that had been adopted in the chapter on Mass Communication opened the door to activities directly relating to that proposal. Mr. Kayser pointed out in particular that, among the measures to be taken in 1951, the budget for Mass Communication included an item [document 5C/5 (II), p. 243, paragraph XIV], providing a sum of $17,000, under Travel on Official Business, to enable Heads of Divisions and senior Programme Specialists to visit North and South America, India and South-East Asia, the Middle East, and as many as possible of the countries of Europe, to strengthen personal contacts with the National Commissions and with the heads of press, film and radio groups. That item would enable the proposals for the dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be implemented in all countries without any danger of upsetting the equilibrium of the budget by the establishment of new posts.

[25] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) expressed his appreciation for the United States proposals. He hoped that, as suggested by Professor Piaget, the dissemination of knowledge about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would take the form of active experience, and not be confined to mere theorizing. Progressive education on the question was necessary, but it should also be borne in mind that the issue was a practical one. There was a grave disparity throughout the world between the actual realities of life and the principles contained in the Declaration. His United States colleagues lived in a highly developed society in which it was easy to practise what they preached; but there were other corners of the world where

certain rights were not accepted, or at least not applied, and where practice was so much at variance with the Declaration, that the latter could not be disseminated in a simple and direct manner. It therefore had to be adapted to each particular situation, and at the same time be progressively applied. Dr. Jamali therefore entirely supported Dr. Walker's suggestion that the National Commissions should be invited to co-operate with Unesco in this field.

[26] There was also the practical difficulty of whether instruction about the Declaration of Human Rights should be given separately or as an integral part of civics. The Iraqi delegation believed that it should be given side by side with teaching about the United Nations and the United Nations Charter. They did not believe that special field-workers were necessary, since any specialist in civics or sociology could include teaching on the subject in the course of his normal work. Unesco would not, therefore, require any additional experts.

With regard to timing, Dr. Jamali felt that the proposal had definitely come too late in the Conference; but if it were really considered to be of prime urgency, his delegation would always be willing to give time to a revaluation of the Commission's previous decisions, to give priority to those which were of fundamental importance to world peace and to Unesco's objectives.

[27] Dr. PLAZA (Venezuela) also supported the proposal, as it concerned one of Unesco's essential aims: the maintenance of peace. It was in the minds of men that peace had its root. The basic programme had frequently been criticized as being too dispersed. The proposal under discussion provided an opportunity of concentrating Unesco's efforts on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was necessary to make an immediate choice of those main points in the American proposal which could be usefully examined without delay, and particularly those concerning the inclusion in school curricula of teaching about the Declaration.

[28] Mr. DURÁN (United Nations) recalled what had already been said in plenary meeting at the beginning of the Conference, of the importance attached by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to Unesco's activities in that direction. He was certain the Secretary-General would be most gratified at the unanimous and enthusiastic response given by the Commission to the United States proposal.

[29] Replying to the fears expressed by Dr. Walker concerning possible overlapping of Unesco's activities with those of the United Nations, Mr. Durán said there had been none in the past, and he saw no reason for any in the future. The functions of the United Nations Department of Information were purely informatory. Besides, close and constant co-operation was maintained between Unesco and the United Nations at the planning level, and would no doubt continue. Any programme prepared by the Executive Board in co-operation with the Secretariat would be examined by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and would be the subject of constant consultation, so that no duplication would arise.

[30] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the support given to their proposal by so many members of the Commission. In spite of the reference made by Dr. Jamali to the high development of the United States, much still remained to be done there in the field under consideration.

He entirely agreed with those delegates who had emphasized the need for co-operation with the National Commissions. Such co-operation was of basic importance to the whole project, and the latter part of the resolution provided for it. The proposal was, in fact, conceived in two parts: (1) amendments to existing resolutions, and (2) the new resolution itself, which included various provisions. Points of detail had purposely been omitted because it seemed to the United States delegation that the Director-General should have ample opportunity to plan them himself. Suggestions had merely been made regarding the types of activities which could be undertaken by Unesco.

[31] The CHAIRMAN noted that the Commission did not intend to take an immediate vote on the United States proposals. He therefore, at the suggestion of Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom), proposed the establishment of a small sub-committee consisting of representatives of the United States of America, United Kingdom, France, Cuba, Australia, Iraq and Switzerland. The sub-committee could meet the following day under the chairmanship of the Swiss representative. It would be responsible for the final drafting of the resolutions that had been submitted and for estimating the expenditure entailed by their execution. Those proposals would be submitted to the Budget Committee and would be referred back to the Commission for final decision.

That proposal was *adopted*.

[32] The Commission *took note* of the Report on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [document 5C/PRG/13).

Regulations concerning Economic and Social Rights in the International Covenant on Human Rights [document 5C/PRG/17].

[33] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) emphasized the importance attached by his delegation to the preparation of texts that could be applied immediately and practically. The Belgian delegation therefore presented a draft resolution which could be carried out through Unesco's normal working contacts without any further budgetary implications.

[34] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) seconded the draft resolution. He congratulated the Secretariat on the remarkable quality of the document which it had submitted to the Commission, and pointed out that in the task of embodying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in legislative texts and conventions, serious difficulties would be encountered on certain points. It would be necessary to work out a new method, and Unesco should continue to study the matter in close contact with the United Nations.

The Belgian proposal was also seconded by the delegates of NETHERLANDS, CUBA, UNITED KINGDOM and LIBERIA

[35] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom) asked whether the Commission was to decide immediately between the three possible solutions set out in document 5C/PRG/17. If not, why had the recommendations been included? If the Commission was to decide, however, the United Kingdom delegation wished to support recommendation *(b)* on page 53 of that document and to oppose *(a)* and *(c)*.

[36] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that in the previous April, the Commission on Human Rights had considered the drafting of a Covenant on Human Rights which was to have been presented to the Economic and Social Council at its session in July and transmitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations in September. As it had proved impossible to study the various questions involved in such a document, it was decided to concentrate work for the present on the provisions concerning individual freedoms. The questions relating to economic and social rights were thus reserved for further study to be undertaken in 1951. The resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights had therefore not provided any time-limit for the drafting of provisions for insertion in conventions concerning the latter category of rights, which were particularly delicate and had been recognized more recently in the international sphere.

[37] Moreover, the Commission on Human Rights had not indicated the procedure to be followed. Mr. Saba therefore warmly welcomed the Belgian draft resolution, which would enable Unesco to come to an agreement with the United Nations on which provisions should be worked out immediately and which could be left to a later stage.

[38] In answer to Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom), Mr. SABA added that the Commission on Human Rights seemed to have given no precise directives regarding the fields which were to be covered by special conventions setting forth the ways and means to be adopted.

The Belgian draft resolution was *adopted*.[1]

The meeting rose at 0.10 a.m.

1 In final form: Resol. 9.22.

TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Report on past and present activities and on the policy to be followed as regards publications [document 5C/PRG/15].

[1] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) recalled that the General Conference, at its Third Session, had emphasized the importance of the publications problem. The complex field of printed publications was one in which big sums could be most rapidly swallowed up. It was easy, in reading document 5C/PRG/15, to realize the cost of publications and to notice that some of those produced by Unesco in the last few years had not been as useful as had at first been hoped. The number of

unsold copies bore witness to a certain wastage. Mr. Cowell believed that a serious problem had to be faced: that of the sale of publications. Hitherto, many documents published by Unesco had been distributed free; very few had been for sale. That was probably inevitable in the first stages of every organization, since only by such free distribution could it make itself known. The United Kingdom delegate believed, however, that the problem needed to be studied and that the first point to be considered was the quality of publications. Tangible results could not be attained simply by authorizing the printing of a document. A publication would only serve its purpose if it supplied some demand on the part of the public.

The Secretariat had already made a great effort in that direction. A special Committee had been set up to assist the Director-General in defining a publications policy. Moreover, Mr. Delavenay had recently been appointed Head of the Documents and Publications Service. The British delegation considered that a most fortunate choice and congratulated the Director-General upon it. Mr. Delavenay was well known in British official circles, with which he had been in contact particularly during the war. He could not fail to do excellent work. In all large-scale organizations the question of publications was of primary importance. Rationalization of the department at different stages of production could save a lot of money. It was a big and difficult task and the speaker believed that if anyone could do it, it would be Mr. Delavenay. The British delegation would welcome any attempts by the Director-General to improve the Publications Service. The delegation proposed that a report on publications policy should be submitted to the Sixth or Seventh Session of the General Conference.

[2] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) thanked the United Kingdom delegate for his kind words.

An organization like Unesco could not avoid the free distribution of publications, at least for a certain class of documents. It had been found that a clear line had to be drawn between propaganda publications and those which, intended for a wider public, provided the kind of interest which enabled them to be put on sale. The problem was complex, because it was difficult to satisfy the needs of the whole world with the small issues with which Unesco had so far been content.

Mr. Delavenay thought the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation most acceptable; he was ready to submit a report on publications at each General Conference.

[3] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) read out a resolution adopted by the working party on Mass Communication (United States National Commission):

That Unesco take note of the fact that many of its publications are produced without apparent definite purpose or any plan for effective distribution in Member States. . . that it clarify its publications programme, making plans for distribution prior to production, notifying Member States of each publication and the number of copies available to those States. . . that it make available to Member States in the near future a recapitulation of publications to date, with information on stocks on hand, and that it issue quarterly reports on publications in the future.

That Unesco make an effort to establish a system for more comprehensive reproduction, promotion and distribution of Unesco publication in the United States. . . and that it review consideration of the recommendation made a year ago for the establishment of a guarantee fund to make possible the production of publications which otherwise will not get wide distribution.

Dr. ZOOK considered that a few publications of general interest, such as those on Human Rights or on the way of life in different countries should receive wider circulation. He emphasized that Unesco would be judged by the quality of its publications and suggested that at a future session a sub-committee should be set up to study the question closely.

[4] The CHAIRMAN read out a draft resolution proposed by the United Kingdom delegation:

The General Conference, after considering the report submitted by the Director-General [document 5C/PRG/15] at its Fifth Session on past and present activities and publications policy, requests the Director-General to submit to the Sixth Session of the General Conference a concise report on the activity and general policy of the Organization in regard to publications during the previous twelve months.

The resolution was *adopted*.[1]

Programme for 1951 (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part II].

6. Mass Communication (*continued*).

ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO (*continued*).

Item 6.35.

[5] The CHAIRMAN read out the following amendment which the Indian delegation proposed should be added to item 6.35:[2] "and, on request

1. In final form: Resol. 9.6.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.381 and 6.382.

from Member States, to supply whenever possible radio material to meet their special requirements".

The draft amendment, seconded by the delegate of PAKISTAN, was *adopted.*

Project of developing a Friendship Flag among the children of the world, presented by the Philippine delegation [document 5C/74].

[6] Presenting his delegation's draft resolution, Mr. FLORES (Philippines) recalled that in the last paragraph of its comments [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., page 88], the Executive Board had expressed the hope that the General Conference would examine any project which might further the work of the United Nations mission of peace. Moreover, Unesco's Constitution enjoined upon the Organization to contribute to the peace and security of the world. It was in that spirit that the Philippine delegation submitted its draft resolution, which aimed at creating a "Friendship Flag" and a "Friendship Stamp". The Budget Committee had calculated the cost of the proposal at $8,700. Mr. Flores thought that that figure might be reduced without jeopardizing the success of the project, and that in any case the object in view was of greater importance than the expense. It was the children of today who would later be the judges of Unesco's work; every means must be used to teach them to build a world community. Mr. Flores moved the adoption of the draft resolution in document 5C/74 as item 1.363 of the 1951 Pogramme.

The proposal was seconded by the delegates of PAKISTAN, VENEZUELA, URUGUAY, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, ECUADOR and MEXICO.

[7] The CHAIRMAN considered that the question should first be submitted to the Chairman of the Executive Board, who was unable to attend the current meeting.

[8] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) recalled that Unesco had emphasized the necessity of teaching children about the United Nations and the specialized Agencies. But such teaching could succeed only if it implied active participation on the part of the child. The Philippine proposal was calculated to make children understand that they were themselves a part of the United Nations Organization and that the future of that Organization depended upon them to that extent. The Afghan delegation therefore supported the Philippine perposal.

[9] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) entirely recognized the value of displays with a symbolic meaning, especially for young people. At the same time, his delegation could not support the proposed resolution, as they believed that the suggested flag might lead to useless duplication with that of the United Nations and create a certain confusion.

With regard to the issue of a stamp there were certain administrative difficulties, at least in the United Kingdom, where the issue of stamps was very stictly controlled.

The British delegation, whilst admitting that Unesco should leave nothing undone to encourage friendship between children of different nations, considered that the Organization's programme already provided for a certain number of activities which should achieve excellent results in that sphere.

[10] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) agreed with Anas Khan: children should be given some real contact with the United Nations Organization. On the other hand, he considered that the programme on education for international understanding already included a number of activities likely to achieve the results aimed at, and that Unesco should not dissipate its efforts. He wondered whether the Conference could not suggest that the Secretariat should include some such project in the programme to be submitted at the next session.

[11] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) fully concurred in the opinion expressed by Mr. Cowell.

[12] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that the Secretariat would warmly welcome any project likely to catch the imagination of children as well as adults; but it could not for the moment undertake the action suggested by the Philippine delegation. Experience proved that certain attempts, such as competitions, after involving considerable expense, had not produced the hoped-for results. The project submitted to the Commission involved some expense and extra work for the Secretariat. It was for the Commission to decide whether such an effort would be justified in the present circumstances.

[13] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Commission had not been able to obtain the opinion of the Chairman of the Executive Board on the matter, but already knew his reactions in similar cases. He felt that such a project should at all events have the approval of the Budget Committee.

[14] Mr. FLORES (Philippines) thanked Mr. Cowell for emphasizing the difficulties which would be encountered if the project were carried out. He made it clear that his own delegation did not wish to encourage Unesco to compete with the United Nations by creating a rival flag of its own. So far as practical difficulties were concerned,

means of smoothing them out could perhaps be found; in any case they should not be allowed to bar the project completely. It had to be remembered that the children of today would become the leaders of tomorrow; projects planned for their benefit in the field of education were certainly excellent; but that advocated by the Philippine delegation would carry immense weight.

[15] Mr. JAUME (France) was of the opinion that the Philippine project might quite possibly be no burden on the budget, and he thought that it should be examined in the same spirit of idealism that had prompted its conception. He added that a similar effort on the part of the French Ministry of Education had given excellent results at no expense.

[16] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting should vote on the draft resolution, subject to its re-examination, should the Chairman of the Executive Board consider it necessary.

With that proviso, the draft resolution in document 5C/74 was *adopted* by 18 votes ot 10.[1]

Statement of Methods (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., page 80].

Items 13 and 14.

[17] The CHAIRMAN recalled that items 13 and 14 in the Statement of Methods had been postponed until the Official and External Relations Commission had considered document 5C/OXR/16.

[18] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) pointed out that in paragraph (*a*) of item 14, "Article III" should be read: "Article IV". He moved the adoption of the two items.

Item 13 and 14 of the Statement of Methods were *adopted*.[2]

Draft resolution on the presentation of the annual programme and budget of the Organization [document 5C/12].

[19] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) stated that the draft resolution of his delegation aimed at giving a practical survey of the work of the Organization. The question had already been discussed and had met with certain difficulties. It was a problem which affected both the Executive Board and the National Commissions, in view of the difficulty of finding the budget entries corresponding to the programme resolutions. The United Kingdom delegation did not ask that the exact cost of each item on the programme should be given, but simply for an indication of the approximate cost of the items under discussion at any given time. His delegation was ready, if necessary, to make concessions to achieve that aim. The point at issue was to enable the Executive Board, the General Conference, the National Commissions and the public to have an idea of what the Organization intended to do, and of the expense entailed in its activities.

[20] The CHAIRMAN wondered whether, as the question was rather delicate, Mr. Cowell would not prefer to have the document sent to the Budget Committee and the Administrative Commission.

[21] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) emphasized that he was only asking the Director-General and the Executive Board to consider the programme in the form in which his delegation wished to see it submitted.

The United Kingdom proposal [document 5C/12] seconded by the delegate of the UNION of SOUTH AFRICA, was *adopted*.[1]

Draft resolution on the forming of a civil conscience for the defence of freedom and peace [document 5C/69].

[22] Mr. FOSSI (Italy) explained reasons which had led the Italian delegation to submit the draft resolution. Looking at Unesco generally, one could allot to it two main objectives: the first, that of increasing and spreading culture and scientific knowledge and at the same time striving to protect the heritage of art and culture in each civilization; the second, that of providing information and education for the masses with a view to developing a civic conscience fitted to defend freedom and peace. It was the second aim which was the subject of the Italian proposal.

Mr. Fossi asked that, above all, the principles and system of rules for forming a civic and democratic conscience should be formulated in a brief code, approved by the Member States of Unesco. Such a code was indispensable in order to define the true spirit of Unesco in that matter. It would be of great assistance because it would have been approved by the Member States after careful drafting. It could remove certain objections and difficulties which might arise for various reasons. The Italian delegation believed such a code would not be very difficult to draft, since the Members had acceded to Unesco's Constitution whose general tone was inspired by the principle

1. In final form: Resol. 9.7.
2. In final form: Section II, Eighth Part, items 13 and 14.

1. In final form: Resol. 9.93 to 9.932.

of the defence of freedom. That principle formed the very basis of the Organization.

[23] Further, the draft resolution aimed at entrusting to the Director-General, assisted by the Heads of the different Departments, responsibility for the code of mass education and, if necessary, the co-ordination of a programme of action. The Director-General would be responsible to the Executive Board and to the Member States. If such action were to be really successful, it had certainly to be guided and organized by some executive authority located at the Organization's headquarters.

The need for more effective action on the part of the central Organization had appeared from the proposal made by the United States of America [in document 5C/97], and even in the Director-General's reply to that proposal. It was with that in mind that the Italian delegation submitted its own draft resolution asking merely that it should be supported by the Commission as a suggestion to be studied by the Secretariat and the Executive Board.

[24] Mr. JAUME (France) seconded the Italian proposal, but said that it would be necessary to make certain amendments to the French text; he therefore suggested that it be entrusted to the Drafting Committee.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the same be done for the English version.

[25] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wanted certain details explained. He recalled that the Executive Board and the General Conference had worked very hard to create the code asked for by the Italian delegation. He did not see how the rules suggested in its draft resolution could fit in with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The proposal was of such a general character as to overlap with the activities of the Human Rights Commission.

[26] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) observed that the problem raised by the Italian amendment was indeed important. The Commission should reflect before taking a decision. Unesco possessed four basic documents: (1) the Constitution, with a Preamble setting out the aims of Unesco, the reasons for its establishment and the principles which were to govern its activities; (2) the Basic Programme, listing all Unesco's main activities; (3) the Annual Programme, which each year gave details of the parts of the Basic Programme under discussion; (4) the Statement of Methods, which determined how Unesco's work should be done.

[27] M. Cowell had recalled the existence of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations, to which Unesco had adhered enthusiastically, and which furnished the basis of that civic conscience referred to in the Italian proposal.

[28] Did the Italian delegation think that Unesco should draft a document which could merely take the place of earlier documents and might even cause confusion? If "a code of principles and methodical and well-defined rules" could be precisely set out, would there not be some danger of transmuting Unesco's ideas into a kind of philosophy, whereas Unesco had been careful not to encroach on territory other than its own? In the circumstances, however interesting his proposal, would Mr. Fossi not agree that the essentials of his idea were already contained in the documents produced by Unesco?

[29] Mr. FOSSI (Italy) pointed out that "principles and methodical rules" proposed meant more detailed statements of what followed from the Declaration of Human Rights. It was natural that Human Rights should remain the basis of Unesco's standpoint. The Italian delegation asked for a code of more detailed principles which would allow the formation of a democratic conscience. It also attached great importance to the second part of the proposal, which wanted more power put in the hands of the Director-General for carrying out and co-ordinating this work. At the same time it hoped that, after rewording by the Drafting Committee, this proposal would still remain a subject for study by the Director-General and the Executive Board.

[30] At the CHAIRMAN'S request, Mr. FOSSI (Italy) agreed that his proposal be forwarded to the Executive Board and the Director-General for their perusal.

[31] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) said that, bearing in mind the explanations given by Mr. Thomas, his delegation considered that Unesco should ensure that Member States were in agreement as to the practical outcome of the proposal. In view of existing differences of opinion, his delegation thought that it was not for Unesco to formulate a brand of philosophy which could bind States outside the terms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He recalled that Unesco had done excellent work in publishing a document on Human Rights, for it had set the various philosophies side by side, leaving the reader free to judge for himself.

The Italian proposal [document 5C/69] was *rejected* by 10 votes to 7.

Draft resolution on the selection of central Unesco themes [document 5C/28].

[32] Mr. DÉSY (Canada) stated that the matter was one of co-ordination for a well-defined purpose along the lines of the discussion which had taken place the previous evening on the subject of concentration of effort. For the public to understand Unesco's work its Programme must be simplified.

[33] Mr. DÉSY added that such a pragmatical attitude was doubtless best. If the Organization was to opt for a particular service, it would do well to confine itself to the Exchange of Persons Service, and if it seemed better to stop at one project, it should limit itself to fighting illiteracy throughout the world. Those themes were given by way of example. They need not be the most important. It was enough that each in its right time and place had a recognized value.

[34] Various organs or various projects of Unesco would be spotlighted in that way and made to stand out to the uninformed public. For that reason paragraph (*b*) (page 1) of the Canadian draft resolution provided for "one or more major themes or services" and each section would collaborate in carrying out that programme.

[35] If the proposal were adopted, the measures it recommended would help to make Unesco more effective and to raise its prestige among the masses of the people. It was essential to pick out from nebulous programmes a few highlights to interest the public and give Unesco's work an appeal for them.

The Canadian proposal was seconded by the delegates of URUGUAY, BRAZIL and VENEZUELA.

[36] The CHAIRMAN thought no decision could be taken on this document before hearing the Chairman of the Executive Board and the Director-General. He therefore proposed to postpone the discussion until the next meeting.

It was *decided* accordingly.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

THIRTIETH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 9 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. C. E. BEEBY (New Zealand)

Draft Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials [documents 5C/PRG/11 and 5C/PRG/20].

[1] Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland), Rapporteur of the special Sub-Committee, recalled the words of Heine when, after a tiresome encounter with the Customs officials, he exclaimed: "Thoughts are duty-free!" Once thoughts were expressed in books or printed documents of any kind, however, they came up against not only Customs regulations, which were a minor difficulty, but also endless administrative and budgetary complications. Educational, scientific and cultural documents were the chief instruments of Unesco's work for the advancement of tolerance and truth. How could it carry out that work if it met with intolerable obstacles at every frontier?

[2] That was why, at Beirut, the General Conference had instructed Unesco to prepare the necessary agreements for arranging for the free circulation of such material. The Conference held at Geneva the previous March had prepared a text which, though not ideal, represented the greatest measure of freedom that could be aimed at in present conditions. It was obvious that, from the cultural point of view, complete freedom would have been desirable, and that books could not be considered as merchandise. The Sub-Committee considered that the cultural nature of books should be all the more emphasized as, commercially, they represented no more than 1 per cent or 2 per cent of the total volume of trade. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that certain material considerations militated against the complete acceptance of that essential character of books. In any case, it did not seem that the Draft Agreement prepared by the Geneva conference (which was attended mostly by customs and finance experts) could give

rise to serious objections in the 25 countries which had attended the Conference. The amendments submitted to the Sub-Committee set up by the Programme and Budget Commission related to details of form and sprang from a desire to bring out yet more clearly the fundamental idea on which such an Agreement should be based.

[3] Some countries might think that the Draft Agreement in its final form was too limited in scope; but it was obvious that an international agreement could only be achieved at the cost of various sacrifices. Exemption from import duties had been proposed exclusively for cultural objects imported for non-profit-making purposes. On that point the French representative had raised the question of possible dumping. It was obvious that such an Agreement could not justify dishonest practices of that kind. The Canadian, Mexican and Swiss delegations had thought that the provisions of the Agreement might have been more liberal, and that no restriction (customs, administrative of currency) should hinder the free movement of books, manuscripts and documents of an educational and scientific nature. The Sub-Committee's view was that the results achieved were the best that could be expected.

[4] The only important addition it had made to the draft agreement in document 5C/PRG/11 had been a Protocol, which provided that the United States of America would have the option of ratifying the Agreement or of accepting it with the inclusion of a reservation, which formed part of the Protocol.

The Sub-Committee had agreed to add the following clause to the end of paragraph 2 of the Protocol [document 5C/PRG/20, page 7]:

. . . provided that no measure taken in virtue of this reservation shall be of a discriminative nature.

[5] In its present form, the draft agreement represented the first step towards a better future, when the circulation of cultural materials would be completely free. Mr. Bourgeois proposed its adoption.

[6] Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) raised the problem of granting foreign exchange for the importation of certain articles listed under Article II of the Agreement, and suggested that the words "when convenient" be included in paragraph 1 after "The Contracting States undertake".

Further, he suggested that sub-paragraph (*a*) of the same Article should read:

Books, publications and documents specified in Annex A of this Agreement, in so far as they are being sent to Contracting States.

He also suggested that a difference should be made in the treatment accorded to the importation of works of art and collectors' pieces, such as those listed in Annex B, according to whether they were being sent to private individuals or whether they were being acquired by public bodies such as museums etc. He therefore suggested including in the title of Annex B the phrase:

. . . addressed to museums, galleries and other public or private non-lucrative institutions, provided they are authorized by the competent auhorities.

[7] Mr. ASHFORD (United Kingdom) said his delegation whole-heartedly approved the Draft Agreement presented by the Sub-Committee. It was a striking agreement entirely in accordance with Unesco's aims and objectives, whose acceptance would be a great step forward. He wished to underline that the drafting of the Agreement was a matter of great complexity, and, as already pointed out by the Rapporteur, represented a compromise between different shades of opinion. Any substantial changes would lead to considerable difficulties, and Mr. Ashford therefore urged acceptance of the Draft Agreement in its existing form.

[8] Professor NAPOLITANO (Italy) gave his full support to the Agreement, whose provisions were necessary to the improvement of cultural relations. But he drew attention to a possible danger for States whose economic situation was particularly unstable: in virtue of that Agreement, they might run the risk of having their markets flooded by huge imports of documents printed in their own language and sold at prices lower than those for which they could be sold if printed in the country. For instance, although it was proper for the Ticino to send books printed in Italian to Italy, it would be unfair for a non-Italian-speaking country to dump on the Italian market books printed in Italian at prices likely to ruin the national industry. However, the Draft Agreement contained guarantees against such a danger. The Italian delegation, fully realizing its educational value, therefore approved it.

[9] Mr. TAYLOR (United States of America) said the position of his delegation was the historic position of the United States, which had always been opposed to obstacles to the free flow of information. The United States Government had followed developments in preparing the Agreement with the greatest interest from its inception. The Government thought it was good, and would like to see it adopted.

The modifications proposed by the Rapporteur to the actual text made it possible for the United States Government to withdraw the reservation mentioned in Section III.1 of document 5C/

PRG/20, and to support the report as it stood. He hoped that would enable other delegations to give the report their full support, so that it could be adopted as a whole.

[10] Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) said his Government's position was well known. They had, from the beginning, favoured the maximum freedom in the flow of material of an educational, scientific and cultural nature; but they were unfortunately compelled to include a reservation regarding the application of the foreign exchange clause, which might invalidate or reduce the potential usefulness of the Agreement. They believed that, in such a field, the clause might have been abandoned, since the impact on the economy of any State of importing such material free of control was bound to be so small as to be insignificant.

His delegation therefore regretfully registered their formal opposition to the Agreement. The Canadian Government had already taken steps to remove restrictions on the importation of visual and auditory materials. The Agreement in that case was of the type which did the greatest credit to Unesco, and unless a similar agreement could be reached in the instance under consideration, his delegation could not accept it.

[11] Mr. STEWART (Union of South Africa) said his Government generally favoured and supported any reduction of restrictions to the free flow of material of an educational, scientific and cultural nature, and the tariffs at present in application in the Union were generally in conformity with that principle. Nevertheless, his Government had not yet had time to assess some of the more detailed implications of the Agreement, which would require new legislation and modifications of the existing tariff. Owing to the South African parliamentary system, the necessary action could not be taken until the following year, and in the meantime a detailed study would be undertaken of the impact of such an agreement on the Union's economy. Until such time, his delegation was unable to commit itself unreservedly to the Agreement.

Finally, Mr. Stewart asked the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee what had led it to adopt the Protocol instead of the escape clause proposed by the United States delegation in Amendment I to document 5C/PRG/11.

[12] Mr. BOURGEOIS (Switzerland), Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee, replied that, as the United States was the only country that had asked for an escape clause, the Sub-Committee had placed it discreetly in the Protocol instead of including it in the body of the Agreement, particularly as it was unlikely that the United States would ever have to invoke the clause.

Speaking as the delegate of Switzerland, he admitted that some clauses in the Agreement ran counter to the customs legislation of certain countries, and particularly of his own. For instance, at first glance it was not clear how the enrichment of a private collection could increase the cultural heritage of a country. But it had been pointed out that the free admission of works of art for private collections constituted an enrichment of the patrimony of the country in question and that, after a certain time, a large number of those collections were incorporated in the national museums. The Swiss delegation, mindful of the sacrifice that would have to be made by every country for the conclusion of an international agreement, had therefore refrained from making reservations on that point.

In that connexion, Mr. Bourgeois wished to draw attention to the fourth recommendation of the Sub-Committee [document 5C/PRG/20, page 10]. It was in that generous spirit that the text should be interpreted. Once countries were convinced that a task carried out in common could contribute to the cause of peace, it was inadmissible that any State that was in a position to make sacrifices should refuse to do so because its neighbour was unable to do likewise. Those were the principles on which the acceptance of the Swiss delegation had been based.

[13] Mr. SEMINI (France) associated himself with the Swiss delegate's remarks. The French delegation had also considered that, in any action that might advance the cause of peace, national considerations should be relegated to the background. The text that emerged from all those concessions might be considered inadequate or imperfect, but it represented a compromise whose psychological influence should be such that that consideration should take precedence over all others. The French delegation therefore supported the Agrement.

[14] Dr. HASAN (Pakistan) regretted that, in spite of his Government's great sympathy with the aims underlying the Agreement, they could accept it only with reservations for the time being, owing to difficulties similar to those mentioned by previous speakers.

[15] Similar statements were made by the delegates of NORWAY, IRAQ and AUSTRIA.

Mr. FLETCHER (Australia) thought the statements of reservation made by several of his colleagues were unnecessary, since the Commission was only being asked for the present to recommend that the text of the Agreement be submitted to Member States for signature. Thus Member Governments would still have two stages—those of signature and later of ratification—during which

they could continue their studies of the proposal. His delegation would fully support the Agreement.

[16] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) supported Mr. Fletcher's remarks. The working out of the project obviously required considerable sacrifices. The Belgian delegation, faithful to the ideal of co-operation, had willingly consented to them. It did not consider the Agreement as final but simply as a first draft which could be considerably improved. On that understanding the Belgian delegation approved it.

[17] The draft resolution submitted by the Sub-Committee [document 5C/PRG/20, pages 9 and 10] was *adopted* by 19 votes, with 9 abstentions.[1]

Consequently, items 6.21 and 6.22 (Reduction of Obstacles to the Free Flow of Information) (document 5C/5 (I) (Rev.), Part II], which had been held over, were *adopted*.[2]

Proposals for the recommendation to Member States of measures to eliminate obstacles to the free movement from country to country of persons and educational, scientific and cultural material [document 5/PRG/10].

[18] Recommendations 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 had already been adopted; recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 were *adopted*.

[19] Replying to a question from Mr. PEARSON (United States of America), Mr. BEHRSTOCK (Department of Mass Communication) said the Agreement to Facilitate the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character had been signed by 17 countries and ratified by one, namely Norway. The certificate to be used for attesting the educational character of films had been adopted and forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for circulation to Member States.

[20] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) drew attention to document 5C/79, submitted by the delegation of Colombia, which gave gratifying proof of the value of the method of recommendations to Member States, showing the steps already taken by the Government of Colombia to implement such recommendations. The result achieved was very encouraging, and he was glad to be able to pay tribute to it at the meeting.

Draft resolution submitted by the Canadian delegation on the selection of central Unesco themes (*continued*) [document 5C/28].

[21] In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN concerning document 5C/28, Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) admitted that the proposal submitted by his delegation raised complex problems. He therefore did not press for the immediate discussion of that document but, as it had been transmitted to the Executive Board and the Director-General, he asked that they should both consider the matter and report thereon to the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Canadian delegation for its co-operative attitude.

Draft resolution presented by the Sub-Committee of the Programme and Budget Commission on the Dissemination of the Declaration of Human Rights [document 5C/117].

[22] Mr. THOMPSON (United Kingdom), Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee, recalled that the original United States proposal had been in very general terms, and that the Commission had been given no specific proposals in writing. Nevertheless, the general approval given to the proposal for an extension of the Programme for the purpose under discussion had been taken into account by the Sub-Committee.

[23] There were certain points about the draft to which he wished to draw special attention.

(1) The resolutions had been put in the form of a special project outside the normal Programme of Unesco. That had been done because it was necessary to give special emphasis to the work which Unesco was doing on Human Rights; because projects in that field straddled several different departments of the Secretariat, so that it was not desirable to include them in the Programme resolutions relating to any one department; and because of the United States proposal that the Director-General should be enabled to seek additional funds outside the Budget. The Sub-Committee had therefore adopted as a model the section of the Programme relating to Germany.

(2) The Sub-Committee had thought that the resolution should take the form of a definite project of costed activities which would draw together both activities already in progress in Unesco and approved by the Commission, and also certain new activities. Consequently, if the draft resolution were approved, the Commission would have to go back over certain parts of the Programme it had already approved, and take out, in

1. In final form: Resol. 9.4 to 9.44.
2. In final form: Resol. 6.22 to 6.222.

particular, items 1.352 and 6.31. Similarly the Budget appropriations for those two items would have to be included in the new project.

(3) The Sub-Committee had considered the budgetary implications of the new proposals, but found them very difficult to determine. It had before it the United States rough estimate, giving the figure of $70,000, which would leave some $40,000 to $50,000 to be found in addition to those already voted. However, that matter would have to be decided by the Budget Committee.

(4) The resolutions had been so drafted as to enable the Director-General to take on more work over and above that already provided for, should he be able to obtain supplementary funds from a source outside the Budget.

[24] Dr. JAWAD (Iraq) thought the importance of the proposals was self-evident, and moved the acceptance of the report as a whole.

[25] Professor MARINELLI (Austria) asked whether the wording of Section II (*a*) implied that the Director-General was authorized to print and distribute the kind of document in question in languages other than the working languages of Unesco. If that were the case, it might be specifically mentioned. If not, however, he wished to point out that his Government had frequently received material in the form of posters etc. which had proved valueless, because the mass of the population it was intended to reach had no knowledge of the working languages of Unesco.

[26] After a short discussion with the RAPPORTEUR of the Sub-Committee and the CHAIRMAN, Professor MARINELLLI agreed to content himself with having brought the matter to the notice of the Director-General and of the Executive Board.

[27] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) thought that the Commission should refrain from a detailed discussion of the measures to be taken, since the relevant action was within the competence of the National Commissions. The Swiss National Commission had already translated into German the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which it was disseminating in conjunction with the Secretariat.

[28] M. TREMBLAY (Canada) noted that in Section III (Education) the Director-General was authorized "to prepare, after consultation with experts, systematic recommendations to Member States, concerning the curricula in primary and secondary schools and universities". He did not see the need for the term "systematic". Moreover, it was obvious that the curricula used in different States were extremely diverse. In order to avoid ambiguity, he suggested the following text:

To prepare, after consultation with experts and Member States, recommendations concerning the curricula in primary and secondary schools and universities.

Mr. THOMPSON (Rapporteur) and Mgr. HOCHWALT (United States of America) accepted that amendment.

[29] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) regretted that, since he had not heard the previous evening's discussion of the project, the draft resolution still seemed to him rather vague and indeterminate. He wondered what were the implications in man-hours for the Secretariat, in addition to the purely budgetary implications.

The activities described under Section II (*a*) had surely been exploited to the full already, although possibly not in sufficient languages. He had been given to understand that the United Nations Association had specialized in that type of work, and he himself had seen posters in various parts of the world giving the text of the Declaration. He did not see what more could be done by the use of posters, and he wanted to known what sort of posters the Secretariat had in mind and how they should be used. Had the Department of Mass Communication the technique involved at their fingers' ends, and was it all sufficiently worked out?

As for Section III, he wanted to know the exact meaning of "to promote educational methods". Was a new technique in teaching involved, and did it require new methods or only a new curriculum? He also wanted more information about the meaning of the terms used in the second paragraph of that section.

[30] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland), Chairman of the Sub-Committee, pointed out that the current meeting was not a suitable time for the consideration of educational techniques. The question of Human Rights raised the whole problem of international education. Special mention was made of the Declaration in school curricula because of its great value in awakening the conscience of schoolchildren. But that mention in no way implied new methods or any fundamental change in curricula.

[31] Mgr. HOCHWALT (United States of America) expressed his delegations gratitude to the members of the Sub-Committee, in particular, to Professor Piaget, the Chairman, and Mr. Thompson, Rapporteur.

He regretted that Dr. Beaglehole had not been present at the previous evening's discussions, when the details of the project had been discussed, as it seemed, to the satisfaction of most of those present.

As to the basic value of such a resolution, he suggested that it was one of the Unesco-wide

projects which the Director-General should be encouraged to develop over and above the normal work of the Secretariat and in co-operation with all the Departments of Unesco. It offered a magnificent opportunity to make a large-scale contribution to world peace and security. He suggested that the resolution should be discussed and voted as a whole.

[32] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) pointed out that, owing to a typographical error, the words "and recordings" had been omitted from the first paragraph of the authorizations to the Director-General under Section IV, which should read:

To supply, to the greatest extent possible, articles, radio scripts *and recordings*, discussion material and exhibits.

[33] Replying to the points made by Dr. Beaglehole, Mr. Schneider added that the project had already been studied by the Secretariat, that exhibitions had been prepared, and that a member of the staff was now engaged in studying the activities. The Secretariat was aware of posters distributed by or on behalf of the United Nations, and of other material, such as children's copybooks, with the Universal Declaration printed on the covers, which had been issued by a firm in Belgium and brought to the notice of the Secretariat by Professor Verniers.

The document as a whole was *adopted* by 23 votes to none.[1]

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 9.2 to 9.2173.

THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Friday, 16 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France)

Unesco's contribution to peace (*continued*).

[1] The Czechoslovak draft resolution [document 5C/17] was not seconded and could therefore not be put to the vote. The same applied to the Yugoslav draft resolution [document 5C/19].

[2] Professor VERNIERS withdrew his delegation's draft resolution [document 5C/25], in order to simplify the Commission's task.

[3] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) explained that the Yugoslav delegation had felt it necessary to propose its draft resolution [document 5C/110] in an endeavour to uphold the fundamental principles of international co-operation and mutual understanding between the peoples in the fields of education, science and culture, and with a view to condemning all action running counter to those principles and jeopardizing world peace. The speaker referred to many facts that clearly bore out the Yugoslav delegation's contention that three Member States of Unesco—Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia—had, in their dealings with Yugoslavia, broken the commitments into which they had entered by becoming members of Unesco. For those reasons, he considered it essential for the Yugoslav resolution to be adopted; such facts could not be ignored by Unesco, whose duty it was to condemn the inhuman methods adopted in certain Member States of Unesco and the violation of the solemn pledges made by these countries.

The Yugoslav draft resolution was not supported and accordingly lapsed.

Draft resolution presented by the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Italy, United Kingdom and United States of America [document 5C/119].

[4] Mr. DELBOS (France) stated that certain delegations had felt it necessary to submit a resolution which might form a fitting conclusion to the Commission's discussions after their interruption, and serve as a reply to the moving and clear-sighted statement by the Director-General regarding Unesco's responsibilities in the problem of peace—a statement by which the French delegation had been deeply touched. Mr. Delbos pointed out that the text showed where Unesco's

true role lay—in the building of peace in the minds of men, with due regard to the special rights of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies; it brought out Unesco's need for securing a universal outlook through joint action by all peoples, and suggested the methods to be adopted: respect for the rights of man and recognition of the principles of justice and freedom. While unilateral action would be liable to weaken those peoples most attached to peace, world-wide action—which Unesco was qualified to undertake—could and should be the salvation of mankind.

In conclusion, Mr. Delbos expressed the hope that the draft would meet with the unanimous approval of the members of the Commission.

[5] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) said that during the preceding day's meeting he had thought of certain phrases which had been formulated in the course of the Conference, namely some of those by the Director-General. One which had particularly struck him was the statement that "we live in an epoch in which ivory towers are tombs".

[6] He vigorously supported everything which had been said by Mr. Delbos. He thought everyone could agree that throughout the Conference the delegates and the Director-General had been unanimous about the need for Unesco's intensified activity on behalf of peace. The heads of several delegations had emphasized this need in many ways. They believed in the need for tangible, commonsense projects, but they realized that certain ideas entailed a sacrifice, and that many of them required financial backing before they could prevail.

[7] He recalled what the Director-General had said at the Third Plenary Meeting of the current Session about what 56—henceforth 59—nations could do to strengthen the peace. At that time he had said:

> First of all, countries working together in this manner can regularly exchange information, and can agree simultaneously to take the most effective measures to surmount or remove obstacles to the free flow of culture.
>
> Again, they can study and try out together the various modern means of helping men to participate actively in the progress of the international community. They can undertake together to further all steps which may help educators to form citizens conscious of their rights and yet equally conscious of their duties towards their fellow men of every nation, language, race and religion.

[8] That statement had made a profound impression on the United States delegation and had their whole-hearted support. They regarded the present resolution as attempting to sum up what it was in the minds and hearts of the delegates and Member States to do, and not as merely pledging words. There was, he thought, a considerable measure of agreement on the proposals contained in that draft resolution, on which he wished to make a certain number of observations.

[9] In his speech to the Plenary Session the previous day, the Director-General had rendered a great service by focusing the delegates' attention more sharply on points which had already been discussed during the Conference. The United States delegation had the greatest sympathy for any immediate contribution which Unesco could make to peace. At the beginning of the Conference Mr. Sargeant had himself stressed that Unesco was confronted at the present time with a basic challenge to its organization. A programme full of noble and worthy resolutions had been passed, but it seemed that sometimes these were insufficiently focused on Unesco's basic purpose. Like many of his fellow-delegates and the Director-General himself, Mr. Sargeant had felt that the Programme should be reduced in such a way that certain central projects might emerge with greater coherence and with the possibility of making a greater impact on the world.

[10] He did not agree with those who suggested that they had accomplished little at the current Conference. If they retraced their steps sincerely, he believed that they would find they had from the beginning to a great extent lived up to the tasks they had set themselves. This was expressed in the second paragraph of the draft resolution. The United States delegation emphatically believed in the validity of the statement contained in that paragraph beginning with the words: "Noting that the Programme. . ."

[11] Mr. Sargeant thought he might with all modesty take a genuine pride in the fact that the United States delegation had been able to introduce into the Conference certain ideas which had been accepted by their colleagues and which had contributed to the feeling that they had moved in the direction at which Unesco was aiming. A number of commonsense projects had been devised. He quoted the projects for the greater dissemination of knowledge about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and those concerning Unesco's activities in Germany and Japan as examples of the type of concentration at which delegates had been aiming during the Conference.

[12] The draft resolution before the Commission endeavoured to show that, although it was already too late in the Conference to attempt a

complete and systematic revision of the Programme, the Director-General and the Executive Board could nevertheless be provided with signposts which would help them during the coming months. More detailed indications were given on those lines in the fifth and sixth paragraphs of the resolution, which gave certain instructions to the Director-General and the Executive Board. The United States delegation did not think this implied a request to tear up and throw to the winds the labour of the last years, but those paragraphs showed that the delegates wanted the future efforts of Unesco directed along lines which would ensure peace and security.

[13] Referring to the seventh paragraph, which put forward certain requests, Mr. Sargeant repeated affirmations previously made by members of his delegation that they felt sure means could be found of financing extraordinary projects. His Government believed that Unesco should have a budget commensurate with its Programme, provided that it had a programme commensurate with the needs of the modern world. He reminded the Commission that, without financial backing, ideas would not prevail, nor change and influence the minds of men.

[14] People often spoke as though there were a magic word by which peace could be obtained overnight, but this was not possible in the existing political climate. The achievement of peace was a long and hard task requiring many means which had no tangible or visible impact. The members of Unesco represented 59 nations which believed that education, science and culture were important and that ideas could change the world. Unesco had survived five years of criticism: it still existed and was developing still further. Every generation must be educated to peace, patiently and persistently.

[15] It should also be remembered that there was no other organization in the world which had chosen to attack those problems which Unesco had chosen to attack. If Unesco did not exist, all those who were gathered together at the Conference would feel it their duty to bring such an organization into being. Thus the hope and faith of the delegates in the tasks on which they were engaged would be demonstrated by the unanimous adoption of that draft proposal.

[16] Mr. Sargeant hoped that the work programme which it attempted to set forth would evoke a response in each Member State and encourage them to contribute towards it by offering to the Executive Board and the Director-General reports of the projects already started or which they would be willing to undertake. Therefore, on behalf of the United States delegation, he urged other delegates to submit suggestions to the Director-General which would enable Unesco to make a genuine contribution towards the efforts of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. As the Director-General had emphasized the previous day, the technical nature of Unesco's work did not affect its ability to work effectively for peace in the immediate as well as the distant future.

[17] In conclusion, Mr. Sargeant referred to an event which, although peculiar to his country, had its parallels throughout world history. At a recent service at the American Military Cemetary on 30 May, celebrated in the United States as Memorial Day, he had been profoundly moved by the thought that, if all Unesco's representatives could have been present there, the realities of the meaning of peace could have been effectively brought home to them. He recalled that, in his Gettysburg speech in 1863, President Lincoln had thought clearly in terms of future peace, although the United States was still in the midst of a shooting war. In that forethought, Mr. Sargeant saw a close parallel to the position of Unesco at the present time.

[18] Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) also supported the draft resolution; it was quite clear from the Preamble to the Constitution of Unesco that the Organization's prime purpose was to uphold and consolidate peace. The public was entitled to ask what tangible contribution had been made by Unesco to the cause of peace. It was not to be forgotten that Unesco was more than a Specialized Agency with a technical programme; it also had a definite political complexion, as the Conference included Ministers and Ambassadors who played a prominent part in promoting Unesco's aims. The Director-General's resignation had afforded the Conference an excellent opportunity of making a plain and forthright statement of its intentions with regard to the defence of peace. The discussions had issued in that draft resolution, which had the advantage of being clear and of laying emphasis on the need for effective action not only by the Secretariat but also by Member States, with the assistance of National Commissions. An extraordinary programme obviously necessitated the raising of additional funds for its implementation; and the resolution referred to the possibility of obtaining voluntary contributions; but the time had come to consider seriously means of adding to the Organization's regular resources.

[19] Professor BOGDANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia), while recognizing the lofty motives that had

inspired the draft resolution, noted with regret that its adoption would be tantamount to renouncing immediate and concrete action on behalf of peace. That would have the gravest consequences and would in particular greatly discourage all those who were hoping that Unesco would immediately embark on an effective campaign for peace.

[20] Dr. WALKER (Australia) said that his first reaction on reading the draft resolution and listening to the speeches had been one of disappointment, not for the reasons advanced by Professor Bogdanović—because he did not believe that Unesco's main contribution to peace lay in dramatic action and the calling of conferences, but rather in forming the minds of men so that they might contribute to peace—but because of the failure of the resolution to refer to the problem continuously before them of enlisting the cooperation of Member States.

[21] His disapointment had been somewhat modified by the concluding section of Mr. Sargeant's speech and by Dr. Fawzi's declaration. The Director-General, the Chairman of the Executive Board, and many other delegations, including the Australian delegation, had pointed out all along that Unesco would never make a profound impact on the world unless Member States carried out the obligations they had assumed in signing their contract with Unesco. They had also repeated again and again that the Secretariat must assign a larger part of the work to Member States.

[22] In the view of the Australian delegation, it was no answer to say that Member States were weak or uninterested or lacked the necessary machinery. Such a reply did not meet the problem, but it was often offered and showed one of the most critical aspects of the situation which faced Unesco. He did not see how a resolution framed to meet this very critical situation could fail to include an appeal to Member States along these lines.

[23] That was a point on which his delegation felt very strongly. His Government had all along devoted large resources to carrying out the activities of Unesco in addition to their contribution to the central budget, and were in fact spending much greater sums on those activities. Had Member States really thought to ensure that their Governments placed sufficient resources at the disposal of the various national authorities and organizations to enable them to carry on their work? If not, what they were doing would be largely ineffective for peace. He believed that Unesco would never get anywhere unless as much time and importance were devoted to the day-to-day programme of each Member State as to the programme of the Executive Board.

[24] Dr. Walker therefore moved the insertion of a new paragraph between the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the resolution, i.e., after "Organization is based.", to read:

Reminds all Member States that the effectiveness of Unesco's contribution to peace depends directly on the extent of each Member State's active participation in the Programme of the Organization.

Further, Dr. Walker suggested that the following words should be added to the sixth paragraph:

. . . and in the preparation of this programme to give special emphasis to projects involving the active participation of Member States.

Finally, Dr. Walker suggested inserting "for 1952" in the third line of the same paragraph, after "draft programme".

[25] Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) was entirely convinced that this draft resolution really expressed the spirit which should be that of Unesco. He believed that all activities directed to the development of education, science and culture would be vain unless they first ensured the prevalence of peace, justice and truth in the world. The proposal under discussion was a synthesis of the ideas put forward by the Director-General the previous day, and by approving it, the Commission would be confirming its expression of confidence in him. Unesco's action on behalf of peace must develop slowly but could be tremendously important. He gave his full support to the resolution.

[26] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand), in associating himself fully with the preceding speakers who had expressed their desire to see world peace established, was particularly anxious that the wording of the sixth paragraph should not be taken to mean that the Commission wanted the Director-General and the Executive Board to make further sweeping changes in the Programme for the next two or three years. He recalled that the Sixth Session of the General Conference, to be held in Paris, would be relatively small and businesslike, and that many countries would be unable to send their most important and knowledgeable experts. The Director-General must be able to carry on the Programme if it was to be effective, and while he fully supported the proposal for a change in emphasis, Dr. Beeby hoped that no major change in form was proposed. On that understanding he was very willing to support the draft resolution.

[27] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) expressed his wholehearted support of the draft resolution and of

most of what Dr. Walker had said; he wished to second the amendments proposed by the latter.

[28] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) submitted a proposal which he thought might meet the case put forward by the delegate of Yugoslavia. Professor Bogdanović had made the point that, in its present form, the resolution appeared to make no immediate change in Unesco's activities. Sir John suggested that this situation might be met by inserting "1950 and" in the fifth paragraph after "to carry out the programme for". Thereby, instructions would be given to the Executive Board and the Director-General to start immediately on improvements which they could not otherwise make until January 1951. He understood that no drastic or rapid changes were contemplated.

Further, Sir John pointed out that the instructions in the sixth paragraph should be constitutionally addressed to the Executive Board, and that the Director-General should not be mentioned. A reference to the year 1952 should also be included, as suggested by Dr. Walker. To meet these two points, he suggested that the sixth paragraph should read:

Instructs the Executive Board in preparing, for the Sixth Session of the General Conference, a draft programme for 1952, to ensure that the various activities involving international co-operation. . .

Professors SOMMERFELT (Norway) and CARNEIRO (Brazil) seconded the suggestions made by Sir John Maud.

[29] Dr. BRULL Y CABALLERO (Cuba) felt bound to support a draft resolution marking another step towards the attainment of peace through constructive action. Peace was a complex concept, covering both material and moral forces, but the latter had all too often been obliged to give way to the former. The delegate of Cuba endorsed the statements of his colleagues and, going even farther, would be in favour of vesting the Director-General and the Executive Board immediately with the necessary powers for carrying out so admirable a programme.

[30] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) said that he was authorized by the delegates who had presented the draft resolution to say that they accepted the amendments proposed by Dr. Walker.

He had not yet had the opportunity of consulting with his delegation on the point raised by Dr. Beeby, but he expressed his personal belief that it was not a question of asking that a bold new programme should be started from scratch, but merely of pressing in the direction already taken in the work of the Conference.

[31] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) hoped that the text would be adopted as it stood.

[32] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) proposed that the words "from public or private sources" be inserted after "money" in the fourth line of the seventh paragraph, and that "in the future", in the fourth line of the eighth paragraph, be altered to: "in 1951".

[33] Referring to a proposal which he had already put forward at two previous sessions, Professor Verniers mentioned a method whereby additional funds might be raised for the Organization in 1951, namely the issue of stamps with a surcharge, the revenue from which would be set aside for Unesco's activities on behalf of peace.

[34] The whole of the draft resolution [document 5C/119] was *adopted* unanimously, with one abstention (Yugoslavia), subject to the amendments proposed by Dr. Walker, Sir John Maud and Professor Verniers.[1]

Consideration of the report of the Programme and Budget Commission [documents 5C/PRG/19 and Annexes I-IV].

Report of the Rapporteur [document 5C/PRG/19].

[35] Mr. FLORKIN (Rapporteur of the Commission) presented his report which served as a preface to the main body of the report. A few amendments were necessary in view of the developments that had occurred since the document had been drafted. In accordance with a wise custom, he also requested the Commission to authorize the Director-General to make any alterations in the presentation of the documents and the numbering of the resolutions that might seem necessary in preparing final text of the Records of the Conference.

The report was *adopted* in the form amended by the Rapporteur.

I. Preamble [document 5C/PRG/19 (1)].

[36] After discussion, it was *agreed* to insert the words "through education" after "To promote" in clause (3) on page 4.

[37] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL feared that the over-ambitious wording of clause (4) (page 4) might impose responsibilities on Unesco out of proportion to its resources and might prompt requests that could not be complied with.

1. In final form: Resol. 9.1 to 9.115.

To meet the wishes of the United States delegate, it was *decided* to change the word "remove" in clause (4) into "overcome".

[38] At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion and to meet a comment by Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), clause (6) was amended to read:

To study the causes of tensions that may lead to war and to endeavour to combat them through education.

the latter term being understood in the widest sense of the word, as the education of the citizen.

[39] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) pointed out that the text of the heading of the paragraph 2 on page 7 should be changed as follows, so as to conform to the relevant text in document 5C/PRG/19 (II), to:

Assistance to Research, *particularly* for the improvement of the living conditions of mankind.

Agreed.

The Preamble, thus amended, was *adopted* as a whole.

II. Basic Programme as amended by the Drafting Committee in accordance with the instructions of the Programme and Budget Commission [document 5C/PRG/19 (II)].

CHAPTERS A (EDUCATION), B (NATURAL SCIENCES) AND C (SOCIAL SCIENCES).

Adopted without discussion.

CHAPTER D (CULTURAL ACTIVITIES).

[40] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) recommended qualifying "artists" in item D.31 with the adjective "creative", so as to distinguish them from executant artists. In item D.32, he further suggested substituting "*the improvement* of legislation" for "the harmonization of legislation".

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Dr. Chediak's first suggestion had already been met in the heading of section 3 of the programme: "Protection of Creative Workers". As regarded his second point, it was covered by the text of section 4.6. "Copyright", in the 1951 Programme.

Chapter D: Cultural Activities, was *adopted* without change.

CHAPTERS E (EXCHANGE OF PERSONS), F (MASS COMMUNICATION) AND G (RELIEF ASSISTANCE SERVICES).

Adopted without discussion.

III. Result of discussions by the Programme and Budget Commission and by the Budget Committee on the 1951 Programme [document 5C/PRG/19 (III)].

CHAPTERS 1 (EDUCATION), 2 (NATURAL SCIENCES), 3 (SOCIAL SCIENCES) AND 4 (CULTURAL ACTIVITIES).

Adopted without discussion.

CHAPTER 5 (EXCHANGE OF PERSONS).

[41] It was *agreed*, at the suggestion of Dr. ZOOK (United States of America), to alter the term "refugee intellectuals" used in resolution 5.142 to: "*stateless* refugee intellectuals", which was the term proposed by him during previous discussions.

Chapter 5 was *adopted* as amended.

CHAPTERS 6 (MASS COMMUNICATION) AND 7 (RELIEF ASSISTANCE SERVICES).

Adopted without discussion.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON ASSISTANCE TO ARAB REFUGEES IN PALESTINE, [document 5C/51] AND DRAFT RESOLUTION ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN OF THE MIDDLE AND NEAR EAST [document 5C/120].

[42] Mr. FLORKIN (Rapporteur of the Commission) pointed out that the additions to the introduction of his report included especially the recommendations to launch a new appeal on behalf of the refugee children of the Near and Middle East, and to give the highest priority to emergency relief for Arab refugee children in Palestine.

[43] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) recalled that the draft resolution presented by his delegation [document 5C/51] had been discussed by the Commission on 13 June. At that time, the Iraqi delegation had accepted the proposal made by Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan to submit it to the Executive Board, with a request to increase the budget for this relief work. In spite of the report of that meeting which appeared in the minutes, Dr. Jamali now found that the Chairman had apparently incorrectly interpreted Sir Sarvepalli's intentions, as well as those of Dr. Jamali in withdrawing his text. The matter had not come before the Executive Board and the possibility of increasing the budget had not been considered.

[44] Dr. Jamali recalled that, in answer to the objections made in the Commission by the Chairman of the Executive Board, he had clearly stated that he considered the Board to have been unfair in evaluating certain programme items. He had asked for a revaluation, and as a member of the Board, Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan had been fully aware of the need for such a revaluation.

[45] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Iraqi proposal be considered as an amendment to document 5C/120, but Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) was reluctant to accept this suggestion.

[46] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained that the Iraqi proposal had been presented first to the Executive Board and then to the Programme and Budget Commission, with the comments of the Board. In the course of the discussion which followed, Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan had made the suggestion to which Dr. Jamali had referred, but it was not in the form of a definite resolution. Sir Sarvepalli had included a suggestion that the Executive Board should take the necessary measures to increase the appropriation for that purpose. As Sir Sarvepalli had himself been a Chairman of the Board, he was well aware that the Board could vote the increase of a direct sum for relief assistance only if authorized to do so by the General Conference. The most he could have meant, therefore, was that, within the present budget of $188,000 for relief assistance, the Board should do the best it could for the Arab refugees.

Sir John also recalled that, as stated in the minutes, the Chairman of the Commission had summed up what he thought was the sense of the meeting, without any specific reference to a budgetary increase; but no exception to his summing up had been taken at the time.

[47] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) regretted that he had not understood that the Indian resolution had not been adopted. Otherwise he would have protested at the time.

[48] The proposal to consider draft resolution 5C/51, as an amendment to resolution 5C/120 was seconded by the delegates of HASHEMITE JORDAN, ITALY, LIBERIA, PAKISTAN and PERSIA.

On a vote by roll-call the amendment was *adopted*, subject to ratification by the Budget Committee, by 15 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions and 28 absentees.

Resolution 5C/120 was *adopted* by 20 votes to none.[1]

Document 5C/PRG/19 (III) was *adopted*.

1. In final form: Resol. 9.5 to 9.5132.

IV. Resolutions concerning Unesco's activities in Germany in 1951 [document 5C/PRG/19 (IV)].

Adopted without discussion.

V. Resolutions concerning Unesco's activities in Japan in 1951 [document 5C/PRG/19 (V)].

[49] Mr. SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) expressed his country's great appreciation of the General Conference's decision to adopt Spanish as a working language.

He recalled that at the Paris Conference the preceding year, he had explained his country's position with regard to Japan, since his countrymen had suffered more than any other nation at the hands of the Japanese during the last war. His people were not, however, revengeful by nature, they were ready to forget and forgive and willing that Unesco should send to Japan all the documents and literature that might enable the Japanese people to learn about the aims and objectives of the Organization.

Nevertheless, his delegation was opposed to international status being granted to Japan, and to the presence of her representatives at Unesco conferences. Firstly, there was not yet a peace treaty. They were not yet convinced that Japan had abandoned her militaristic policy or was ready to be absolved from the sins she had committed.

The position of the Philippine delegation was the same as it had been in Paris. Nevertheless, for the sake of harmony and peace, and in order to accede to the request of many delegations, his delegation would abstain from voting on the paragraph beginning "To invite" on page 2 of the document.

Document 5C/PRG/19 (V) was *adopted* without change.

VI. Statement of Methods [document 5C/PRG/19 (VI)].

Adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.

THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Draft resolution on Aid to Arab Refugee Children in the Near and Middle East and an amendment to that resolution (*continued*) [documents 5C/120 and 5C/51].

[1] Miss LAISE (United States of America), Chairman of the Budget Committee, stated that the Budget Committee had examined the two resolutions. The resolution in document 5C/120 had no budgetary implications. The budgetary implications of the Iraqi amendment [document 5C/51] could not be estimated exactly, as they depended upon the interpretation of the resolution, but the Budget Committee recommended that a maximum of $150,000 should be allocated for the purpose out of the $188,000 available for Emergency Relief.

The recommendation of the Budget Committee was *approved*.

[2] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) expressed his delegation's gratitude to the Chairman and members of the Commission, and especially to the Budget Committee. He hoped that the sum of $150,000 would be considered only as a beginning, and that others would subsequently be added to it. Although this beginning would be greatly appreciated, it would cover only a small portion of the cost of the educational care of the refugees.

The draft resolution contained in document 5C/51 was *adopted*,[1] that in document 5C/120 having been adopted at the previous meeting.

[3] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission had completed its work. Summing up the results achieved during the Fifth Session, he observed that there was a debit and a credit side to every undertaking.

On the credit side, the Commission had arrived at a more coherent and effective programme in the field of Fundamental Education. In resolutions addressed to Member States, the latter had been invited to work in much closer co-operation with Unesco. The Commission had adopted a very favourable attitude towards international conventions, and had approved the draft Agreement on the Free Circulation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials. Two resolutions on works of art, presented by the Mexican and Italian delegations, had been adopted. The Chairman wished to pay a special tribute to the United States delegation for its resolutions concerning human rights, which had been adopted by the Commission. Lastly, the Commission had achieved an intensification of work in Germany and Japan.

[4] On the debit side, an inhuman effort had been required of delegates and the Secretariat, since, instead of the twenty-four meetings which had been anticipated, it had been necessary to hold thirty-two. The result had been that the Chairman had been obliged to limit the length of speeches, so that some delegates might feel that they had not been given an adequate opportunity of expressing their views. Furthermore, much time had been spent on detailed discussions of many programme items, which had meant that insufficient time had been available to discuss certain big, important projects, such as the popularization of science, the free circulation of educational, scientific and cultural materials, and Human Rights. The Chairman considered that more time should be devoted to such projects at the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

The Chairman concluded by thanking the delegates and members of the Secretariat for their collaboration.

[5] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman and the Rapporteur.

The motion was *adopted* by acclamation.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 7.23.

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT COMMISSION—PROGRAMME AND BUDGET, OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

Election of Chairman.

[1] On the proposal of Dr. BARALT y ZACHARIE (Chairman, Official and External Relations Commission), M. Roger Seydoux (Chairman, Programme and Budget Commission) took the Chair.

Unesco's activities in Germany during 1951 [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part III].

General Discussion.

[2] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) recalled the debates which had taken place at previous Conferences on the question of Unesco's activities in Germany, and observed that the programme which he was presenting was the logical outcome of the decision taken at the Mexico Conference to initiate a programme of work in Germany. At the Beirut Conference in 1948, it had been decided to expand that programme, and following that Conference, the Executive Board had decided that an expert committee should be established to advise the Board and the Director-General on the way in which Unesco could best contribute to world peace through its work in Germany. The Expert Committee was composed of representatives from Czechoslovakia, Netherlands, Poland, United States of America, Norway, Belgium, France, United Kingdom and Switzerland. The Committee held its first meeting in May 1949 and its second in the autumn of that year. The Board had had the advantage of the Committee's advice in preparing the draft programme for Germany in document 5C/5 (I) Rev., although the Czechoslovak and Polish representatives had unfortunately been absent on that occasion.

[3] The Executive Board had recently taken an important decision regarding Unesco's work in Germany in 1950: it had authorized the Director-General to continue his consultations with representatives of the appropriate Allied Authorities and German circles, and with experts on German questions, with a view to furthering Unesco's action in Germany in the fields of education, youth movements and the social sciences and, in particular, with a view to preparing plans for the establishment of centres or institutes in those three fields. That decision of the Board should be borne in mind in considering the 1951 programme, for which the 1950 programme would serve as a spring-board.

[4] The United States delegation had submitted two proposals, contained in document 5C/55, as an amendment to the Board's programme. The Board had no comment to make on the first proposal, but what it had decided in 1950 had a certain relevance thereto. The second proposal was a slight amendment to the seventh paragraph on page 60 of the Board's programme. The Board was prepared to accept this proposal, provided the words "from private sources and from Member States" were substituted for "from sources outside the regular Budget", which the Board had felt were not sufficiently precise.

[5] In conclusion, Sir John observed that no part of Unesco's work had constituted a more serious responsibility for the Executive Board and the General Conference than the programme in Germany. It was in the hope that results would be achieved more fruitful than those of previous

Conferences, that he presented the Board's proposals for 1951.

[6] The CHAIRMAN welcomed the three observers of the Allied High Commission in Germany, Mr. Schmitlein, Mr. Reid and Professor Marshall.

[7] Mr. SCHMITLEIN (France) (Allied High Commission in Germany) stated that the Allied High Commission was on the best of terms with the Unesco Office in Germany and strongly in favour of the Organization's activities.

[8] Mr. REID (United States of America) (Allied High Commission in Germany) said that all those at present working in Germany were impressed by the crucial point which had been reached and by the fact that the German mind was at present more open and fluid than it had been for many years. There were encouraging and discouraging signs: an encouraging sign was the reaction of university students. Polls showed that they had had their fill of militarism and were looking for a new spirit. On the other hand, the spiritual outlook of many of the unemployed aroused grave concern, and the time was perhaps ripe for Unesco to increase its activities for peace and international understanding in Germany. So far, not much was known of Unesco and its goals, although that was not the fault of the Unesco representatives in Germany, and Dr. Thompson's excellent work, carried out in difficult circumstances, was very much appreciated. Upon the initiative of the Unesco staff, a German Committee of forty or fifty members representing major cultural and scientific groups had been set up on a democratic basis, and the Bonn Government had allocated 100,000 marks to it.

Mr. Reid himself, and his British and French colleagues in the Allied High Commission all hoped that Unesco would take further concrete steps in Germany.

[9] Professor MARSHALL (United Kingdom) (Allied High Commission in Germany) fully endorsed what his colleague had said. He underlined the fact that all those working in Germany felt that a new phase had started in recent months, not only because of the establishment of a Federal Government and the handing over to it of control of German life, but also because a generation of young people, too young to have been consciously involved in the war and still less in the Nazi regime, were now reaching maturity; the upheaval had been so great that a dark curtain covered the past and youth looked to the future: it was there that they needed guidance from Unesco.

With regard to Unesco's functions in the immediate future, its aims should be the same as those of the three Allied Occupying Powers, namely to develop education, science and culture on a genuine international basis. Unesco, as a free international body, had even greater possibilities than the occupation Authorities, and its ultimate aim should be to bring to Germany exactly the same benefits as it brought to other countries, not considering Germany as a special case, but as a country which, although it needed to receive outside benefits, would in the near future have something to contribute to other countries, and indeed already had something to contribute. To bridge the great gulf caused by the past, there should be clear focal points in Germany to which Germans could turn to learn about Unesco and to contribute to its work. Professor Marshall therefore particularly welcomed the project to establish Unesco centres.

[10] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) had listened with great pleasure to the remarks made by the Chairman of the Executive Board and was delighted that the Board had decided to authorize the Director-General to continue consultations with German circles and with experts on Germany. He warmly supported Professor Marshall's remark that Unesco should not consider its German programme with the feeling that it was dealing with a special case, but should try to promote the same activities in Germany as in other countries; that was the very sense of the United States resolution. His delegation felt that Unesco's programme in Germany had hitherto lacked a sufficiently penetrating quality, and the United States resolution therefore aimed at administratively strengthening and intensifying the Executive Board's programme. An example of what Unesco could bring to Germany was the opportunity for self-education, which meant that it must create the conditions which made that possible. It had a great role to play with regard to youth, and the main purpose of the United States resolution was to plant the seeds of freedom and peace in the minds of the young.

Mr. Sargeant announced that his delegation accepted the Executive Board's amendment to the second resolution of document 5C/55. He formally moved the adoption of the United States resolutions, with the inclusion of the Board's amendment.

[11] Mr. NANSEN (Norway) spoke of the desperate plight of a great number of children and young people in Germany, many of whom were refugees from the Eastern Zone and had no home or normal family life: all their efforts to obtain educational possibilities and vocational training were in vain and they were reduced to living dishonestly. There were criminals of all ages, and children of 12 or 13 years were convicted for

robbery, murder and even white slavery. Juvenile delinquents would exceed one million in 1951 if nothing were done, and Unesco's main activity in Germany should therefore be focused on youth.

[12] Speaking of the appalling refugee problem, Mr. Nansen recalled that Germany was divided into two conflicting parts, between which there was increasing tension. Of the 12,000,000 refugees, only a portion had been assimilated. Germany was obliged to accept all the German and non-German refugees who poured in at the rate of 1,000 to 1,500 a day; it had not been humanly possible to refuse refuge to the 600,000 refugees from the Soviet Zone who, in desperate straits, made a brave fight against heavy odds. Two things were clear: that many of the refugees would not have the physical or spiritual strength to survive, and that their fate would be of decisive importance to Germany. If they were left to their fate, it would lead to a total disaster in Germany which would affect all Western civilization, of which Germany was an integral economical, social and geographical part. All reconstruction work carried out in Germany would be vain if the importance of the refugee problem were not faced. Mr. Nansen explained that he had suffered in German concentration camps during the war, and that he was not pleading the cause of Germany, but the cause of humanity, of Europe and of the future of Western civilization. He was appealing to all the delegates present to do everything in their power to prevent a recurrence of the horrors experienced in the concentration camps, where he had learned something of the destruction of human beings and had seen how quickly human minds could be destroyed and a whole community transformed into a lawless hell.

[13] Appealing to Unesco to take action before it was too late and to check the spiritual destruction which was proceeding in Germany at the present time to an extent unparalleled in the history of mankind, Mr. Nansen called for action instead of promises and speeches. Unesco could take a leading role in the spiritual and cultural rehabilitation of Germany by increasing opportunities for professional training and humanistic education. The Bonn Goverment was attempting to find a solution by constructive activity in many fields, and rehabilitation work was being carried out by German and non-German non-governmental organizations, but there was an urgent need to co-ordinate all the dispersed efforts, and it was there that Unesco should play a leading part. Mr. Nansen sincerely hoped that Unesco would carry out the plan proposed in the Director-General's report to establish a body in Germany to co-ordinate the work of all the non-governmental organizations and to ensure that all support received the utmost assistance from the Bonn Government and the German authorities in general.

In conclusion, Mr. Nansen requested his fellow delegates to insist that activities in Germany should be courageously conceived and executed, so that Unesco might contribute to the solution of the tragic situation existing in that country.

[14] Mr. DELBOS (France) urged the need for continuity in Unesco's work, and noted with approval that the draft resolutions presented by the Executive Board extended and amplified the resolutions previously adopted in this field. He emphasized the wisdom of making a modest beginning with active organizations, which had proved most valuable in introducing Unesco to Germany. The need of the moment was to consider how to enlarge the field of action and to develop further methods. He hoped that the means of financing projects then being contemplated was an exceptional measure, and that the greatest possible number of States would offer their contribution to enable the existing bodies to be developed and a National Commission to be set up on a democratic basis.

[15] Dr. KRUYT (Netherlands) recalled how, at the first Conference in Paris in 1946, the Netherlands delegation had proposed a resolution advocating that Unesco should try to teach the democratic way of life to the youth of Germany. He was therefore very glad to see that the United States delegation was now supporting the action proposed by the Netherlands at the First Conference. He recalled how much his country had suffered under the Germans during the war, which explained why it so much desired to see Germany re-educated. The Germans were a nation which had never understood the principle of mutual respect, but there were a few Germans who respected men of other countries and races, and Unesco should support that minority in the hope that it would become a majority in the near future. He therefore supported the United States proposal.

[16] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) stated that the situation in Germany was of great concern to Denmark, as a neigbouring country. Her delegation agreed with the United States delegation that Unesco's activities there should be intensified. Two major difficulties faced Unesco in Germany, the first being the refugee problem. The Danish delegation could not accept Mr. Nansen's proposal that Unesco should try to solve that problem, as the Constitution did not justify this. The Director-General's Report [document 5C/31] recom-

mended (page 110) that the problem should be brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities of the United Nations, and that view was supported by the Danish Delegation.

[17] The second difficulty was that of contacting the proper organizations and individuals in Germany. The Danish delegation wished to stress the importance of contacting German women's organizations, such as the National Council of Women, a branch of the International Council of Women, which was carrying out work in accordance with Unesco's aims. Miss Pedersen recalled that women formed 65 per cent of the voting body in Germany, and that their co-operation was therefore essential to Unesco.

[18] In view of the financial difficulties involved in the German programme, the Danish delegation supported the United States resolution and was of the opinion that practical work should be given priority over research and studies throughout the programme. Thus, on page 110 of the Director-General's Report [document 5C/3], the activities listed under (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) should be given priority over those under (*a*) and (*b*). Similarly on page 62 and 63 of the Programme of the Executive Board [document 5C/5 (I) Rev.] under Cultural Activities, the projects relating to the preparations of lists of recorded music, works of art, etc., and to copyright, should not be given priority, but should be carried out under the 1951 programme resolutions as part of Unesco's ordinary programme.

[19] Dr. OPRECHT (Switzerland) felt that the question of Germany should be among Unesco's foremost concerns, and he hoped that adequate resources might be forthcoming through the adoption of the methods then being considered. He pointed out that in nearly all Member States, the National Commissions had already established relations with Germany, and he referred especially to the Swiss National Commission, which had set up a special committee for relations with Germany.

[20] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) reminded the meeting that from its earliest days Unesco had not only offered Germany material assistance, but had given its activities in that country a high moral significance. He emphasized that the first experiments had been made at the suggestion of the Netherlands delegation. If Unesco was now in a position to strengthen its material assistance, it was necessary that the moral significance of such work should continue to be uppermost in the minds of the German people. He was in favour of the projects presented by the Executive Board and of the proposal of the United States delegation, and hoped that the suggested activities might in the future be extended to the whole of Germany. He felt that Germany would be preparing to become a Member State of Unesco if it accepted the present programme.

[21] Mr. SARAJĆIC (Yugoslavia) was of the opinion that the proposed activities were likely to promote the maintenance of world peace and to combat any fascist tendencies that still existed, as well as the re-emergence of imperialism. Accordingly, the Yugoslav delegation supported the Executive Board's proposals and the resolution of the United States delegation. The speaker also urged the need for further expansion of the suggested programme and its extension to Germany as a whole.

[22] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) dwelt on the very keen interest Colombia was taking in Unesco's work in Germany, and expressed his support of the proposal put forward by the delegation of the United States of America.

[23] Dr. KOHN (Israel) hoped that the gravity of the German problem would not be underestimated. The Jews had suffered more than any other people from the Germans and no nation more greatly desired a change of heart in Germany, but his delegation had doubts regarding the methods proposed in the Board's Resolutions: the democratic outlook was not acquired from textbooks, but required a moral effort on the part of the Germans and a sincere discarding of the Nazi aggressive spirit. The Israeli delegation would not oppose Unesco's efforts to guide the German people, provided the methods used were effective and not harmful, and it would like to see the German authorities bear the major part of the cost of the programme.

[24] Dr. Kohn issued a strong warning against allowing Germany to enter Unesco as an active factor in the near future and against giving her leadership; so long as she was not admitted to the United Nations, she should not be allowed to exercise an active influence within Unesco.

[25] With regard to the Exchange of Persons Programme, Dr. Kohn agreed that mature professors could be sent to Germany, but expressed grave doubts as to the wisdom of sending young persons with unformed minds. He pointed out that Nazism had not yet been eradicated and that young foreigners might be infected with that doctrine. It was easy to undermine democracy and Unesco should beware of undue optimism.

[26] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) recalled that frequent references had been made to Unesco's central objective of peace and security.

It was clear to the United States delegation that the situation in Germany constituted one of the greatest threats to peace and security: he believed that all other delegations shared that apprehension, and he appreciated the fact that representatives of other countries, such as the Netherlands, had taken the leadership in calling the attention of successive Conferences to the situation in Germany. Some progress had been made since the close of hostilities, and after a long debate at the Paris Conference in 1949, funds for the German Programme had been increased. The total sum of $115,000 for the Programmes in Germany and Japan however represented only 1.5 per cent of Unesco's Budget and bore very little relation to the seriousness of the situation: the United States delegation had therefore taken the liberty of proposing a resolution which would enable additional funds to be found.

[27] One of the most outstanding contributions made by Unesco's small staff in Germany had been to assist in the organization, on a voluntary and democratic basis, of the German National Committee for Unesco activities. Unesco could henceforth count on the vigorous co-operation of the German representatives and also on that of the Allied Occupation Authorities.

Three fields of activities had been mentioned by the Executive Board; education, youth leadership and social science development. In the first field, Unesco could help to eliminate the causes of past friction and excessive nationalism by encouraging the revision of textbooks, by research in comparative education and by the introduction of ideas about human rights into school curricula. With regard to youth leadership, Unesco could undertake a variety of projects, such as the training of youth leaders, the extension of professional training and the establishment of international houses for young people. In the field of social sciences, it was important to inspire public opinion in Germany with a desire to co-operate with other nations. Social sciences were practically unknown in Germany, so that there was a great need for basic research, including research in the field of tensions. Dr. Zook believed that the three foregoing areas were excellent examples of fields in which co-operation could be achieved by Unesco with the Allied and German Authorities.

[28] The United States delegation considered that the resolutions of the Executive Board were quite adequate for the situation, but that a substantial amount of concentration could make the programme more effective. It further believed that an increased appropriation by Unesco for staff in Germany was necessary to the exception of an effective programme. Unesco should try to establish a more effective relationship between its programme departments and its staff in Germany. If supplementary funds were found for the German programme, they should be made available for the development of the Unesco centres or institutes. They should also be used for the establishment of a central office in Germany to co-ordinate all reconstruction activities. Germany must be prepared to enter the family of nations and it was for Unesco to prepare a situation which would enable her to do so. Her reintegration in the family of nations was essential to the peace and security of the world.

Draft resolutions presented by the Executive Board [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part IV].

PREAMBLE.

[29] Referring to the third paragraph, Dr. KOHN (Israel) considered such a political declaration to be out of place in Unesco's programme and moved its deletion.

The proposal was not seconded and *lapsed.*

[30] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) moved the deletion of the fourth paragraph, since the words "abstain from any campaign or polemic opposed to the principles of the organization and" applied no more to Germany than to any of Unesco's Member States.

The proposal, seconded by the delegate of SWEDEN, was *rejected* by 15 votes to 9.

The Preamble was *approved.*

1. GENERAL.

First paragraph.

[31] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark), referring to the words "interested groups in Germany" in the first paragraph, drew the Secretariat's attention to the fact that certain small groups in Germany were working hard for democracy and were not sufficiently supported by the Allied Authorities.

The first paragraph was *adopted.*

Second, third and fourth paragraphs.

Adopted without discussion.

New paragraph.

[32] At the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, the Commission *adopted* the following new paragraph based on the first proposal presented by the United States delegation [document 5C/55]:

To develop and implement certain major programmes in Germany designed to further international under-

standing. These programmes should involve the co-operation of all the Departments of Unesco in relation to a co-ordinated plan.

Fifth paragraph.

[33] The CHAIRMAN proposed amending the beginning of this paragraph on the lines suggested in the second United States amendment in document 5C/55 and on the basis of the amendment presented by the Chairman of the Executive Board. The paragraph would then begin:

To seek financial support, outside the regular budget, from private sources and from Member States. . .

This proposal, seconded by the delegates of NORWAY, EGYPT, PAKISTAN, GREECE, PERSIA and BRAZIL, was *adopted.*

The fifth paragraph was *adopted* as amended.

Sixth paragraph.

Adopted without discussion.

[34] In reply to a question from Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), Dr. THOMPSON (Head, Unesco Office in Germany) stated that the total budget implications of the section amounted to $98,857.

The whole of Section 1 was *adopted* unanimously.

2. EDUCATION.

First paragraph.

[35] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) having asked for a definition of "maladjusted children", Dr. THOMPSON (Head, Unesco Office in Germany), replied that it meant children who had suffered seriously as a result of the war, or from conditions existing after the war.

[36] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) suggested substituting some such expression as "competent experts" for "appropriate sources" in the first paragraph of section 2 (Education).

The first paragraph was *adopted* as amendment.

Section 2 was *adopted* as a whole.

SECTIONS 3 (NATURAL SCIENCES), 4 (SOCIAL SCIENCES), 5 (CULTURAL ACTIVITIES), 6 (EXCHANGE OF PERSONS), 7 (MASS COMMUNICATION).

Adopted without discussion.

8. RECONSTRUCTION SERVICE.

[37] With reference to section 8, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded the meeting that, in accordance with a decision taken at a meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission, the draft resolution dealing with international voluntary work camps was to be transferred to the chapter on Education.

Section 8 was accordingly *deleted.*

NEW RESOLUTION.

[38] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) announced that, as the General Conference had accepted the suggestion of the United States delegation in the matter of seeking financial support outside the ordinary budget for activities in Germany in 1951, the Executive Board wished to ask the Conference to allow it to authorize the Director-General to act in the same way in 1950; otherwise, the words used at the General Conference in Paris in 1949: "to stimulate resources from private sources and endowments" would make it impossible for the Director-General to seek funds from Member States in 1950 for the German programme. He therefore moved a resolution, which would begin with a paragraph repeating resolution 35.38 passed at the Fourth Session of the General Conference and continue with the following words:

CONSIDERING that the Executive Board has authorized the Director-General to proceed with the elaboration of preliminary plans for special projects in the fields of Education, Youth Activities and Social Sciences,
CONSIDERING that the General Conference at its Fifth Session, has authorized the Director-General to seek financial support for such projects outside the regular budget from private sources and from Member States,
RESOLVES that, for the remainder of 1950, the Director-General shall be authorized to seek funds from the same sources and in the same conditions as he has been authorized to do in 1951.

The proposal was supported by the delegates of GREECE, NORWAY, DENMARK, CHINA, TURKEY and the UNITED KINGDOM, and *adopted.*[1]

Activities of Unesco in Japan during 1951 [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., Part IV].

General Discussion.

The CHAIRMAN extended a welcome to Dr. William K. Bunce, observer of SCAP.

[39] Dr. BUNCE (SCAP) expressed his pleasure at having Japanese advisers represented at the Conference. There had been revolutionary changes in Japan since 1945, and the Japan of the present day was in almost all respects a different Japan from the nation which had launched forth into wars of aggression in the past. The change

1. In final form: Resol. 8.1.

embraced all parts of Japanese life, and Japan had taken active steps to co-operate with Unesco. Ninety Unesco co-operation societies and twenty-five Unesco student clubs had been established, and three agencies within the government dealt with Unesco affairs. In November 1949, the Japanese Legislative had unanimously voted a resolution calling upon Ministries to co-operate in promoting Unesco's programme in Japan. In the past year, with the help of Unesco, there had been an exchange of materials and ideas with foreign countries. A great deal of Unesco literature had been produced in Japanese and books had been written on Unesco and the United Nations. There was an attitude of receptiveness among the Japanese people towards the programme and ideals of Unesco: they were tired of war and were avidly seeking new ideas.

[40] With regard to Japanese needs of concern to Unesco, although democracy was much more than a mere skeleton in Japan, it needed to be given vitality, which would require time and a continuous infusion of new ideas at the right time. The Japanese needed to be brought into contact with the outside world by attendance at conferences and by fellowships. There was also a need for a flow of information into Japan through all media, such as published materials, films, etc. As far as work among youth was concerned, there were great opportunities for Unesco in Japan and Japanese women's organizations also needed encouragement.

[41] As Professor Marshall had stated in connexion with Germany, so also in the case of Japan the flow of ideas, materials and persons would not be one-sided; Japan could already contribute something to other nations and would soon be able to contribute still more. SCAP welcomed any Unesco action aimed at the integration of the Japanese people in the family of the democratic nations of the world.

[42] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) was impressed by the way in which Japanese nationals, aided by SCAP, had moved in the direction of democracy. He drew attention to the fact that a Japanese medical biologist had recently won the Nobel Prize, and that 30 per cent of the medical men in Japan were members of organizations committed to Unesco's principles and programmes. The United States delegation hoped that Unesco would do everything within reason to guide Japanese and political leaders along the path of democracy.

[43] The delegate of CHINA expressed the opinion that the souls of Germany and Japan were worth saving and that they had a great contribution to make to the cultural life of the world. China had suffered for eight years under a Japan misguided by militarists, but she liked to forget that and to remember other Japans which had known so well how to cultivate the arts of peace. It was in this spirit that the Chinese delegation welcomed the draft resolutions on Japan for 1951 and hoped that Unesco would contribute towards making Japan democratic and free and strong.

[44] Mr. FLORES (Philippines) considered the words pronounced by the representative of SCAP to be very reassuring and hoped that the changes in Japan since the war would lead to the improvement of her relations with the other nations of the Far East. If such a miraculous change had been accomplished it was a great tribute to the work of the United States and other nations working in Japan and, in particular to General MacArthur. If there had been some scepticism in the Philippines regarding that miracle, it was not only because of the immeasurable suffering of the Philippines during the war, but also because of a natural caution which made them suspicious of overnight changes in the spheres of education and culture. His delegation therefore felt that Unesco should proceed with great caution in the treatment of the tremendous problems of the spiritual, educational and cultural rehabilitation of Japan. It should strengthen and stabilize the changes which had been made since the war and take measures that would go deep into the heart of the Japanese people and not only change the surface of their culture.

[45] Dr. WALKER (Australia) announced that his delegation would vote for the Executive Board's proposals and was glad to hear of the progress made, but he was obliged to make a reservation regarding the last paragraph on page 67, concerning the invitation of Japanese individuals to expert meetings, etc. Australia had already been in disagreement with the Far Eastern Commission on the rules governing participation in meetings, and he was obliged to make a similar reservation at the present Conference.

Draft resolutions presented by the Executive Board [document 5C/5 (I) Rev., Part IV].

PREAMBLE.

Adopted without discussion.

1. GENERAL.

First paragraph.

[46] Mr. FLORES (Philippines), referring to the expression "interested groups", pointed out that

those groups in Japan which were not interested were probably just the people who required Unesco's peace programme.

Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that, in view of the limited number of documents available, they were distributed to bodies concerned with education, science and culture and desirous of establishing relations with Unesco. They were also distributed to student groups. That had been thought to be the best means of making Unesco's publications as widely known as possible.

The first paragraph was *adopted.*

Second paragraph.

[47] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) moved that the following words be added at the end of the last paragraph on page 67:

. . . and to encourage the attendance of Japanese individuals at meetings of international non-governmental organizations having consultative status with Unesco.

The paragraph, thus amended, was *adopted.*

2. EDUCATION.

Adopted, subject to the replacement in the first paragraph of the words "appropriate sources" by "competent experts".

SECTIONS 3 (NATURAL SCIENCES), 4 (SOCIAL SCIENCES), 5 (CULTURAL ACTIVITIES), 6 (EXCHANGE OF PERSONS) AND 7 (MASS COMMUNICATION).

Adopted without modification.

8. RECONSTRUCTION SERVICE.

Deleted for the reasons set out in the corresponding section relating to activities in Germany.

BUDGET TABLE III.8.B. [document 5C/5 (II), pages 273 and 274].

[48] Dr. STODDARD (United States of America) suggested that provision should be made on page 273 for an expert on Japan in the Secretariat in Paris, who would require secretarial help and payment of other expenses in Paris. Secondly, he proposed that a sum should be added to the total budget for the programmes in Germany and Japan in order to allow for a general intensification of these programmes.

Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) proposed that the United States suggestion should be adopted in principle and referred to the Budget Committee for examination of its budgetary implications.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the United States proposal and Table III. 8. B. of the Budget Estimates were provisionally *approved.*

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

FIRST MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Election of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

[1] The proposal of the Nominations Committee for the post of Chairman of the Budget Committee, seconded by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was *adopted* unanimously.
Dr. F. Bender (Netherlands) was therefore appointed Chairman.

[2] The proposals of the Nominations Committee for the posts of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur were also *adopted*
Mr. Sidney Pollock (Canada) and Dr. Pinhas Kohn (Israel) were therefore appointed Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur respectively.

Terms of reference of the Budget Committee.

[3] The CHAIRMAN announced that the terms of reference of the Committee [document 5C/BUR/1, Addendum and Corrigendum, Section I] had been amended as follows by the General Committee of the Conference:
(1) Paragraph 2, sub-paragraph 1: the Budget Committee was now to consist of *thirteen* persons instead of eleven;
(2) Paragraph 3, sub-paragraph 3 (c): the Budget Committee would report to the General Conference *through the Programme and Budget Commission.*

Methods of work of the Committee.

[4] The CHAIRMAN suggested examining the various parts of the budget [document 5C/5 (II)], taking Part III (Programme Operations) first, in order to be able to report as soon as possible to the Programme and Budget Commission scheduled to open on 26 May.

[5] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested that, in order to save time, the Committee might first discuss the exact nature of its task and methods of work.

[6] The CHAIRMAN considered that paragraph 3 of the Committee's terms of reference [document 5C/BUR/1 - Add. and Corr.] was an adequate guide in this respect; in addition, there was the element of timing.

[7] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) supported Mr. Roseman. His delegation felt the Committee could make a real contribution to Unesco's future by recommending certain broad budgetary principles aimed at producing greater efficiency and lasting economies; however, he agreed on the necessity of examining the Budget item by item at a later stage.

[8] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) and the CHAIRMAN both felt that, in view of the necessity to avoid holding up the work of the three main Commissions, the Committee should first deal with the various items of the budget and then revert to discussion of general principles.

[9] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed that the questions of principle he wished to raise could be brought in during discussions on the various items.

[10] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said his delegation had a list of general questions aimed at clarifying the background material of the Budget and the actual financial position of the Organization. As the Secretariat would undoubtedly require further time to prepare the information required, he suggested that his delegation and any others with questions of a similar nature be allowed to submit them immediately.

[11] After discussion, and in order that all delegates might know exactly what information the Secretariat had been asked to prepare, it was *agreed* that all such questions should be submitted to the Secretariat in writing after the meeting, and that the Secretariat would prepare a complete list for circulation.

Examination of the Budget Estimates [document 5C/5 (II)].

[12] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked why it had been necessary to increase the number of personnel in the Clearing-House for Education from 16 in 1949 and 22 in 1950, to an estimated 32 in 1951.

[13] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that this apparent increase merely represented the amalgamation of the Clearing-House for Fundamental Education and that for Education. The work of the Clearing-House was now reaching its peak, and the personnel would be utilized with the greatest economy and efficiency

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.1.A].

[14] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), on a question of principle, asked if there were any regulations setting out who was entitled to a secretary.

[15] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that there were no such regulations, this matter being decided purely on a basis of individual requirements.

[16] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that this point, i.e., the limitation of the right to a secretary (all other shorthand-typing services being pooled), should be borne in mind by the Committee for further consideration and possible recommendation.

[17] Mr. POLLOCK(Canada) warmly supported this suggestion as being the type of broad line of economy he had been advocating. As a further example of this type of economy he raised the question of travel. He noted that large sums were being requested for travel in the Education Department as in all other departments. He felt that, whereas the Director-General undoubtedly made great efforts to co-ordinate missions and reduce unnecessary travel, several possibilities might have been overlooked; for instance, he wondered if all possible advantage was taken of personnel travelling on Home Leave, and also whether the best use was being made of the top-ranking officials in the New York Office. In addition there were several suggestions for economy contained in the Report of the United Nations Expert Committee on administrative questions, which he felt Unesco should implement at the earliest possible moment. He would like to see a general recommendation from the Budget Committee outlining these various fields in which over-all economies could be made. Since they were specifically considering the budget of the Education Department, he asked the Secretariat:

1. To co-ordinate all official travel including Home Leave so as to reduce separate trips;
2. If one project were delayed for a short period, to employ the personnel involved elsewhere in the Organization;
3. To assure the Conference that certain of the economies proposed in the Report of the Experts Committee on Administrative Questions could be implemented without waiting.

[18] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL gave an assurance that every effort was being made to co-ordinate missions and reduce travel (see, for instance, drastic reduction of travel for the External Relations Service). The New York Office had been strengthened with the object of reducing the number of missions necessary between Paris and New York. There were, however, certain special considerations necessitating official travel. For instance:

(1) Meetings were often called at Lake Success at very short notice, and there was insufficient time to ensure adequate briefing of the New York Office on the technical matters involved.
(2) It was essential that Unesco should be represented at many of the United Nations meetings by substantive specialists.
(3) The Unesco Programme was wide in scope and consequently it was virtually impossible to keep the New York Office fully briefed in detail of all Secretariat activities.
(4) Requests by Member States for missions required trips by specialists.

[19] With regard to the question of fluidity in the Programme and the transfer of personnel between projects, the Deputy Director-General pointed out that, because of the highly technical nature of many of the projects, top-level expert personnel could seldom be transferred usefully to another project. However, this was not true in the lower categories: the Deputy Director-General agreed in principle with the suggestion for pooling shorthand and typing services, but felt that it would be extremely difficult to lay down specific rules for an organization of such a complex nature.

[20] With regard to the immediate implementation of the salary and allowance scales recommended in the report of the Experts Committee on Administrative Questions, the Deputy Director-General pointed out that the Director-General was under instructions from the General Conference to follow the policy of the United Nations in this respect. This was why Unesco was following, rather than leading.

[21] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) expressed his satisfaction with this statement, but reserved the right to raise these several points later with a view to making a general recommendation.

[22] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) supported the idea of a general recommendation, and suggested that such items as Hospitality and Personnel Costs might be considered for inclusion therein.

[23] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the budgetary item for Hospitality costs showed an increase in the Department of Education; however, the representation allowance of the Assistant Director-General for Education had previously been included under Personnel Costs. The estimates for 1951 included a smaller representation allowance for the Director of the Department ($1,000, compared with $2,360 in 1949 and 1950) under Personnel Costs, and a larger sum, in consequence, for Hospitality.

[24] Replying to the Delegate of Australia, Mr. Weitz explained that the total sum requested for Travel in the Office of the Director of the Department of Education included provision for the travel of the Deputy Director and all *per diem* costs involved.

EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS [III.1.B (1)].

[25] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) assured the delegate of Canada that everything possible would be done to ensure coordination of the various educational missions and to avoid overlapping with the Technical Assistance Programme.

[26] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt that the total cost of each mission might be reduced by about $2,000, and asked whether the inviting Member State assumed local travel and subsistence costs.

[27] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) agreed that the total cost of each mission, as shown, was approximate, and confirmed that the inviting Member State normally assumed local expenses. He also pointed out that the personnel recruited for the mission did *not* receive a *per diem* allowance while on duty in the country; on the other hand, "advisers" did receive *per diem*.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the Committee communicate with the General Committee requesting that all programme resolutions should be passed to the Budget Committee for consideration before any other action was taken upon them by other bodies.

[29] The CHAIRMAN read a draft letter he had prepared to this effect.

[30] It was *agreed* that it was not the object of the Budget Committee to delay consideration of all new programme resolutions, but merely to ensure that no decisions involving financial obligation were taken before its views were taken into account.

[31] It was *decided* that the Chairman should send his letter to the General Committee.

[32] In addition, it was *decided* to recommend that all proposals having budgetary implications should be submitted by Wednesday, 24 May.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Education (*continued*) [Part III, Chapter 1].

EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS (*continued*) [III.1.B.(1)].

[1] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the technical advisers' *per diem* should be provided by the Member States in the same way as in the case of missions.

[2] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that a mission was undertaken only after negotiation of a contract with a particular state with a clear statement of the financial commitments of both parties. It had not been found possible to establish the safe administration relationship with regard to technical advisers, in view of the short duration of their work.

[3] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) did not think the precedent was a good one.

[4] Mr. KIRPAL (India) supported the Director-General's point of view

EDUCATION CLEARING-HOUSE [III.1.B.(2)].

[5] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stated that out of the $16,500 for the IBE contract, $15,500 constituted a subvention for the implementation of Resolutions 1.122, 1.123 and 1.132, and $1,000 constituted Unesco's share in the preparation of the IBE-Unesco Conference.

[6] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the working documents referred to in 1.132 could be reproduced more quickly and cheaply by offset than by printing.

[7] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured him that his suggestion would be borne in mind by the Secretariat.

[8] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), referring to Resolution 1.133, pointed out that the United Nations had a considerable staff to deal with the matter. Regarding Resolution 1.135, he wished to know whether Unesco was obtaining its own statistical information and whether Unesco was drawing on the United Nation's service; in both cases, there was the possibility of closer co-ordination and of effecting some economies.

[9] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, with regard to statistics, Unesco had moved very cautiously. Close relations with the United Nations Statistical Service had been established. Dr. Liu, who headed the unit, had come to Unesco from the United Nations Statistical Service and was taking great care to avoid the possibility of duplication.

[10] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stated that the programme envisaged under Resolution 1.133 was entirely based on the work of the Ecosoc Commission on the Status of Women, with which good co-operation had been established.

In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. GUITON explained that the "administrative status" referred to in Resolution 1.123 was directly related to the "Teachers' Charter"; it included the questions of salary, pensions, material and administrative status of teachers. The IBE was conducting a survey of salaries of elementary school teachers.

[11] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) saw a possibility of duplication in the fact that similar work was going on in other bodies. He thought it very difficult, not to say impossible, to compare salaries of elementary school teachers all over the world. He was in favour of making greater use of existing documentation and of reducing the estimates which appeared at the bottom of page 86 of document 5C/5 (II).

[12] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stressed that the ten people mentioned on that page were considered the minimum staff necessary to assemble the already existing data. Those people were divided into two small units:

(1) Documentation (incoming information)—one grade 12, one grade 10 and four documentation assistants;

(2) Three grade 14 specialists in secondary and technical education and the teaching professions

and one grade 12 specialist in the general psychology of education.

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) did not see what resolution authorized such items as the $3,000 for the study of the use of the mother tongue in education and the $2,000 for the collection of information on the teaching of modern languages. In any case the work could easily be referred to the National Commissions and the budgetary item deleted.

[14] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stressed that most National Commissions' resources were very limited; Unesco needed some small sum to get the work started or else it would never be done at all. The enquiry into the use of the mother tongue was related to the Executive Board's resolution taken on the request of the United Nations, which had asked for it to be undertaken in the non-autonomous territories.

[15] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) said that, unless the National Commissions were invited to do something, they would most probably do nothing. He stated that the Australian Co-operating Body did not need a budget to make such a survey.

[16] Mr. BALEEIRO (Brazil), referring to Resolution 1.134, asked if the Pavia International Institute for Public Finance would receive a grant.

[17] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the International Universities' Bureau, created by the Utrecht Conference and quite independent of Unesco, would decide whether such a grant should be made.

[18] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) emphasized that, for the progress and development of teaching methods in all countries, a documentation and co-ordination centre was indispensable. In the opinion of the French delegation Unesco should assist the IBE; the grant seemed quite reasonable and the delegation supported the Director-General's proposals.

[19] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) saw an obvious possibility of economies in the three fields under consideration if the Member States could be induced to perform some of the work. He had doubts as to the necessity for the special Conference mentioned on page 87; the Commission on the Status of Women, for instance, could express its views without any cost to Unesco.

[20] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) was also in favour of helping existing organizations. The International Universities' Bureau was almost ready to begin its work.

[21] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stated that the Yearbook referred to in Resolution 1.135 would be published in 1950. In 1951 and subsequent years there would be annual supplements.

[22] Section III.1.B (2) was *provisionally approved*, it being understood that the members of the Committee remained free to propose cuts at a later stage.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATION [III.1.C(1)].

[23] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) had economies to propose in connexion with Resolutions 1.211 and 1.2132: the duration of the Seminars could be reduced from six weeks to one month.

Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) supported the suggestion.

[24] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) declared that the length of all the seminars had been very carefully considered. All the participants in the previous ones agreed that six weeks was a minimum duration for that kind of meeting, the success of which depended in a large measure on people becoming acquainted with one another through community life. Moreover, the economy produced by the suggested reduction would not exceed some $3,000 out of a total cost of $40,000.

[25] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) was not in favour of shortening the seminars, but he asked for some figures which might enable the Committee to compare the cost of the two types—six weeks and one month.

[26] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought the board and lodging expenses—amounting to $9,200— could be met in part or whole by the host country and the participating states.

[27] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) was against a shortening of the seminars.

[28] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) admitted there was a difference between international and regional seminars; the latter, at least, could be shortened. Some of the necessary staff could be made available by the participants instead of by Unesco. He pointed out that the extension of length of seminars nearly always reduced the quality of their leadership, because the really outstanding people who should direct them could not be spared for long periods.

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that by reducing the seminars to four weeks, an approximate saving of $4,500 would be effected: personnel costs would decrease from $10,000 to $9,000;

there would be a small reduction on local staff; travel costs would, of course, remain unchanged, while board and lodging would drop from $9,200 to $6,000. Common services would cost about $2,500 instead of $3,050.

[30] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was in favour of shortening the seminars, but he thought the Programme and Budget Commission was the right body to consider the matter.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with him.

[31] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), seconded by Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), proposed that the Committee's report to the Programme and Budget Commission should suggest six weeks for international seminars and four weeks for regional ones.

[32] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) stressed that the Secretariat was not dogmatically minded on the subject; it was going only by the strong general opinion of the erstwhile participants. He held that the subject of a seminar was even more important than its international or regional character.

In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. ELVIN stated that requests for information concerning the action envisaged in Resolution 1.2121 had already been received from Pakistan, Indonesia, Liberia, Persia and Venezuela.

[33] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) drew attention to three travel items for almost the same people: (1) in connexion with seminars; (2) of field counsellors (paragraphs I and II on page 93) and (3) to encourage the formation of National Committees for Fundamental and Adult Education (paragraph VI on page 94). He was certain that those items could be merged.

[34] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the people mentioned in paragraphs II and VI were different travellers travelling at different times.

[35] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) agreed that it was essential for Unesco to visit the Member States, but every effort should be made to avoid successive visits dealing with the same subject.

[36] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked if a valuation of the Haiti project had been made, and what were Unesco's relations with the Organization of American States in connexion with the Mexican project (paragraph V, on page 94).

[37] Mr. BOWERS (Head, Fundamental Education Division) thought the question concerned the programme rather than the budget. The Haiti Project now showed great promise of success: the United Nations was very interested in it, WHO was helping with it already and FAO was preparing to join in the work.

[38] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) indicated that the Board had authorized the Director-General to sign an agreement with the Organization of American States and with the Mexican Government. He suggested that the discussion of the matter might be deferred.

[39] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked how many films Unesco was hoping to make on the $5,000 referred to in paragraph IV on page 94.

[40] Mr. BOWERS (Head, Fundamental Education Division) explained that Unesco was not paying for the films but only sending an adviser to assist in their production. As certain modern equipment was not available in the countries concerned, Unesco was helping by sending a small number of indispensable items.

[41] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), referring to paragraph VII on page 94, was concerned about the appropriateness of using experts in the manner outlined, when their advice could be obtained by correspondence and by contacts with the Unesco officials who would be travelling in connexion with the question. In his opinion the activity envisaged in paragraph VIII (page 94) could definitely be referred to Member States. With regard to paragraph IX (page 94), he thought two or three Member States might be asked to arrange with some Universities, or with individual experts, to prepare the monographs.

[42] The CHAIRMAN assured Mr. Weeden that the Secretariat would give specific replies to his suggestions when the budget was examined.

EDUCATION FOR MALADJUSTED CHILDREN [III.1.(c)(2)].

[43] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) pointed out that a great deal of work was being done in that field; it might be wiser to wait for the results of the broader study which was being made before coming to a decision concerning Unesco's activities.

[44] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) associated himself with Mr. Pollock's remarks: he did not think that $45,000 was a reasonable sum to deal with such an important problem.

[45] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) held that paragraph I on page 99 could also very appropriately be referred to the National Commissions.

[46] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) supported

the principle of the Director-General's proposals in relation to section III.1.C.(2).

[47] The Committee *decided* that its report to the Programme and Budget Commission would contain the remark suggested by the Canadian delegate.

[48] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) noted that no serious objections or criticism of the section had been expressed on its budgetary aspect.

[49] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) reiterated his opinion that $45,000 was both too little to deal with the problem and too much to fritter away.

EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING [III.1.D].

[50] In reply to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. ELVIN (Head, Department of Education) stressed that $2,000 was not too much to pay for an intelligent comparative study of the material referred to in paragraph VII on page 106. The sum was not intended to cover the preparation of the list only.

[51] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), referring to paragraph I on page 105, said he understood that the race relationship brochure was being prepared by another unit of the Secretariat. In his opinion the Director's report mentioned in that paragraph need not cost Unesco anything. He did not see the relation between the resolution and the activity listed in paragraph III on page 106.

[52] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) suggested that point (*b*) of paragraph I should be separated from the resolution and referred to Resolution 1.3. Resolution 1.32 could be substituted for 1.321 in paragraph III.

[53] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked whether the Directors of International Schools were the right people to do the work envisaged.

[54] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that they were one of the bodies entrusted with the organization of the 1949 seminars. The $200, under fees, were intended to cover the secretarial expenses of the meeting.

[55] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested drawing the Programme and Budget Commission's attention to the fact that 1.32 was a title and not a resolution proper. In connexion with paragraph V (page 106), he asked if the work would be done in co-operation with the National Commissions as had been done in France. He thought paragraph VII could best be referred to the National Commissions and the fees eliminated; the same was also true of paragraph VIII. With regard to paragraph X, he thought adequate materials for the purpose stated were already available in various forms. Paragraph XI should be referred to the National Commissions, while paragraph XII probably overlapped with paragraph VI in so far as travel expenses were concerned.

[56] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that WHO was spending $200,000 in the field of mental hygiene. He was not certain that Unesco need spend the $8,000 mentioned in paragraph VIII. In conclusion he suggested—in view of the large number of expert meetings and conferences whose subjects were often closely related—that substantial economies could be obtained by more important meetings at less frequent intervals.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Natural Sciences [Part III, Chapter 2].

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.2.A].

[1] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), as a general observation, remarked that there were various items for the purchase of books and periodicals in the budget, and suggested that all such items might be grouped under the Library Service to avoid risk of duplicating purchases.

[2] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that all actual purchasing of books and periodicals was done by the Library Service, but that, for specialized book requirements, they were charged against the budgets of the various units in conformity with the method of showing a project budget.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION, SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS [III.2.B (1)].

[3] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) asked, with respect to item 2.113, whether the World Health Organization also made a financial contribution and, if so, what was the percentage of the contributions made by WHO and Unesco.

[4] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that the World Health Organization did in fact make the larger contribution in money, goods and services, the percentages being 70 to 30.

[5] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that there was no programme resolution attached to item I on page 117, and felt that the Committee was not therefore empowered to approve requests for funds for this item.

[6] He was supported by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), who felt that the Committee must have a specific programme resolution to correspond with each request for the allocation of funds. If funds were allocated without the specific programme resolution, the result would be a series of hidden reserves in the budget.

[7] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that it was almost impossible to cost the entire budget by programme resolutions, as provision had to be made for general overheads.

[8] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) added that, although not a reserve, funds such as these were essential in the programme departments in order to obtain advice needed eighteen months from the time of consideration of the budget.

[9] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) agreed that allowance must be made for overheads, but did feel that specific resolutions should be attached to requests for funds for the programme, and suggested that the Committee should pass a resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission to this effect.

[10] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation could not agree with the general principle of having a specific resolution to cover each budget item.

[11] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) pointed out that the General Committee had that morning decided to transmit to the Programme and Budget Commission and the Budget Committee a resolution submitted by the United Kingdom with regard to the co-ordination of the programme and the budget. The Budget Committee would therefore discuss this matter at a later stage.

[12] In view of this, and on the suggestion of Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), it was *decided* that it would not be in order to pass a formal resolution on this matter at the present time.

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that the Committee should merely note in passing that, in examining proposals in the budget under its existing form, the Committee had found on occasions that items for which funds were requested did not seem to be supported by a programme resolution. *Agreed.*

[14] In reply to questions, Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) gave an explanation of the way in which Unesco controlled the financial aid it gave to outside organizations. Each organization receiving money from Unesco submitted its programme of work to the Secretariat and the Executive Board for consideration and approval. If, for any reason, the organization could not use the funds provided by Unesco in the manner requested, full explanations had to be submitted to the Secretariat and the Executive Board and prior approval obtained for new plans utilizing Unesco monies.

[15] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked what criteria Unesco used in determining the amount of contributions to outside organizations: was this a programme of continuing support?

[16] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that the authority for such contribution was contained in Article I (*c*) of the Unesco Constitution, and that the amount was decided by the amount of money available in the Unesco budget in conjunction with the requirements of the various recipient organizations. As he knew of no higher or more competent inter-governmental authority than Unesco in the field of science, it was Unesco itself which decided the size of its contributions to other scientific organizations. Generally, when it co-operated with another organization to organize a scientific congress or other similar activity, Unesco contributed about 50 per cent of the total amount, but Professor Auger emphasized that, in addition, the inviting country or town usually provided most generous services, the value of which frequently exceeded the total amount provided by the two organizations.

[17] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked for further explanation with regard to items such as 2.115 whereby Unesco provided financial aid and services to assist the activities of the International Union for the Protection of Nature. He asked what was the proportion of the contribution made by Unesco as compared to the contribution provided by the organization receiving a grant.

[18] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that such contributions were not so much grants-in-aid as contracts whereby Unesco contracted with the Union concerned to carry out a certain task. The financial payment made to the Union was actually for services rendered.

[19] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) felt that Unesco should continue to give maximum aid to existing organizations in order to increase their facilities and make the best possible use of their trained personnel.

[20] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) remarked that the same general points he had raised during the discussion on the Department of Education applied also to the Department of Natural Sciences. With regard to the large sums being requested for publications, he would like to know the percentage of these publications which could be sold and what income could be expected from them.

[21] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that, under the present publications policy of the Organization, every effort was being made to reduce the number of free distributions of publications. A publications revolving fund had been established under authority of the Third Session of the General Conference, as amended by the General Conference at its Fourth Session, providing that all receipts reverted to the publications fund. The Director-General was required to report twice yearly on the state of this fund to the Executive Board.

[22] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) asked if the Committee could incorporate in its general report the suggestion that a balance sheet of publications costs and receipts be prepared and circulated to each session of the General Conference. He felt that, in addition to providing useful financial information, it would enable delegates and the Secretariat to see clearly which publications were selling successfully and which fields of Unesco's work were most popular.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE AND MATERIAL [III.2.B (2)].

[23] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) assured Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) that the OEEC and the International Organization for Standardization were being fully consulted in carrying out item 2.131.

FIELD SCIENCE CO-OPERATION OFFICES [III.2.C].

[24] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) assured Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) that the Director-General held full consultations with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and all Directors-General of Specialized Agencies before submitting plans for the location of a Field Science Co-operation Office, in order to ensure the maximum co-ordination of all branches of the United Nations.

ASSISTANCE TO RESEARCH FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF MANKIND [III.2.D].

[25] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the proposed International Institute of the Arid Zone had no resources outside Unesco at the present time. However, as soon as the Constitution of the Institute was established, it was expected that several countries interested in this project would make contributions.

TEACHING AND POPULARIZATION OF SCIENCE [III.2.E].

[26] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) and Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) both emphasized that they felt several items under this heading could be dealt with more effectively and more economically by National Commissions rather than by the employment of Unesco personnel.

[27] The CHAIRMAN agreed that these remarks would be taken into account in the report of the Committee.

NATURAL SCIENCES INDIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS [III.2.F].

[28] No comments.

Social Sciences [Part III, Chapter 3].

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.3.A].

[29] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), seconded by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), pointed out that the personnel chart for this department (page 142) indicated a very high percentage of secretarial and clerical staff in proportion to the number of high grades.
[30] It was *agreed* to bear this matter in mind for later consideration.

AID TO INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION [III.3.B].

[31] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having asked what percentage of the total revenue of the organizations grouped under paragraph 1 on page 147 was supplied by Unesco, Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) replied that, since these organizations had only been formed during 1949 and 1950, their revenue outside Unesco was still very small, perhaps 10 to 20 per cent—the exception being the International Studies Conference which was revived after the war. However, they were all making great efforts to increase their membership and raise more funds.

[32] Dr. Angell also assured Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) that, with regard to paragraph IV (page 148), he did not feel that the number of surveys to be undertaken should be reduced. A meeting had already been held in Paris; the other organizations concerned were most enthusiastic and plans were well prepared for the completion of this task in an efficient manner.

STUDIES OF SOCIAL TENSIONS [III.3.C].

[33] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that items 3.24 and 3.25 had been left vague intentionally, as Unesco wished to consult a group of experts meeting in July in order to formulate the most important and most useful types of studies to make in this connexion.

Reports of the Budget Committee.

[34] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Chairman of the Executive Board wished to make a statement before the Committee adjourned.

[35] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) explained that the creation of this new type of Budget Committee was an experiment suggested by the Executive Board, and he outlined the type of reports it was hoped the Committee might be able to make:

(1) A provisional report to the Programme and Budget Commission before its meetings devoted to consideration of the programme for 1951. This report might indicate how far the Budget Committee felt that the budget presented by the Director-General corresponded with the programme presented by the Executive Board and how accurate and reasonable that budget was.

(2) A report indicating specific areas where it was thought general economies could be made; this report should be made preferably before the Programme and Budget Commission discussed a provisional total budget figure.

(3) A final report on the budget in the light of the total budget figure voted, in the light of decisions taken on the programme by the Programme and Budget Commission.

[36] Finally, if the Committee had sufficient time, the General Conference would appreciate a recommendation as to the method which might be used in preparing and considering the budget at the next session.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Constitution of a Drafting Committee.

[1] The CHAIRMAN suggested that Sir Ronald Adam (United Kingdom), Mr. Sedar Senghor (France) and the officers of the Committee should form a drafting committee which could begin work that evening on its interim report. *Agreed.*

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Social Sciences (*continued*) [Part III, Chapter 3].

STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION [III.3.D].

[2] Mr. KIRPAL (India) asked why the various consultants mentioned in sections II and IV, on pages 156 and 157, should be drawn from North America and Western Europe.

[3] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that the very specialized studies envisaged required personnel with a very particular kind of training, which at present was available only in those areas.

[4] Mr. KIRPAL (India) did not think such a selection should be settled in advance.

[5] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that, in an attempt to make the best possible estimate of costs, it had been necessary to choose the geographical area from which the consultants were likely to come.

[6] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) hoped the Secretariat would in future try to avoid the implication that experts could not be found elsewhere than in the areas listed.

[7] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) wondered why the World Federation of United Nations Associations received no subvention in 1951. It had organized five two-week seminars and one six-week seminar with 590 participants at a cost of $10,700 of Unesco's money, whereas Unesco's one seminar with 82 participants from 32 countries had cost $55,000. This showed that independent organizations did more work for less money and should be encouraged by grants.

[8] The CHAIRMAN thought the question was one for the Programme and Budget Commission to consider.

[9] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) agreed with resolutions 3.31 and 3.32, but he did not see the necessity for the two expert meetings—of eight and ten members respectively—when Unesco's three specialists could formulate the plans themselves.

[10] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that there would be only two Programme Specialists in 1951. The studies described in 3.31 and 3.32 were most important and it was felt that the best possible advice was indispensable.

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), referring to section IV on page 157, asked for information as to the difference between Consultants ($6,300) and Fees ($2,400).

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the rules and regulations of the Organization were responsible for this difference; the first item covered the $20, $35 or $50 a day which consultants received; the second item was for extremely junior membres of the teams who were given a flat bilateral contract on a fixed monthly basis.

[13] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wished to draw a distinction between the programme and the budgetary aspects of the question. A great deal of work, by the Carnegie Foundation, the Association for Economic Planning and the United Nations was going on in that field, and he hoped their work would be taken into account by the Programme and Budget Commission.

[14] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) asked if the Travel expenses mentioned in section II and IV, of $900 and $700 respectively, could not be reduced by sending one person instead of two. He also wished to know if the other Specialized Agencies participated in the work envisaged under resolutions 3.33 and 3.34.

[15] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that Dr. Sharp was in closest touch with all the other Specialized Agencies and the UN, as well as with the non-governmental organizations working in that field. The meetings and travel were budgeted separately, but, if it was found possible to merge them, the suggested saving would be realized. Unesco was the only Agency with a Social Science Department, and the other Agencies looked to it for that kind of work.

[16] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was concerned at the disproportion between the permanent personnel costs of the Department (about $110,000) and the sums for fees, consultants and contracts (over $145,000).

[17] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the approximate percentage of funds for personnel services was 55 per cent in Social Sciences, 47 per cent in Natural Sciences, 53 per cent in Education and 57 per cent in Cultural Activities.

[18] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) stressed that a great deal of Social Science work was farmed out because it was practically impossible to do all the research required at headquarters. The comparatively small staff of the Department was able to examine, analyse and co-ordinate the work done outside because it worked hard. Finally, in the last three years, the Department had built up all over the world groups of friends who helped and advised, and formed a sort of additional staff.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked if the Secretariat could supply the Committee with a written statement of ICSU'S accounts.

Cultural Activities [Part III, Chapter 4].

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.4.A].

[20] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked for written information concerning the hospitality standards referred to in the last two lines on page 164.

UNESCO LIBRARY [III.4.B.]

[21] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the Beirut Conference had decided on the creation of an historian's post to ensure the collection of all the documentation about General Conferences and Executive Board decisions.

[22] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of the Netherlands, expressed the view that the sum of $15,000 for the purchase of books seemed large.

[23] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) agreed that books could often be borrowed in Paris; but many of them, essential for the daily work of the Organization, had to be purchased by Unesco because they were constantly needed by the various departments. Last year, the library had acquired 4,532 books and 1,258 periodicals.

[24] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having asked the Secretariat for a statement showing the sums spent on the purchase of books by the different departments, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that all the relevant figures could be found on pages 318 and 319 of document 5C/5 (II).

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES [III.4.C].

[25] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought the International Co-operation Section seemed to do the work for which grants-in-aid were usually given. He asked for more information concerning the work of the Head of the Division and pointed out the high proportion of clerical staff in the composition of the Division.

[26] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was sure money could be saved by increasing the grant to the CIPSH (International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies) and leaving it to do all the work outlined in resolution 4.11.

[27] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) reminded the Committee that CIPSH was only fifteen months old. It was developing extremely well, but had not attained full growth and could not yet deal with all the requests it received; these had to be sifted by Unesco, which also had to consider the questions of grants and publications. The grade 10 Programme Assistant was really the permanent secretary of CIPSH whose other staff was entirely voluntary. The grade 14 Specialist was more particularly in charge of technical negotiations, while the Head of the Division looked after the orientation of international studies and all other questions, and advised CIPSH on many problems including the choice of new members. Some tasks were left to CIPSH because it was already able to undertake them, but others were the Secretariat's own responsibility by decision of the Conference itself.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought the tasks in resolutions 4.122, 4.123 and 4.124—all international questions—could be

carried out by CIPSH or by the National Commissions.

[29] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked whether it was a sound policy to have CIPSH'S permanent secretary on Unesco's budget.

[30] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed with Sir Ronald Adam and Mr. Roseman. The period of nursing and nurturing of an international organization should be as brief as possible.

[31] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, for the first years of the life of a new organization, it was indispensable that Unesco should assist it directly in its daily work. It was the Director-General's intention that this period should be as short as possible. He pointed out, in connexion with paragraphs II and III (pages 171 and 172), that the General Conference decisions, which were being discussed by the Official and External Relations Commission, gave no criteria as to the character and duration of that assistance.

[32] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained in connexion with resolutions 4.123 and 4.124 that it was intended to enlist the help of the International Federation for Philosophical Sciences. The National Commissions would be asked to help in selecting the people to be invited to participate in the symposium. Technical international surveys could be entrusted to an international organization, but not the more general ones which needed the Member States' collaboration. In passing, he explained that National Commissions were not mentioned in the Work Plan because consulting them was one of the standard working methods of the Secretariat.

[33] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that the sums for "consultants" and "travel" could be saved if the work was entrusted to a non-governmental organization.

[34] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured him that National Commissions would be asked for much more than help in the selection of participants in the symposium.

[35] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought "travel on official business" was always Secretariat travel.

[36] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that consultants always received their travel expenses, unless locally recruited.

[37] Referring to paragraph IV (page 172), Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) stressed that the project under resolution 4.122 was quite simple and could be referred to the National Commissions. The only fee needed was a small one for the consolidation of their reports.

[38] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) emphasized that the proposed plan was based on two years' experience. 4.122 was a very complex question, and it was hoped that the National Commissions would help; but really valuable collaboration could not be secured without some financial compensation: the $4,000 were intended to cover about twenty fees of $200 each.

[39] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) held that 4.122 was not an individual but a team job: the appropriate National Commission could assemble the teams which would cover the three points of the resolution.

[40] Mr. KIRPAL (India) thought the Work Plan rather vague and unsubstantial. He associated himself with the previous speakers. He wished to know how many conferences and meetings would be necessary to prepare the symposium referred to in paragraph III (page 172), and what was the meaning of "oriental studies" in Resolution 4.1112.

[41] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the plural in the brackets in paragraph III was an administrative practice. In reply to Mr. Kirpal, he said that Unesco wished to group in a permanent federation the many existing associations for oriental studies whose next Congress would be held at Istambul in 1951.

[42] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) wished to know how, at the initial stage of the work, the Organization would spend the $33,400 mentioned in paragraph VI.

[43] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that the project voted in Mexico, and discussed at Beirut and Paris, was fairly advanced. Its plan was prepared in December 1949 and the comments of ten National Commissions and those of others had been received. If the Conference approved the plan, money would be needed in 1951 for the creation of an international steering committee and for fees for contributions to the first volume of the History.

[44] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) emphasized once again that he would prefer the $4,410 for the post of permanent secretary to the CIPSH to be carried by the regular Unesco budget.

ARTS AND LETTERS (III.4.D).

[45] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked

if the articles envisaged in paragraph 1 on page 179 could not be inserted in the *International Arts Review*, or the *Courier*, to avoid more publications.

[46] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was of the opinion that the National Commissions could contribute those articles without fees.

[47] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) recalled that the first two numbers of the *Bulletin* had already appeared. It was thought that such very specialized material should be published separately and not in the rather popular *International Arts Review* . Material from the National Commissions had been received and published, but some technical articles ought to be contributed by specialists who had to be remunerated.

[48] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the cost of transportation and repairs of the exhibition mentioned in paragraph II, page 179, could be covered by the recipient States.

[49] In reply to Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the $1,000 for Other Contractual Items (paragraph II, page 179) was intended to meet the assembling and packing of the materials sent by the different countries.

[50] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of the Netherlands and referring to paragraph XII on page 180, asked if the round trip of a Unesco official to the United States could not be economized by making the New York Office do the work.

[51] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the *International Arts Review*'s budget for 1950 was $7,500 for fees and $3,000 for contributions, for two numbers only. The figures were actually slightly reduced by devaluation. He reminded the Committee that the project was conceived as an asset of the Organization and not as item of expenditure; the three European editions of 10,000 copies each, published in London, Paris and Zürich, and the 120,000 copies printed in the United States of America—of which the total figure should reach 300,000 copies after one year—should, according to expert estimation, produce $60,000 in royalties.

[52] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) was glad to note that the Department of Cultural Activities was able to contribute to Unesco's finances. On the other hand, he was of the opinion that the varied sums listed in paragraph VII (page 180) for catalogues were excessive.

[53] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the Mozart and folk music catalogues could not be produced more cheaply. Their publication was entrusted to a private firm, but long and fairly expensive preparations had been needed. The catalogues should sell as well as that on Chopin, and therefore also produce some royalties.

[54] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) asked if some of the money collected in the Publications Revolving Fund would be used for the 1951 budget.

[55] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Publications Revolving Fund was set up outside the budget and not included in the organization's accounts. The Director-General reported twice annually as to the deposits to, and withdrawals from, the Fund. It was a little early to decide whether some of its assets could be used for Programme activities.

[56] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) was glad to learn that the *International Arts Review* was self-supporting. He asked for information on the position with regard to reproductions and to *Museum*.

[57] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) was concerned at the diffusion of responsibility in connexion with exhibitions and asked the Secretariat for some information on the matter.

[58] The Committee *decided* to hear the Secretariat's replies after the lunch recess.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

later: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Cultural Activities (*continued*) [Part III, Chapter 4].

ARTS AND LETTERS (*continued*) [III.4.D].

[1] In reply to the Mr. Roseman's question regarding exhibitions, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the need for an exhibition was determined on the basis of programme requirements. Sometimes a specific instruction was contained in a programme resolution while on other occasions, the Executive Board authorized an exhibition as being necessary for the effective fulfilment of a programme resolution. A member of the staff of the Department of Mass Communication undertook the co-ordination necessary within the Secretariat to prepare such exhibitions. The best possible use was made of services within the Organization, and outside assistance was only contracted for in very special circumstances.

[2] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) promised to supply a financial statement relating to the International Theatre Institute and an indication of the amounts and probable sources of income of the International Music Council.

[3] In reply to further questions, Mr. Thomas explained that fees for the Translation of Great Works together with publishing costs were shared on a fifty-fifty basis by Unesco and the Government concerned. On the basis of 450 copies, the present cost to Unesco per book translated and published was on an everage $610. In 1951, the Secretariat proposed to participate in the translation of thirty books.

[4] For the information of Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Mr. THOMAS explained that Unesco did not contribute funds or services to the actual work of colour reproduction, but merely facilitated sales; in return, it was the custom of publishers to grant a reduction on sales made to National Commissions through Unesco. With regard to *Museum*, the present number of subscribers totalled 1,100; this showed a large increase on last year, and it was hoped to reach the figure of 2,000 very soon.

[5] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked whether it would not be possible to save the $4,500 provided for the proposed meeting under items 4.251 and 4.252 by asking the writers and artists concerned to send written reports which Unesco would circulate instead of holding a meeting.

[6] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Fourth Session of the General Conference had expressed a strong desire that Unesco should assist and collaborate closely with the International P.E.N. Clubs, and Unesco had been particularly requested to organize this meeting.

[7] However, it was *agreed* that there was some confusion in the wording of the resolution, which might be clarified by the Programme and Budget Commission.

MUSEUMS AND HISTORICAL MONUMENTS [III.4.E].

[8] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked the Secretariat to supply a breakdown of the total costs in this section as proportioned between items 4.3 (Museums) and items 4.4 (Historical Monuments).

[9] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) also requested a financial statement on International Council of Museums.

[10] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) having remarked on the large amount requested for travel in paragraph III (page 186), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that, although this project had been studied and discussed by Unesco for some time, it had not been possible before to take any specific action. In 1951, it was proposed to implement a

proposal made by several Member States to bring an exhibition of Mexican Art to Europe. It was for this project that the money was required.

[11] Replying to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. THOMAS explained that the phrase "or the provision of services" in item 4.31 referred merely to the provision by Unesco of office space and local telephone facilities in Paris.

[12] Mr. KIRPAL (India) having asked what form of assistance to Member States ($10,000) was proposed under item 4,42, Mr. THOMAS said that, on the request of a Member State, Unesco would send a mission of three people for three months. He emphasized however that the requesting Member State would be expected to pay the expenses of the mission during its stay.

[13] On item 4.41, Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) suggested that, instead of establishing a new Advisory Committee, Unesco should take advantage of the experience of one of the non-governmental organizations already established. In this way he thought that the necessity for holding an annual meeting at a cost of $8,000 could be avoided.

[14] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that this would not be an entirely new advisory committee. Before the war, an International Office of Museums had existed under the League of Nations; it was on the experience of this body, and on a decision of the Third Session of the General Conference, that it had been decided to re-establish a body of this nature. The Secretariat was convinced, moreover, of the necessity for having an advisory body entirely at the disposal of Unesco. A non-governmental organization could not meet this requirement.

LIBRARIES AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES [III.4.F].

[15] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) raised the question of the International Book Coupon Scheme. His Government felt that this scheme must stand or fall on its administrative efficiency. The object must surely be to ensure the greatest possible distribution of books at the lowest possible administrative cost. He would be glad of further information as to the total cost of this scheme in 1949 and 1950, as it appeared that far too few Book Coupons were being distributed in relation to the high costs of planning, launching and administering this scheme. Mr. Pollock also requested information as to the disposition of the soft-currencies received by Unesco in exchange for Book Coupons.

[16] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) could not agree that the administrative costs were so extremely high. He estimated that present overheads amounted to approximately 3 per cent of the total turnover, although, in view of the revolving capital involved, it was difficult to estimate overheads accurately. He explained that the amount of dollars made available by Unesco for this scheme was fixed in consultation with the Executive Board on the basis of the amount of dollars available to the Organization, having regard to the hard-currency requirements of Unesco itself. Moreover, there was no danger that the Organization would not, in the normal course of its business, be able to utilize all the soft-currency it acquired in operating this scheme.

[17] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) added that a total of four staff members were employed on the administration of this scheme, and reminded delegates that it had now been extended to cover not only books but also documentary and scientific films, etc.

[18] The CHAIRMAN assured the delegate of Canada that his remarks on this subject would be included in the general report of the Committee to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[19] In reply to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. E. J. CARTER (Head, Libraries Division) explained that Unesco's role under item 4.532 was to stimulate the development and co-ordinate the operation of national centres for the exchange and distribution of books; the Secretariat never actually handled books the books itself.

[20] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested that the sum of $1,000 provided to hold a meeting to co-ordinate the activities of the International Federation of Libraries Associations, the International Federation of Documentation and the International Council of Archives could be deleted, and the necessary degree of co-ordination achieved by correspondance.

[21] Mr. E. J. CARTER (Head, Libraries Division) replied that the three organizations concerned were autonomous bodies with overlapping interests and Unesco was convinced that, in order to ensure adequate co-ordination, an actual meeting of the representatives concerned was essential.

[22] In connexion with items 4.52 and 4.521, Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked how much longer it was estimated Unesco would be required to continue a grant for the maintenance of ex-German Libraries in Italy.

[23] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that, in spite of continued efforts, the future of these libraries still remained unsettled. Many remained closed through lack of funds. Unesco had now been asked to undertake a positive survey with a view to reaching an agreement on this matter. In the meantime, another small grant had been requested.

[24] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) said that his Government did not feel that it was within Unesco's competence to carry out the task proposed under item 4.5513: Unesco should merely provide clearing-house services in this respect and the sum of $5,000 requested for Fees should be deleted.

[25] It was *decided* to defer discussion on this item until after consideration of the Programme by the Programme and Budget Commission.

COPYRIGHT [III.4.G].

[26] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that, although his Government had supported publication of the *International Copyright Bulletin* (item 4.61), they now felt that the scope of the *Bulletin* extended far beyond the limits originally intended and should therefore be reduced with consequent economies. In addition, his Government felt that it should not be necessary for Unesco to convene both the committees referred to under items 4.62 and 4.621: the work of preparing for a Universal Copyright Convention could be accomplished by the Secretariat with the assistance of one or other of these expert committees.

[27] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) replied that there was a big question of time and rhythm of work involved. This was a very complicated matter and, at the rate of work planned, he felt that it would not be possible for the Secretariat to work without consulting an expert committee in 1950 and again in 1951. In addition, it must be remembered that participants in such committees not only provided the Secretariat with expert advice and opinions, but also conveyed the views of their governments with regard to the proposed Universal Copyright Convention. The second committee of experts could not be convened until after the next session of the General Conference had given a decision with regard to the establishment of an Inter-Governmental Conference to prepare the text of the Universal Copyright Convention.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that some economies should certainly be made under this project.

[29] It was *decided* to give the matter further consideration after the Programme and Budget Commission had reported on the programme.

[30] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured M. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) that the Unesco *Bulletin* was produced in collaboration with the Berne Bureau although, as the Berne *Bulletin* dealt with matters relating only to implementation of the Berne Convention, it was not possible for the two bulletins to be combined.

[31] For the information of Mr. BALEEIRO (Brazil), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) outlined the regulations governing the Publications Revolving Fund, and explained that the specific uses to which this fund might be put could be found under Programme Resolution 25.2 in the records of the Fourth Session of the General Conference [document 4C/Resolutions].

SERVICE FOR CULTURAL LIAISON IN THE MIDDLE EAST [III.4.H].

[32] No comments.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Friday, 26 May 1950, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Mass Communication [Part III, Chapter 6].

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.6.A].

[1] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the staff of the Director's Office was rather large, although the Department itself was not the largest in the Organization.

[2] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) queried the necessity for the posts of Executive Officer (grade 12), Administrative Officer (grade 10) and Assistant (grade 6), in view of the elaborate structure of the remainder of the Department.

[3] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the relative size of the Director's personnel was conditioned by the fact that the Department had much more varied activities than the others. The Executive Officer was the Director's personal representative: he supervised all the Division's work, dealt with correspondence and received reports of outside groups on purely Programme activities. The Administrative Officer and the Assistant looked after liaison with the Administrative, Budget and Personnel units.

[4] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) drew attention to the disproportion between the total number of posts of the Department (111) and the number of secretaries, stenographers and typists (41): the Division of Improvement of Means and Techniques, for instance, comprised as many as seven secretaries.

[5] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stressed that the general means of communication such as radio scripts, special articles, press releases (in many copies), etc., demanded a higher proportion of clerical assistance than in the other departments.

[6] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought considerable economies could be made by having a stenographic pool instead of personal secretaries.

[7] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that most of the secretaries shown were not attached to a particular person; they worked for any member of their division who happened to need it. It was a fact, however, that the efficiency of secretarial staff was increased by assigning them repeatedly to the same type of work. The grade 6 secretary was attached to the head of the division, while those of grade 4 took bilingual dictation in shorthand from the programme specialists and assistants.

[8] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought the whole question of secretaries and clerical staff ought to be discussed in a general way and the CHAIRMAN agreed with him.

IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATION [III.6.B].

[9] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) stated that his delegation was very interested in paragraph 1 (page 224). He asked whether the general trend was towards an increase or a decrease of clearing-house services.

[10] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that in 1949 there had been no clearing-house; in 1950 the service was being prepared and started, and it would be fully fledged in 1951. The clearing-house services would make available the information for which there were numerous requests, and the standing consultative committees would be a permanent core of highly qualified experts to be consulted by correspondence.

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) hoped National Commissions would be consulted in the formation of those committees. He asked for information concerning Other Contractual Items ($7,000).

[12] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) assured him that National Commissions would be applied to; in fact the clearing-house idea was the development of a suggestion made by a member of a National Commission. The $7,000 could be broken down into two parts: $5,000 for the continuation of a service which had existed since the very beginning of

Unesco for the collection of press clippings and $2,000 for specific clippings on Mass Communication matters.

In reply to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. SCHNEIDER stated that the press clippings service collected and analysed major articles mentioning Unesco, on a weekly basis.

[13] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of the Netherlands and referring to paragraph II on page 224, thought the cost of the surveyors rather high, especially for reports which might be obsolete by the time they were issued. He asked whether it was really necessary to have an expert committee costing $8,000, when the printing of its report cost $7,000.

[14] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) held that costly personal visits of Unesco officials to remote countries like his own could often be dispensed with, and the same results achieved by correspondence.

[15] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) agreed that it was not impossible to obtain information by correspondence, but pointed out that this method was usually extremely slow. The Unesco officers who went on these journeys established very useful personal contacts for the future, which would help to keep the information up to date after the survey period was over, that is after 1951. The 1947 surveys had revealed the fact that salary, *per diem*, etc., was a more expensive method than the payment of fees. Finally, the findings of the surveys would be submitted to meetings of experts and representatives of the countries surveyed for approval and advice as to the action to be taken, not only in 1951, but also in years to come.

[16] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) wished to know the number of clippings collected over a certain period and to see a sample of an analysis. He asked how much staff-time would be devoted to the activities under paragraph III and what financial basis there was for the statement that it was cheaper to employ outside surveyors rather than staff members.

[17] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stated that the number of clippings varied from 600 to 800 a week, rising to 1,000 during major conferences. He informed the committee that he would cause an analysis to be sent from Paris immediately. Keeping the surveys up to date absorbed about 10 per cent of staff-time, and this figure would increase in proportion to the number of countries surveyed; there were some thirty left. The reason why surveyors were cheaper to use than staff members was that they received a flat fee of $100 a week.

[18] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph V, asked if there was enough money in the fellowships scheme to bring people out for study purposes, a method his delegation preferred to the sending of experts to countries in need of advice.

[19] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said there were nine Mass Communication fellowships in the Exchange of Persons programme. The countries which did not consider their radio systems satisfactory usually asked for the visit of a specialist.

[20] Mr. DESJARDINS (Department of Mass Communication) added that one of Unesco's experts was also head of the radio in his country; that country had asked for a mission to help start a schoolbroadcasting scheme and it was giving substantial support to the mission.

[21] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked if the money requested for those missions could be spent this year and how many missions were envisaged.

[22] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) declared that the money would be spent because two missions had already been requested, and it was expected that the third would be asked for before the end of the present session of the General Conference.

[23] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) advocated that the Committee should recommend uniform conditions for all the missions sent out.

[24] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked the Secretariat for an estimate of the proportion of the $20,000 which would be used for missions dealing with communication facilities and for those related to the Programme.

[25] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stated that the two missions already asked for were (1) for education, films and broadcasting and (2) on audio-visual means of education. Priorities would be the same as for the activities in paragraph IV.

[26] Referring to the third paragraph on page 224, Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked what proportion of the budget would be devoted to the Braille project.

[27] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that it entailed the expenditure of $32,400, and would be presented by the Executive Board to the Programme and Budget Commission as an amendment to the Programme.

REDUCTION OF OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION [III.6.C].

[28] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) thought the section was excellent, but he had some doubts concerning "facilitating trade agreements to overcome currency difficulties" in resolution 6.25. He thought the Committee should say that Unesco should not attempt to facilitate trade agreements.

[29] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) supported Mr. Pollock's point of view. Referring to paragraph IV (page 231), he asked for the dates of the conferences at which Unesco would be represented, and expressed some concern at the large number of expert observers the Organization would require.

[30] Mr. BEHRSTOCK (Department of Mass Communication) stressed that Unesco did not want to work in the economic field; but it had managed, with the help of certain specialized organizations, to promote the freedom of exchange of educational materials. Only one senior member of the staff would attend the conferences in question in order to stress certain of their educational, scientific and cultural aspects. The Executive Board believed that Unesco could and should promote trade agreements of benefit to its aims. He felt certain that a good deal could also be accomplished by Unesco at Bangkok and Torquay.

[31] In reply to Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR, Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stressed that no expert would accompany a staff member; either one or the other would be sent alone, dependent on the degree of technicality and the place of the meeting. Dates for the 1951 conferences had not yet been fixed and no possibility of economy was being overlooked by the Department.

[32] Mr. BALEEIRO (Brazil) asked if the policy with regard to contractual printing was sufficiently concentrated and standardized.

[33] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that administrative responsibility for contractual printing was centralized in the Documents and Publications Service which had production, distribution and sales divisions.

[34] In reply to Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the $2,000 for fees in paragraphs III and V were overall figures and included not only compensation for the intellectual effort of the expert, but also his secretariat assistance, research and travel.

[35] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) wondered whether anything worth while could be achieved in that field on $2,000.

[36] Mr. BEHRSTOCK (Department of Mass Communication) gave examples of the type of studies made for Unesco which had cost $2,000 each: (1) a work on world legislation concerning Press, Radio and Films; (2) *Trade Barriers and Knowledge* prepared by the London *Economist;* (3) a work on the production, distribution and contents of newsreels; (4) a compilation of world documentation on Press, Radio and Films prepared at the request of the United Nations Free Flow of Information Commission.

[37] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) drew attention to the danger of overlapping within the Secretariat itself: the 6.25 item was already being worked on by the Department of Natural Sciences and the Relief Assistance Services; 6.26 was a matter for the Exchange of Persons Department. He considered that the works cited by Mr. Behrstock were precise subjects, whereas those referred to in resolutions 6.23 and 6.29 were not so clearly defined.

[38] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) assured Mr. Weeden that the question of inter-relation of techniques was being given very careful attention by the Secretariat.

ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO [III.6.D].

[39] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) enquired about the present cost of the *Courier* and the possibility of increasing its production without an appreciable increase of costs.

[40] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) wished to know at what public the *Courier* was aimed.

[41] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) suggested that the Head of Documents and Publications Service would be able to answer Mr. Roseman's question when the corresponding chapter of the Estimates was discussed.

[42] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the aim of the *Courier* was to give all possible news of Unesco to all those people who were neither the highest élite nor the amorphous masses, i.e., to what he might describe as the "medium" élite composed of secretaries of Trade Unions, schoolteachers, doctors and other friends of Unesco.

[43] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) drew

attention to the various figures on pages 236 and 237 and emphasized the necessity, if not of decreasing personnel expenses, at least of not increasing them.

[44] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) declared that these figures for personnel and other objects of expenditure were a matter of balance and of applying the best possible judgment as to the manner of accomplishing the work in hand. He had found an increase of personnel necessary to perform the tasks assigned to the Department by the General Conference, but the Committee could be certain that every possibility of economy had been borne in mind.

[45] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) wished to point out that the disparity between the figures for Other Objects of Expenditure on page 237 was not as great as it appeared at first glance, because the 1949 total included more than $27,000 for the purchase of equipment—a non-recurring expense. Furthermore, considerable changes had been made in the work of the Department between 1949 and 1951: there was now far less contracting out and more work was being done by the staff itself, for instance the Radio Bulletin and the Press Service.

[46] Mr. SEDAR SENGHOR (France) thanked the Secretariat for the explanations he had received.

[47] Referring to paragraphs A, B and C at the top of page 241, Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) drew attention to the possibility of the overlapping of those activities which were related to the Training Centre in Mexico, and those for which the $17,000 referred to in paragraph XIV (page 243) were earmarked. In his opinion, this was another place for the active participation of National Commissions with a view to better co-ordination and reduction of expenses.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Friday, 26 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Mass Communication (*continued*) [Part III, Chapter 6].

ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO [III.6.D].

[1] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) remarked that the sum of $500 each for ten feature scripts requested under paragraph IX.B (page 241) appeared to be extremely high. He felt that Unesco should be able to obtain suitable scripts at a much lower cost.

[2] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that, on his past experience both inside and outside Unesco, he could assure delegates that this was the average price necessary to obtain the type of first-class script required by Unesco.

[3] On this same item Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that at its last session the General Conference had decided that Unesco should not supply Member States with actual scripts for broadcasting, but merely with information enabling the Member State to prepare its own broadcast script.

[4] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that the Secretariat had to differentiate between Member States in this respect. as some preferred to be supplied with an actual script.

[5] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), referring to the four exhibitions it was proposed to organize under paragraph XI (page 241), suggested that the Secretariat might gain experience by organizing only one or two exhibitions for a start.

[6] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) assured the Committee that the Secretariat already had a great deal of

experience in organizing exhibitions and circulating them to different Member States. He emphasized that each exhibition proposed would be shown in several cities or universities.

[7] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) thought that, under item 6.38 (page 233), the words "financially independent" should be stressed and that Unesco should exercise the maximum discretion in this respect.

Exchange of Persons [Part III, Chapter 5].

SERVICE COSTS [III.5.A].

[8] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) queried the amount allocated for travel in this service, which he felt was too high in view of the small size of the service.

[9] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that a certain amount of travel, especially outside Europe, was becoming increasingly necessary as the programme of the Service expanded.

CLEARING-HOUSE AND PROMOTION [III.5.B].

[10] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) gave a specific example of how items in different programme departments appeared to overlap, and suggested that, in order to ensure the closest co-ordination and utmost economy, the Secretariat should even consider the amalgamation of such projects. He referred in particular to item 6.26 in the Mass Communication programme [III.6.C] and item 5.14 in the Exchange of Persons programme [III.5.B].

[11] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that, in this respect, the two sections of the Secretariat co-operated and worked as a team, the Department of Mass Communication making use of the information collected by the Exchange of Persons Service.

[12] On item 5.23, Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that Unesco could really do no more than collect information on the exchange of teachers, as this was an essentially bilateral field of work.

[13] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) agreed that this was mainly a bilateral matter, but explained that Unesco's purpose was to bring the people concerned in the exchange of teachers together with the object of broadening the scope of the scheme and increasing the number of exchanges.

[14] Referring to the same item (paragraph VIII, page 209), Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that the sum of $1,300 for a contract with an as yet unspecified non-governmental organization should be deleted, and that Unesco should make use of National Commissions in this respect. He also requested that, under paragraph IX (page 209), National Commissions should be consulted by Unesco before the choice of organizations to attend the meeting was made.

[15] It was *agreed* that these points would be noted for consideration at a later stage.

[16] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) also noted that the meeting proposed under paragraph X (page 210) was to last only two days. In view of the important nature of the meeting and the high travel costs involved, he suggested that the duration might well be extended.

FELLOWSHIP ADMINISTRATION [III.5.C].

[17] Replying to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) confirmed that the sum of $2,900 had been agreed in discussion with the United Nations as the average cost of a six-months fellowship. The sum might vary between $2,500 and $3,500, according to the amount of travel involved.

[18] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) remarked that this sum appeared to be exceedingly high for a fellowship never exceeding a period of six months.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that the amount allocated for fellowships should vary according to the cost of living in the region for which the fellowship was awarded.

[20] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) replied that, in consultation with the United Nations, Unesco had just completed plans for operating such a scheme. The sum of $2,900 was felt to be the average cost of a fellowship and was submitted as the round budget figure.

[21] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) suggested that the average figure should be lower, i.e., $2,500, as it had been agreed that in some countries a fellowship would cost only $2,000.

[22] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the heavy travel costs involved in many cases necessitated a higher *average* figure.

SERVICE COSTS [III.7.A].

[23] No comments.

INFORMATION ON NEEDS, DIRECT ASSISTANCE, AND VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE CAMPAIGNS [III.7.B].

[24] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) having reminded the Secretariat that he had submitted a written question on the item of $188,000 for Grants for Emergency Aid (page 253), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that a full reply was being prepared.

[25] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) queried the large amounts requested for fees and travel in paragraph 1 (page 254). Since items 7.11, 7.111 and 7.12 were extremely vague, the corresponding amounts were too large to be set aside for purely hypothetical needs in 1951.

[26] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) explained that, until 1950, donor countries had responded to general appeals for relief assistance. However, it was now becoming necessary to supply details of specific needs in order to obtain assistance, and this involved sending field workers to obtain reports of exact requirements in the countries concerned. In addition, needs were continually changing and it was necessary for Unesco to send out missions to maintain complete and up-to-date information.

[27] In reply to Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Dr. DRZEWIESKI explained that the Relief Fund was a sum of money allocated each year to meet emergency requirements throughout the world.

[28] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed that an emergency fund was necessary, but disagreed with the principle whereby a large sum was set aside annually for the Relief Fund, since the General Conference had no check as to how this money was spent. His delegation wished to propose that Unesco adopt the principle followed in the United Nations whereby the Director-General could, with the authority of the Executive Board, draw on the Revolving Fund to meet emergency aid requirements. Under this principle the sum now allocated to the Relief Fund would be freed for use elsewhere in the budget. The General Conference of the following year would be requested to approve replacement of the funds taken from the Revolving Fund.

[29] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) remarked that his Government was also concerned about this matter. The Third Session of the General Conference had recommended a gradual change in the function of the Relief Assistance Services from reconstruction in devastated areas to construction in the fields of education, science and culture in co-operation with the various programme departments. He noted that throughout the budget sums were being requested by the programme departments for assistance to Member States. These items no doubt did represent constructional activities. Mr. Weeden did not at this time suggest that the sum requested for Relief Assistance should be deleted, but that very careful consideration should be given to this matter to ensure the maximum co-ordination between the various constructional activities of Unesco.

[30] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that his Government did not agree that Unesco should continue to maintain a Relief Fund. It felt rather that Unesco's function should be to stimulate aid from all sources and to assist and co-ordinate voluntary campaigns. It was obvious that Unesco's financial contribution to relief could only be extremely small. The development of constructional assistance to Member States in the various programme departments was yet another reason for discontinuing the provision of funds for Relief Assistance.

[31] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) agreed with the delegate of Canada that there was more than one method of allocating emergency funds; but the General Conference had preferred Unesco to present definite proposals on financial aid to be voted each year in advance. He felt that, from the psychological and propaganda point of view, the present method was more valuable; but a change could of course be made by the General Conference.

[32] Replying to Mr. Weeden, Mr. Weitz explained that the Fourth Session of the General Conference had passed a resolution stating that, in the future, Unesco would effect a gradual transition from work of reconstruction to work of construction in the fields of education, science and culture in devastated countries. The Director-General was requested to report to this session of the General Conference on methods which might be followed in this connexion.

[33] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) emphasized that the money voted for the Relief Fund could not be used for any specific purpose without the authority of the Executive Board. This did provide the General Conference with the necessary control over expenditure. He agreed that Unesco was only able to contribute a

small percentage of the relief funds required in any particular area, but he pointed out the valuable example of Unesco's lead to other donors. In addition, he had found that recipient countries were immensely grateful for even the smallest amount of assistance.

[34] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) remarked that only delegates from donor nations had spoken so far, and said that he would like to speak for the recipient countries, although his own country had never asked or received aid from Unesco. The Fourth Session of the General Conference had changed the nature of the aid programme to imply relief rather than reconstruction. Catastrophes and disasters were bound to occur in the world every year, and it was essential that some provision should be made for emergency aid. Mr. Brunswick supported the maintenance of the Relief Fund in its present form.

[35] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wished to clarify his previous remarks. His intention had not been to recommend the complete abolition of a fund for emergency relief. His statement had been made purely and specifically on the ground that the present budgetary principle was unsound. Under the system he had proposed, there would be definite limits and regulations fixed by the General Conference governing the extent to which withdrawals from the Revolving Fund could be made. He did not propose to change the amount available for emergency aid, but merely the budgetary principle involved. However, Mr. Pollock agreed to reserve this matter for discussion at a later stage.

[36] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) paid tribute to the relief work of Unesco—especially in connexion with the Arab refugees in Palestine—and emphasized that he felt this was one of the most useful and most important fields of Unesco's work. He sincerely hoped that every effort would be made to continue a maximum programme of Relief Assistance, especially in connexion with the ever-present problem of Arab refugees in Palestine.

[37] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) replied that the Secretariat was keeping this problem well in mind and was hoping to co-operate with the United Nations Relief Commission for Palestine with regard to the educational problem involved.

[38] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) regretted that, in paragraph III (page 254), Unesco proposed to establish yet another non-governmental organization whose Secretary would be a staff member of Unesco. As he had pointed out before, he did not feel that this was a good principle.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS [III.7.C].

[39] Replying to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) explained that the somewhat large increase in the sum requested for fees and temporary posts ($2,726 in 1949 as against $8,300 in 1951) was due to the large increase in Unesco's activities in this field. As a result of a resolution from the General Conference calling for an increase in the scope of Unesco's activities, it was proposed to send more and more lecturers to an ever increasing number of work camps.

[40] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) remarked that this programme seemed to be becoming extremely educational in nature, and wondered whether it should not be transferred to the Education Department.

[41] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) replied that this was a matter for the decision of the General Conference; however, the lecturers were being sent mainly to camps organized for rebuilding and other reconstructional work.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada)

later: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Documents and Publications [Part III, Chapter 9].

DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS SERVICE [III.9.A].

[1] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that document 5C/PRG/15 gave much valuable information concerning the Documents and Publications Service.

[2] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) reiterated his question about the probable cost of increasing the number of issues of the *Courier*, and asked for information concerning the size of Unesco's classical editions.

[3] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) stated that an increase in the size of the *Courier* could be obtained at a comparatively low cost, since it was the typesetting which was the most expensive phase of the operation. Each additional thousand copies cost less to produce. The important point, however, was to increase distribution and not merely production. A document now in preparation would answer Mr. Roseman's second question.

[4] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the English edition of the *Courier* must have reached a stable unit cost; any increase in circulation must therefore be proportional to the number of copies.

[5] Replying to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service), explained that the fundamental difference between the *Courier* and the *International Arts Review* was that the former was produced at Unesco's sole expense, whereas the latter was printed in four or five countries by private publishers without any cost to the Organization.

[6] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) asked what were the criteria adopted for the selection of the publications which Unesco gave to outside publishers.

[7] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) said that paragraph 12 of document 5C/PRG/15 (Section III, page 3) gave information on this question. Broadly speaking, outside publishers were used because they were better equipped to ensure the distribution of publications in any given area, and also because some of them were ready to undertake the publication at their own cost and without a grant.

[8] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) felt some concern over the publication programme, because of the proliferation of small and comparatively insignificant publications.

[9] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the Director-General, who was also concerned about the publications question, had convened an expert committee to advise him on it, in order to make the best possible use of the funds available. The choice of publications and their size was usually determined by the Conference which, when giving an authorization to the Director-General, really meant that it wished the particular work done.

[10] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having asked if the $7,000 for the International Theatre Institute were included in, or additional to, the $28,000 or $30,000 already granted to it, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that they were part of the total grant.

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) wished to know if subventions of that kind were grants-in-aid or special publication allocations.

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said they fell under three headings; some were special publication contracts, others contributions to the cost of a publication, others—as in the case of the International Theatre Institute or ICSU—a part of the grants.

[13] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Canada, thought the Committee should say that economies in publications could be effected by a

better selection of documents and closer attention to printing costs and arrangements with publishers. He thought that more attention should also be paid to possible commercial results and to the size of free issues. Finally, he suggested that the interpreting and translation services could be more closely integrated.

[14] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) asked if the Committee intended to make a specific recommendation on those three extremely important questions, for in that case very full replies were necessary.

[15] The CHAIRMAN thought the Committee's recommendation should not be a criticism, but an indication that the efforts already made to secure economies could be intensified.

[16] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that three top-ranking experts had considered the whole question and that the Budget Committee was not composed of publication experts.

[17] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) declared that a Secretariat Committee was studying the question of the choice and distribution of documents; a reduction of circulation was expected in July. The printing and publication methods already adopted, as well as the choice of countries where contracts were placed, were as satisfactory as it had been possible to make them. The possible commercial results of publications were the constant preoccupation of the Secretariat. Free distributions were now limited to a minimum: 300 to 400 copies for documents and 100 to 120—to Member States and to National Commissions—for publications. In passing, he indicated that some National Commissions even complained that the limitations were too great. In conclusion, he wished to emphasize that Unesco interpreters were few and very busy, and the very short time they might eventually be able to spare for translations would not constitute a significant economy.

[18] Mr. SAPORI (Italy) wanted to know the experts' opinion on the large number of publication items which could be found in the budgets of all departments. In his opinion, centralization would produce appreciable economies.

[19] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Second and Third Sessions of the General Conference had decided that the Budget should show expenses by major objects of activity, i.e., projects; that was the reason why publication items were not centralized and, accordingly, the experts had not included the question in their report.

[20] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked if the Secretariat could give some figure of the economies which would result in 1951 from its work in the matter.

[21] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) said it was not possible to give exact figures because the cost of production varied notably with the urgency of a manuscript; but a substantial reduction of printing costs might be expected if it were possible to recruit and train the necessary staff to prepare manuscripts adequately.

External Relations [Part III, Chapter 8].

Special Language Service [III.9.B].

[22] No comments.

Division of Legal Affairs [III.8.D].

[23] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked why three legal officers would be needed in 1951 and why the Staff Association's Secretary should be on Unesco's pay roll.

[24] Dr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that the Division of Legal Affairs had been reorganized to enable it to deal with the large and increasing amount of work it was called upon to perform in the field of Human Rights, inter-governmental conventions, cultural agreements, contracts, copyright, etc.

[25] Replying to Mr. Roseman's second question, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the Director-General felt quite strongly that a healthy Staff Association was a necessary component of the Secretariat, and that he should assist it to attain full growth during its initial stages. In all probability, the Association would later be able to pay the salary of its Secretary. The latter also worked for the Chairman of the Appeals Board, which meant dealing with a considerable volume of papers.

[26] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) and to the CHAIRMAN, Dr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that the General Conference had asked for an analytic study of Cultural Conventions in general: the Legal Service had examined, analysed and translated about 200 of these, and the fees ($3,833) mentioned in the last paragraph on page 282 had arisen in connexion with that work. The $1,500 for consultants' fees were not earmarked for the study of Cultural

Conventions, but for that of other special questions which were expected to come up in 1951.

[27] The CHAIRMAN thought most Cultural Conventions were almost identical, and he could not see why outside legal assistance was necessary to make such an analysis.

Statistical Service [Part III, Chapter 10].

PERSONNEL COSTS [III.10.A].

[28] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked whether all the Organization's statistical operations were concentrated in the Service.

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) indicated that the answer was transitional:

(1) Programme statistics would not be concentrated in the Service, except for the verification of the adequacy and accuracy of the departments' figures;

(2) The Service would centralize the statistical data requested by the United Nations and Member States, and it would deal with the statistical questionnaires sent out by Unesco.

[30] Referring to paragraph III (page 300), Mr. KIRPAL (India) asked whether the work could not be done by the National Commissions.

[31] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the standardization of terminology was an extremely important and urgent problem; international comparability depended on it, and it must be dealt with by experts.

[32] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) hoped that paragraph VI (page 300) would be controlled by paragraph III on the same page, in order to keep the activities envisaged within reasonable bounds.

[33] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) assured him that only essential work would be done.

[34] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) had some doubts concerning the possibility of "promoting . . . the establishment of fellowships, the translation of textbooks and compilation of glossaries" on $2,000 (paragraph VIII, page 301).

[35] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the Regional Statistical Educational Centre in India had other resources; the $2,000 and $1,500 were only Unesco's contributions to them.

General Policy [Part I].

GENERAL CONFERENCE [I.A].

[36] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) asked for a breakdown of the $41,000 for other Personnel Costs (page 32) and of the $11,860 for supplementary staff (page 33).

[37] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the relevant information was in process of reproduction and would shortly be distributed to the members of the Committee.

[38] Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) stressed that, although the Conference lasted only three weeks, the preparation of the necessary documents required longer.

[39] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) was of the opinion that the *Journal of the Conference* was not sufficiently useful to justify an outlay of $7,000. The $2,500 for badges and $8,500 for simultaneous interpretation equipment seemed to him excessive.

[40] Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) explained that the 1,250 badges has cost only $300; the remainder was for other supplies and materials needed by the delegates. Unesco, unlike the United Nations, had no permanent simultaneous interpretation equipment; it had to pay for the hire and transport from Paris and back of the 1,200 receivers used by the Conference. In reply to a further question, Mr. Leguen said that the $5,000 for Rental of Premises was made necessary because Unesco's headquarters were not spacious enough to accommodate the 1951 General Conference.

EXECUTIVE BOARD [I.B].

[41] No comments.

[42] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked if the Secretariat could supply the Committee with a list of those activities which would be discontinued in 1951.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NINTH MEETING

Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. Bender (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

General Policy (*continued*) [Part I].

General Conference (*continued*) [Part I].

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Secretariat would present the figures requested regarding the economies which would result from the reduction of the length of the Sixth Session of the General Conference from three weeks to two.

[2] Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) listed the following possible reductions in the proposed expenditure:

Temporary Posts	$10,400
Official Travel	2,500
Contractual Printing	4,000
Rental of Premises	1,500
Rental of Official Cars	700
Other Contractual Items.	800
Rental of Furniture, etc.	1,500
Total	$21,400

[3] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) asked whether a decision had been taken as to the number and location of the rooms to be hired in connexion with the holding of a General Conference in Paris.

[4] Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) replied that, on the experience of the Fourth Session, the Secretariat would suggest hiring the Salle de l'Aéro-Club de France in the Avenue Kléber. This room could be hired for the duration of the General Conference at a total cost of $4,500.

General Administration [Part II].

Conference Planning and General Services [II.E].

[5] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) announced that he had put written questions on this subject and was awaiting replies from the Secretariat.

[6] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, at the moment, the Archives Service was neither part of Registry nor of the Library, but a separate unit. The closest co-ordination was maintained between these three services, and a survey was in process of completion to decide what organizational adjustments might be advisable in order to ensure the maximum efficiency of these three services.

[7] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that, as the Archives unit supplied reference services, it should more properly be combined with the Library.

Office of the Director-General [II.A].

[8] Miss LAISE (United States of America) queried, as a matter of general principle which recurred throughout the Budget, the sum of $750 requested for the replacement of personnel on sick and annual leave in the Office of the Director-General. Her delegation felt that it was normal for an administration to absorb such leave without the provision of extra personnel.

[9] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that, in a small unit such as this, the absence of one person for a few weeks might cause serious dislocation of work. Past experience had shown that, whereas an extra person was often necessary for a short period, there was not sufficient work to justify an additional permanent post. However, when the Organization had greater experience, it might be found more economical to establish one or two additional permanent posts in the typing pool to cover all such emergencies throughout the Secretariat.

[10] In reply to further questions, Mr. WEITZ announced that the total sum requested in the Budget Estimates for this item was $2,975.

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) agreed that an extra permanent post in the pool would be a more efficient and, in the long run, more economical method of dealing with this problem.

[12] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that his delegation was concerned about another question of

general principle which recurred throughout the budget. The various offices listed under Part II clearly fulfilled a number of distinct services, but at the same time, many of their functions appeared to overlap. He referred in particular to possible overlapping in the fields of outside liaison work (Office of the Director-General and External Relations Service), travel on official business (Office of the Director-General, External Relations Service, Bureau of Conference Planning), and financial investment and control and staff management (Bureau of the Comptroller, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget, Bureau of Personnel). In view of the small budget of the Organization, it seemed that a large degree of co-ordination and integration was necessary on the administrative side.

[13] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) believed this was a difficult problem in view of the nature and youth of international organizations; but he felt that greater efforts should be made to avoid duplication of functions. For example, the functional statement concerning the Office of the Director-General (page 46) contained the following sentence:

> Its staff ensures that all matters coming before the Director-General for attention are properly prepared and that the decisions of the Director-General are duly carried out.

It would therefore appear that certain high-grade officials in the Office of the Director-General were employed to supervise the work of programme department Heads; this should be quite unnecessary.

[14] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that the wording of this statement was unfortunate and rather misleading. The staff member in the Office of the Director-General responsible for ensuring that documents submitted to the Director-General were properly prepared, actually carried out liaison and " clearing-house " functions to ensure proper and complete co-ordination between the work of the many specialists in different parts of the Organization.

[15] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) asked why the Office of the Director-General should need the sum of $2,100 for Consultants, since there should be enough specialists on the staff of the Organization to advise the Director-General on all matters of policy.

[16] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that there were nevertheless a number of points in the programme and the administration upon which the Director-General sometimes found it valuable to secure outside advice.

[17] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) remarked that the amount provided for travel in the Office of the Director-General seemed excessive, especially since the Director-General and his Deputy must, of necessity, spend a large amount of time at the Paris headquarters.

[18] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Director-General felt that personal visits to Member States by himself and his Deputy were of the greatest benefit to the Programme, and that he intended to undertake the maximum number of missions compatible with his duties in Paris.

BUREAU OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET [II.B].

[19] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) raised again the question of flexibility in the staffing of the Organization in connexion with the sum of $2,500 requested for temporary posts.

[20] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that it was not possible to use personnel from other departments, since the heavy work load in the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget coincided with heavy work loads in all departments, i.e., immediately before sessions of the General Conference and meetings of the Executive Board.

BUREAU OF THE COMPTROLLER [II.C].

[21] In reply to Mr. GUIGNOLET (France), Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) gave figures indicating the increase in the work load of the Bureau and explained that this increase was due partly to the addition of several functions, such as supervision of the Publications Revolving Fund, and partly to the increasing rhythm of work in the Organization. He also explained that it was not always possible to carry out financial negotiations with foreign banks by correspondence, and that a certain amount of travel was necessary in this respect. He confirmed that the system for the payment of staff salaries was now a completely mechanical process.

BUREAU OF PERSONNEL [II.D].

[22] Replying to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. PYM (Head, Bureau of Personnel) confirmed that the rate of recruitment was now fairly steady and might be expected to diminish as more longer-term contracts were established.

[23] In reply to Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy), Mr. PYM gave the following outline of procedure followed for the recruitment of personnel:

(1) Personnel already on the staff of the Organization were considered first;

(2) All files received from Member States and non-governmental organizations were checked for suitable candidates;

(3) If time allowed, Member States were consulted and asked to propose candidates;

(4) In the case of the secretarial staff, translators and minute writers, selection was made on the basis of tests and examinations.

[24] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) supported the previous remarks of Miss Laise with regard to the provision of funds for the replacement of personnel on sick leave. He felt that, especially in view of the small amount requested, suitable arrangements could be made to absorb this type of leave.

External Relations [Part III, Chapter 8].

[25] Miss LAISE (United States of America) felt that the reorganization of this Service showed a great improvement over the previous year, but she queried the necessity for such a large number of personnel in the Division of Relations with International Organizations, in view of the many facilities (including large travel provisions) already existing in the various programme departments. In addition, the Office of the Director-General and the New York Office carried quite large staffs specifically to deal with this question. Miss Laise felt that this was a matter in which there was great danger of overlapping.

[26] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) replied that the reorganization which had taken place in the Bureau of External Relations had resulted in simplification of procedures, better co-ordination between the various units, and general economies. He assured the Committee that there was the utmost co-ordination and integration of all departments in the question of relations with international organizations, and pointed out that the volume of liaison work with the United Nations was increasing steadily as the activities of the United Nations expanded. The strengthening of the New York Office had resulted in a large decrease in the amount requested for travel (from $19,469 in 1950 to $4,800 in 1951) and for the travel of delegates to conferences and meetings (from $14,674 in 1950 to $8,000 in 1951).

[27] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that Geneva was becoming more and more the focal point for international conferences, as it was the headquarters of so many international organizations. It was difficult to suggest holding such conferences in Paris, as Unesco was unique in being the only Specialized Agency to have its headquarters there.

[28] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked Mr. de Blonay to prepare for the next meeting an explanation of the exact functions of staff members employed on liaison with the United Nations, in the Regional Office in Latin America, and at headquarters of the Division for Relations with Governments and National Commissions.

[29] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) supported this request and also the remarks of Miss Laise with regard to overlapping in this field. He emphasized that great care must be taken to avoid duplication of functions between the Office of the Director-General, the External Relations Service, the New York Office, the various regional offices and the programme departments.

Common Service Costs [Part IV].

[30] In reply to Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the provision of $5,400 for "contingencies" (page 311) was made for the purchase of extra furniture to accommodate temporary staff members, and that the figure was based on the annual increase in personnel of the Organization.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

TENTH MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

later: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada)

Interim Report of the Budget Committee.

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Drafting Committee had made certain changes in the draft report now before the Committee. This report, which would appear as document 5C/BUD/1, included an Introduction, General Observations and a certain number of Annexes. The Chairman proposed leaving the Annexes for a later meeting and going through the Introduction and General Observations paragraph by paragraph.

I. Introduction.

[2] Commenting on amendments proposed to paragraph (d) by the drafting committee, by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and by Mr. GUIGNOLET (France), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the Executive Board had no constitutional status in budgetary matters.

[3] The Committee *agreed* to delete the reference to any of the three specific constitutional organs, and to adopt the proposed amendments as regards the remainder.

II. General Observations.

[4] Discussing the first paragraph, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Programme and Budget Commission had joint responsibility with the Budget Committee for proposing methods of economizing. Economies depended both on the scope of Unesco activities and on the resolutions taken by the various committees and commissions. Certain cuts would have to be made to keep within the funds made available by Member States, but a distinction must be made between over-all programme and administrative economies, as the latter could be effected through the action of the Director-General.

[5] After a discussion on the wording of paragraph 1 (Participation in the Activities of the Organization) between Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) and Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), the text of this paragraph was *adopted* with certain amendments.

[6] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), having pointed out an omission concerning the relationship of Unesco with international non-governmental organizations, it was *decided* to insert an addendum to cover this point (*b* in the final text).

[7] Paragraph 2 (Overlapping of Programme with the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies) and 3 (Greater Participation by Host Governments) were *adopted*.

[8] With one amendment proposed by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), paragraph 4 (Travel costs) was *adopted*.

[9] Referring to paragraph 5 (staff), Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) felt that the personnel hired by Unesco should not be specialists in one field, but persons whose services might be utilized in several branches of the Organization.

[10] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) emphasized the necessity of obtaining the services of specialists of excellent professional competence, who could meet and discuss on an equal footing with professionals in Member States with whom they came into contact.

Paragraph 5 was *adopted* without modification.

[11] Referring to paragraph 6 (Budgetary Authorization), Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) raised a question concerning budgetary authorization for expenditures not covered by resolutions of the General Conference.

[12] As this point concerned fundamental policy, Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) asked for discussion before formulation of conclusions.

[13] The CHAIRMAN pointed out, however, that this part of the text merely stated that, without programme resolutions, there would be no special budgetary reserve for unauthorized activities.

[14] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) stressed that all programme activity should be founded on a resolution and not on a "heading".

[15] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), stating that the Committee would report later on the relationship of specific programme resolutions and their budgetary implications, believed that the present budgetary system would lead to too great "compartmentalization" of activities.

[16] It was *decided* that Sir Ronald Adam and Mr. Roseman should agree on a text to be inserted under paragraph 6.

[17] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Annexes to the Interim Report be drafted by the Secretariat in the form of resolutions which would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee. *Agreed.*

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Drafting Committee, which had considered the Interim Report of the Budget Committee now before the meeting, proposed the following amendments:

(1) INTRODUCTION: In paragraph (*a*), the words "submitted by the Executive Board" should be deleted;

(2) GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: In paragraph 1, the words "by the Director-General" should be deleted; in paragraph 2, the word "major" should be added in the second line between "effect" and "economies".

These amendments were *agreed.*

[2] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) pointed out that the word "tentative", originally included by the Drafting Committee in line three of item I (*c*), had been omitted in the text before the Committee. It was *agreed* that this word should be re-inserted.

[3] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) referred to a previous decision of the Drafting Committee that the second and third items of Section II (General Observations) should be inverted. This was also *agreed.*

[4] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested that the words "under the existing system" in the fifth line of item II.6 be transferred to line eight, after the words "The Committee felt that . . ." This amendment was *agreed.*

[5] The CHAIRMAN explained that the Drafting Committee felt that item II.7 (Further Enquiries) was rather meagre, and might perhaps be omitted completely.

[6] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) felt that this item should remain, as there were several fields in which it was important for further enquiries to be conducted. He asked specifically wether a statement recommending the earliest possible implementation of the Report of the Experts Committee on Salary, Allowances, and Leave Systems of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies could be added to this paragraph of the Interim Report.

[7] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) did not feel that the Budget Committee should refer in this Report to a matter which was on the agenda of the Administrative Commission.

[8] The CHAIRMAN agreed with Mr. Pollock that this was a matter of the greatest importance; but he also felt that it was not within the competence of the Budget Committee to make recommendations on a question yet to be considered by the Administrative Commission.

[9] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) pointed out that, under the provisions of item I (*c*) of the Interim Report, this matter could be discussed in detail at a later date.

[10] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) felt, however, that

the Budget Committee should make immediate reference to the importance of this matter and proposed the following text for inclusion in the Interim Report:

One delegate felt that the earliest possible implementation of the recommendations in the report of the Experts on Salary, Allowances, and Leave Systems of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, could lead to substantial improvements and economies in the personnel administration of Unesco. The Committee decided, however that further investigation of this matter should be deferred until the Administrative Commission had dealt with the related question on its Agenda.

[11] After further discussion, Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) proposed the inclusion of the following statement in the Interim Report, to deal with this matter:

The Committee also noted that the report of the United Nations Expert Committee on Salaries and Allowances, currently on the Agenda of the Administrative Commission, might provide opportunities for additional economies.

Agreed.

[12] Also on the suggestion of Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), it was *agreed* that the following statement would be substituted for the existing text of item II.7 (Further Enquiries):

The Committee noted certain further areas for its further investigation. The matters will be treated in subsequent reports of the Committee.

Annex I (Education).

EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS [III.1.B (1)].

[13] Mr. KIRPAL (India) pointed out that the Committee had not reached any definite conclusions on item 1.111. It had merely suggested that there should be certain flexibility in the regulations regarding payment of *per diem* to personnel on missions.

[14] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed that the existing text appeared to be too specific, and he suggested the following statement as an alternative:

With reference to its General Observation 3, the Committee felt that there might be greater uniformity in the basis of these types of expenditures.

Agreed.

EDUCATION CLEARING-HOUSE [III.1.B (3)].

[15] On item 1.133, Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested the words "United Nations" be inserted before the word "Commission" in the last line. *Agreed.*

FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND ADULT EDUCATION [III.1.C (1)].

[16] With regard to item 1.211, Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) felt that the figures quoted were misleading; it should be made clear that the sum of $2,000 did not represent the average cost per week of the Seminar, but merely the cost of lengthening or shortening the Seminar by a period of one week. He suggested the following text:

The Committee wished to point out that savings of $4,000 might be obtained (out of a total expenditure of $24,000) by reducing the length of the Seminar.

[17] A discussion ensued regarding the competence of the Budget Committee to question whether the proper length for a Seminar should be four, five or six weeks, or to make specific recommendations in this connexion. After several delegates had expressed the opinion that this was a matter for the decision of the Programme and Budget Commission, Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) pointed out that in any case the Interim Report of the Budget Committee was intended to be general rather than detailed, and recommended the deletion of the sentence beginning "Further the Committee wished to point out . . ." *Agreed.*

[18] In Item 1.2121 (*b*), Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested the replacement of the word "person" by "staff member". *Agreed.*

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) proposed the inclusion of the following statement in item 1.2122:

In connexion with the Haitian project, the Committee suggested that the Programme and Budget Commission should consider the relationship between the funds it was proposed to expend for this purpose and the accomplishments so far achieved by prior Unesco expenditures.

Agreed.

EDUCATION FOR MALADJUSTED CHILDREN [III.1.C(2)].

[19] Since the original text of item 1,22 did not clearly convey the feeling of the Committee on this point, Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), proposed deleting the words: "seemed completely inadequate to effective work in the field", and substituting: "was too little for effective work and too large for simple liaison activity." *Agreed.*

[20] It was also *agreed* to insert, in the third line of this paragraph, the words "other agencies and groups" before the word "working".

EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING [III.1.D].

[21] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wished to withdraw

the paragraph under item 1.342, which had been included at his request. *Agreed.*

Annex II (Natural Sciences).

[22] *Adopted* without comment.

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme.

[23] It was *agreed* after some discussion to examine the new programme resolutions in conjunction with the chapters to which they referred.

[24] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) announced that the very rough total of the budgetary provisions required to cover all the new programme resolutions was $650,000. For the Education Department the total supplementary provision requested was approximately $124,000.

[25] The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the Committee would be able to give sufficient time to these new proposals, in view of the fact that a report would have to be made to the Programme and Budget Commission at a very early date.

[26] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that the Committee would not have time to do more than pass to the Programme and Budget Commission the Secretariat's estimate of the extra budgetary provision involved; but Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) felt that the Budget Committee had a specific responsibility to examine the estimates presented by the Secretariat.

[27] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) suggested that the Committee might simply list the new resolutions and state whether or not it was in general agreement with the estimate submitted by the Secretariat.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed that the Chairman of the Budget Committee should draw the attention of the General Committee of the Conference to the fact that new resolutions were still coming in, despite the time-limit of 25 May, and that the Budget Committee would consequently not be able to examine these resolutions in detail before making its first report to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[29] Supporting this request, Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) asked the Chairman to make representations to the General Committee of the Conference, both with regard to the heavy work-load of the Budget Committee and to the necessity for making some alteration in the programme of meetings, to enable the Budget Committee to complete its work in a reasonable manner.

[30] The CHAIRMAN agreed to raise this matter at the next meeting of the General Committee.

New resolutions concerning the programme of the Department of Education.

ED-1 (Methods of Teaching Evolutionary Biology) [document 5C/15].

[31] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) thought it would be possible for the Secretariat to undertake the work required by this United Kingdom resolution [document 5C/15] without the provision of additional funds.

The draft resolution was therefore *adopted* without further comment.

ED-2 and ED-3 (Use of the Mother Tongue in Education and Study of Indigenous Languages) [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1].

[32] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that it was proposed to transfer the sum of $3,000 provided for fees for studies on the Use of the Mother Tongue in Education [paragraph I on page 86 of document 5C/5 (II)] to the project for encouraging the study of indigenous languages [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1]. In other words, the sum in question was to be deducted from the project covered by ED-2, and added to that covered by ED-3.

[33] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt that, once again, this was a matter which could be dealt with efficiently and more economically by National Commissions and that the sum provided for fees [ED-3] might be deleted.

[34] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that the Secretariat was trying to make a small but serious beginning in this field, and that it was essential to engage experts to prepare really first-class documentation. It would be dangerous to approach this problem too superficially.

[35] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was not convinced that the National Commissions could not produce results of the same value as paid experts.

[36] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) remarked that he did not see why the present staff of the Education Department could not absorb the extra work required by the new resolution. He felt that, even if it were really necessary to engage a Programme Specialist at grade 14, it should not be necessary to set up an extra secre-

tarial post in a department where the ratio of secretaries to high-grade personnel was already somewhat high.

[37] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) supported those remarks and added that there seemed to be far too much provision in the budget for temporary personnel and consultants on a fee basis to deal with matters that, in many cases, could be absorbed by the existing personnel.

The meeting rose at midnight.

TWELFTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 2.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that he had made representations to the General Committee of the Conference regarding the work and time-table of the Budget Committee. The General Committee had promised to study the matter with a view to improving the situation.

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions concerning the Department of Education (*concluded*).

ED-2 (continued) (*Use of the Mother Tongue in Education* [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1].

[2] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed that the resolution listed under ED-2 be approved, since this represented merely a transfer of funds to a different project. *Agreed.*

ED-3 (continued) (*Study of Indigenous Languages* [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add.1].

[3] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that it would not be unreasonable for the Budget Committee to say that it hoped the Director-General could carry out the work involved under the resolution contained in ED-3 in the course of the Organization's normal fundamental education activities, and without extra budgetary provision.

[4] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the resolution contained specific instructions to the Director-General to undertake activities in this field *in addition* to those contained in the Programme for 1951. He emphasized that, in preparing the 1951 Programme and Budget, the Director-General had sought the most detailed co-ordination and integration of the two. Any additional tasks or responsibilities placed on him by the General Conference must therefore be accompanied by the provision of additional funds. Mr. Weitz did not feel that it was possible for the present staff of the Organization to absorb any further duties, and he would make this clear to the Programme and Budget Commission in connexion with all proposed new resolutions.

[5] In the circumstances, and in view of the lack of time in the Budget Committee for complete examination of the new resolutions at this stage, Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) formulated the following general statement which he proposed the Committee should use to cover all the new resolutions it passed to the Programme and Budget Commission:

> The Budget Committee has examined the proposal included in Resolution No. . . . and the related budgetary estimate prepared by the Director-General. After preliminary examination, the Budget Committee decided that the estimate of $ . . . presented by the Director-General is an accurate reflexion of the maximum budgetary charge which would arise from the adoption of this proposal.
>
> After further detailed investigation, the Budget Committee hopes to suggest certain economies in this project, but the Committee wishes to emphasize that the final budgetary figure for this project will not be significantly below that suggested by the Director-General.

[6] It was unanimously *agreed* that this statement provided the best solution to the dilemma and should be included in the oral report to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[7] As there were no further comments on ED-3, this resolution was *adopted.*

ED-4 (Education of adolescents, the blind and of maladjusted children) [documents 5C/30, 5C/31 and 5C/32].

(Total increase: $26,305.)

[8] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) asked why it was considered necessary to include a sum of $600 for interpreters and minute-writers for the proposed Expert Committee, since this type of technical staff existed on the permanent Secretariat of the Organization.

[9] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that it was not possible for the Conference staff of the Organization to service more meetings than were contained in the original programme and that, if extra meetings were proposed, it would be necessary to engage outside interpreters and minute-writers.

[10] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) felt that, by more co-ordinated planning of the schedule of meetings for the year, it should be possible to avoid engaging outside staff. However, he agreed to defer discussion on this matter until the Committee had time to consider the resolutions in more detail.

ED-5 (Education for young children) [document 5C/57].

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) remarked that the document did not make it clear that resolution 5C/57 proposed the deletion of the existing provision under resolution 1.22 and the substitution of an alternative project at a total cost of only $13,998. This would result in a net saving of approximately $32,000, rather than in any increase in the budgetary implications.

[12] The SECRETARY promised that this point would be made clear in presenting the report to the Programme and Budget Commission.

ED-6 (The transfer of the activities of international voluntary work camps from Relief Services to the Department of Education) [document 5C/65].

[13] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that resolution 5C/65 merely called for the transfer of a project from one department to another, and had no budgetary implications.

ED-7 (An expanded programme in teaching about Human Rights) [document 5C/56].

(Total increase: $10,410).

ED-8 (Syllabuses and textbooks on teaching about the United Nations) [document 5C/50].

(Total increase: $9,000.)

ED-9 (To concentrate in one division all youth activities) [document 5C/62].

(No budgetary implications.)

ED-10 (Transfer of the "Youth Bulletin" from Clearing-House to Education for International Understanding) [document 5C/66, item 2].

ED-11 (Transfer of funds within the Education Department) [see preceding item].

ED-12 (Social Service Schools) [document 5C/33].

(Total increase: $7,500.)

ED-13 (Adoption of a Friendship Flag among the children of the world) [document 5C/74].

(Total increase: $8,710.)

[14] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that, in supplying an estimate for this proposed activity, the Secretariat considered it necessary, on the basis of previous experience, to establish two temporary posts (one programme assistant, grade 10 and one clerk-typist, grade 3) for the organization of this competition, and to provide $2,000 as fees for the experts who would be required to judge the competition.

[15] As there was no comment on these resolutions, it was *decided* to pass them for consideration to the Programme and Budget Commission.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions affecting the Department of Natural Sciences.

NS-1 (Aid to scientific and technical institutions of international importance) [document 5C/5 (I) (rev.) - Add. 2].

[1] The transfer to Section III.2.D of a sum of $12,000 (originally allocated to the provision of grants to ICSU and its affiliated Unions) was *adopted.*

NS-2 (Pilot project to demonstrate the influence of science on the well-being of society) [document 5C/21].

[2] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) announced that the Austrian Government was prepared to give an additional amount of $7,000 for special equipment.

[3] It was suggested that this information be included in the report. *Agreed.*

NS-3 (Consequences of modern warfare) [documents 5C/25 and 5C/27].

[4] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the original resolution had come from the Belgian delegation. The Yugoslav resolution constituted an amendment with different budgetary implications. As the resolution and the amendment dealt with exactly the same subject, they had been placed together under NS-3.

[5] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) asked for an explanation of the $20,000 for printing costs in the Yugoslav proposal, as compared with only $5,000 in the Belgian proposal.

[6] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Yugoslav proposal was an extension of the Belgian one. The Yugoslav delegation hoped for a mass circulation of the reports, printed in popular style with illustrations, and in several languages.

[7] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) raised questions concerning the $1,500 for the hiring of minute-writers, translators and interpreters, and suggested that the permanent staff should be able to carry out the work.

[8] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that, if the Conference accepted the new proposals for the 1951 Programme, it would mean an increase in the number of meetings anticipated; consequently it would not be possible for the regular staff to cover them.

[9] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) did not see why it should be necessary to hold the meeting outside Paris, and suggested that the $1,000 provided for the travel of staff to that meeting might be suppressed.

[10] Mr. Pollock maintained that a maximum of $30,000 would be required for the Yugoslav proposal, and $11,000 for the Belgian proposal; he pointed out that the hiring of extra staff would be conditioned by the extra work-load imposed by the adoption of additional resolutions in the rest of the programme, that $1,000 could be saved by holding the meeting in Paris, and that printing costs seemed high.

[11] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) supported Mr. Pollock. *Agreed.*

NS-4 (Establishment of an International Research Bureau) [document 5C/35].

[12] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked whether directors of National Scientific Councils would not pay their own travel expenses to the meeting. In most countries, they were public officials with travel budgets of their own.

[13] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) agreed that probably some directors had their own resources. It was *agreed* to take this point into account in the Committee's report.

NS-5 (Postponement of the Conference for the establishment of an International Computation Centre) [document 5C/34].

[14] The Italian draft amendment, which implied a potential budgetary reduction was passed as "reasonable and accurate".

NS-6 (Unesco's role in the organization of Regional Research Centres and Laboratories) [document 5C/58].

(Total increase: $11,000.)

[15] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) suggested that the plans for the regional research centres and laboratories might be prepared in connexion with existing Unesco Scientific Co-operation Offices.

[16] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that, in the absence of detailed information from the United States delegation, the Secretariat's estimate was a mere guess.

[17] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) proposed that, in proposing new resolutions, delegates should discuss their budgetary implications with the Secretariat, in order to facilitate the latter's task.

[18] Mr. MARSHALL (United States of America) was unable to supply the Committee with further details.

[19] It was *decided* to refer the proposal to the Programme and Budget Commission for further information.

NS-7 (Meeting of an Advisory Committee on International Engineering Science Congresses)

[document 5C/64, Item 1].

(Reduction: $12,000.)

[20] No comment.

N-8 (Financial aid to the International Arid Zone Research Council) [document 5C/64, Item 3].

(Reduction: $14,000.)

[21] No comment.

NS-9 (Setting up of a Committee of Experts to create an International Institute of Meteorology [document 5C/83].

(Increase: $6,200.)

[22] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having suggested that the preparatory work in question might be carried out by National Commissions, it was pointed out that most National Commissions did not count meteorological specialists among their members.

[23] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) observed that an international meteorological organization already existed and that Unesco should enter into contact with it before undertaking the project.

[24] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that contact was already established, but that the organization mentioned by Mr. Pollock was purely operative, and not a research centre. The idea of the Swedish delegation was that Unesco should help with the plans and that the International Institute of Meteorology, if created, should primarily be supported financially from other sources, although grants-in-aid (about $10,000) would be required for several years.

New resolutions concerning the Department of Social Sciences.

SS-1 (Repercussions of modern warfare) [documents 5C/25 and 5C/67].

(Increases: $33,970 and $18,970.)

[25] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) observed that the proposals were exactly the same as those discussed in connexion with Natural Sciences, under heading NS-3.

SS-2 (Studies of Agrarian Law) [document 5C/72].

(Increase: $5,000.)

[26] No comment.

SS-3 (Definition of Social Service) [document 5C/37].

(Increase: $7,500).

[27] Mr. MARSHALL (United States of America) suggested that the World Federation of Mental Health, which had at one time received funds from Unesco, might be asked to carry out the task.

[28] Since Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) thought that the Federation was probably not the body to carry out this task, it was pointed out that the work might be more cheaply and effectively done by the Social Affairs Department of the United Nations. *Agreed.*

SS-4 (Establishment of an International Social Science Institute) [document 5C/73].

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that no figures had been given, because the Secretariat

had not been sure what was intended by the Italian amendment.

[30] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) recalled that, in the Programme and Budget Commission the previous day, Mr. Laugier had mentioned a project of the United Nations to set up a Social Sciences Institute.

[31] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed that the Committee should state in its Report that, as a similar proposal was concurrently before the Economic and Social Council, Unesco should await the report of that body. *Agreed.*

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

Annex III (Social Sciences).

[32] The comments on Sections III.3.A (Programme Costs), III.3.B (Aid to International Scientific Collaboration) and III.3.C (Studies of Social Tensions) were *adopted.*

[33] Referring to Section III.3.D (Studies of International Co-operation), Dr. SHARP (Department of Social Sciences) stated that the kind of study mentioned in section 3.3 of the programme had never been carried out before by any organization.

[34] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) observed that it was a study which concerned the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies. He therefore thought that the costs should not be borne by Unesco alone.

It was *agreed* to delete Section III.3.D.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

Annex IV (Cultural Activities).

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.4.A].

[1] No comment.

UNESCO LIBRARY [III.4.B].

[2] In connexion with paragraphe (1), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) assured the Committee that the best possible arrangements had been made with the Paris Libraries.

[3] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought the opening remark of the paragraph should refer more to the staff of the Unesco Library than to its activities.

[4] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested reversing the order of paragraphs (1) and (2). *Agreed.*

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES [III.4.C].

Item 4.1.

[5] No comment.

Item 4.11.

[6] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) proposed the deletion of the Committee's remarks on the item, since General Observations 1 (*b*) already covered the point sufficiently.

[7] Miss LAISE (United States of America) felt that it should be retained.

[8] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the question had been very carefully examined by the Director-General; relations with the non-governmental organizations were a very complex problem, and the results achieved so far by the method shown were excellent.

[9] Miss LAISE (United States of America) suggested an amendment of item 4.11 to indicate that

it was an illustration of the Committee's doubts expressed in General Observations 1 (*b*). *Agreed.*

Item 4.12.

[10] No comment.

Item 4.122.

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) held that collection should be the task of the National Commissions, and the assessment of the material collected that of CIPSH.

[12] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was of the opinion that one and the same person could and should do both. He suggested the substitution of the word "can" for "must" in the Observations.

[13] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought that item 4.122 could be carried out with the help of the National Commission, but that the implementation of item 4.123 should be entrusted to CIPSH.

[14] It was *decided* to leave items 4.122 and 4.123 unaltered.

ARTS AND LETTERS [III.4.D(1)].

Items 4.233 and 4.234.

[15] The CHAIRMAN suggested saying that criteria might be laid down which would lead to revenues that might ultimately offset the cost of the original publications. *Agreed.*

MUSEUMS AND HISTORICAL MONUMENTS [III.4.E].

Item 4.243.

[16] The CHAIRMAN suggested saying that that type of activity might be handled more economically by the New York Office or by one of the Unesco officials on the occasion of a journey. *Agreed.*

Item 4.41.

[17] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) thought the resolution was a little too strongly worded.

[18] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) pointed out that it was the absence of *local* experts which made international collaboration necessary.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) stressed that one really competent expert was better than a committee of experts who were not specialists of the particular region.

[20] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) did not think the Committee was competent to deal with the question, and the CHAIRMAN agreed with him.

[21] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought the Committee might recommend restricting the expert committee in order to reduce costs.

[22] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) offered to prepare a redraft for later consideration by the Committee. *Agreed.*

LIBRARIES AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES [III.4.F].

Item 4.64.

[23] The CHAIRMAN expressed the view that the question of currency was secondary; the primary question, in his view, was the proportion of administrative costs. He proposed a redraft for the afternoon meeting.

[24] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the greater the capital of the Book Coupon Scheme, the smaller that proportion would be.

COPYRIGHT [III.4.G].

Item 4.61.

[25] No comment.

Items 4.62 and 4.621.

[26] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) asked if the Secretariat really thought it possible to carry out the activities envisaged under these items.

[27] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that the suppression of the expert committee would greatly embarrass the Secretariat.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was sure that one expert committee meeting, and not two, would be sufficient.

[29] The CHAIRMAN stressed that it was implicit in the Committee's report that the Programme and Budget Commission would resolve the question in the light of the Committee's previously expressed comments.

[30] The whole of Annex IV was *approved* as amended.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

FIFTEENTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

Annex IV (Cultural Activities) (*continued*).

[1] The amendments which various delegates had prepared during the lunch hour were all *adopted* without further change, except for item 4.54, in which the words "one delegate felt" were changed to "some delegates felt".

[2] Before considering the new resolutions concerning the Department of Cultural Activities, the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Budget Committee would not convey its observations on supplementary proposals to the Programme and Budget Commission in a written report, but verbally through the Rapporteur.

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions concerning the Department of Cultural Activities.

CUA-1 (Pilot seminar for art teachers) [document 5C/10, item 1].

(Total increase: $5,000.)

[3] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) explained that the object of resolution 5C/10 was to replace the two projects 4.211 and 4.212 in 1951 by a seminar, of which the results would be published, so as to prepare the ground for later work on these two projects. The total increase was $5,000; but the amount which would be saved on the other two projects amounted to $8,000.

[4] A discussion ensued between Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) to clarify the terms of this resolution. The Secretariat had presumed that the present wording referred only to the replacement of item 4.212, whereas Sir Ronald Adam made it clear that the actual purpose was to replace 4.212 and to change the work plan of 4.211. The draft amendment was *approved*.

[5] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) suggested that the Committee note with pleasure that the country submitting the resolution proposed to meet a large part of the expenditure involved itself.

CUA-2 (Handbook on Public Libraries Work) [document 5C/10, item 2].

(Total increase: $5,500.)

[6] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the printing office in Paris had now supplied an estimate for this project. Their figure for contractual printing was $5,000, instead of the $4,000 previously estimated by the Secretariat in Florence. Mr. Weitz explained that this kind of correction would only occur in exceptional circumstances.

[7] It was *agreed* that the Rapporteur would notify the Programme and Budget Commission of such changes.

CUA-3 (Preparation for the International Documentation Conference to be held in Italy in 1951) [document 5C/26].

(Total increase: $2,000.)

[8] This resolution was *agreed* without comment.

CUA-4 (Convention for the protection of historic monuments and art treasures) [document 5C/22].

(Total increase: $500.)

[9] *Agreed* without comment.

CUA-5 (Inclusion of Persian works among the classics proposed for translation) [document 5C/27].

(Total increase: $3,000.)

[10] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) explained that the Executive Board had been prepared to include this item in the programme without further budgetary provision, but as the Italian delegation had since

submitted a similar resolution with regard to translations from Italian [document 5C/45], the Board had felt that it would not be possible to include both resolution 5C/27 and 5C/45 in the normal work on project 4.255 without making such provision. The Board recommended that the General Conference should either provide additional funds for project 4.255, or make specific allotments from funds already provided for this project as a whole, thus reducing the funds available for translations already planned.

[11] It was *decided* to pass this resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission with the recommendation made by the Executive Board.

CUA-6 (International Catalogue of Museums) [document 5C/39].

(Total increase: $2,700.)

[12] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) announced that the Italian delegation had now amended the text of this resolution so that, without changing the nature of the proposal, the work could be included in the normal activities of the Department without the present budgetary provision for fees and travel of delegates.

[13] It was *decided* to await distribution of the new text [document 5C/39 (rev.)] before considering this resolution.

CUA-7 (Town Planning) [document 5C/40].

(Total increase: $8,600.)

[14] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) having pointed out that the object of resolution 5C/40 could be achieved at less cost if the Secretariat made use of the International Union of Architects, Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) felt that the terms of the resolution would have to be modified if the budgetary provision were to be reduced.

[15] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that this proposal should be examined in relation to the work being done in the same field by the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) added that, if the Programme and Budget Commission did find that this proposal fell within the framework of Unesco activities, Professor Fantappié's advice should be followed.

[16] The CHAIRMAN thought that a decision on this matter was outside the competence of the Budget Committee.

Miss LAISE (United States of America) felt, however, that the Committee had a certain responsibility to comment on the method of carrying out a given proposal. She agreed with Mr. Weeden's remarks, and noted that the Executive Board had already referred to the work being done by the Economic and Social Council in this field. She thought that the Budget Committee should stress this point, suggesting that Unesco participation in this project was perhaps unnecessary, but adding that, if Unesco participation were nevertheless considered desirable, suggestions had been made whereby the proposal could be carried out more economically than by the method shown in the estimate.

[17] It was *decided* that the Rapporteur would pass these remarks to the Programme and Budget Commission.

CUA-8 (Restoration of works of art) [document 5C/42].

(Total increase: $5,000.)

[18] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the organization to which it was proposed to make the grant-in-aid for this project was the International Conservation Association.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) queried the use of the term "grant-in-aid", since it appeared that in this instance Unesco proposed to contract with this Association to undertake the specified task.

[20] The SECRETARY having agreed that Mr. Weeden was right, it was *decided* to change the text accordingly.

CUA-9 (Inclusion of Italian works in the project for the Translation of Great Books) [document 5C/45].

(Total increase: $2,400.)

[21] This resolution was *agreed* without comment (see above: CUA-5).

CUA-10 (Preparation of a mobile exhibition of colour reproductions) [document 5C/46].

(Total increase: $2,000.)

[22] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the word "catalogue" was an error in the text: the intention was to prepare an itinerant exhibition of colour reproductions, and not a catalogue.

It was *agreed* that the Rapporteur should bring this change to the notice of the Programme and Budget Commission.

[23] It was also *agreed* that the Budget Committee should point out that expert committees

had already met in 1949 and 1950 to consider this matter.

CUA-11 (Extension of the activities of the Middle East Co-operation Office) [document 5C/53].

(Total increase: $12,338.)

[24] A discussion took place as to the possibility of reducing the sum of $3,600 provided for additional Common Costs—since only one staff member was to be added to the Cairo Office—and also as to the possibility of transferring a staff member from Paris to undertake these duties, thereby eliminating the necessity for budgetary provision for a new post.

[25] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) did not think the Director-General could do this, since the staff member in Paris was concerned with general liaison, which would suffer from his transfer to the Middle East for work in one field of activities.

[26] After further discussion, it was *agreed* that this was a matter for the decision of the Programme and Budget Commission, but that the Budget Committee could point out that it was considered possible to include this proposal without budgetary provision.

CUA-12 (Preparation of an International Arts Congress) [document 5C/54].

(Total increase: $3,000.)

[27] On the suggestion of Miss LAISE (United States of America) and Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), it was *agreed* to attach to this resolution the same type of comment as that used in Annex IV in connexion with item 4.243, i.e.,

The Committee noted that travel to the United States for this activity was definitely the type which, in its view, could more economically be handled by the New York Office or other travellers on mission.

CUA-13 (The role of museums in the education of young people and adults) [document 5C/63].

(Total increase: $3,000.)

[28] This proposal was *agreed* without comment.

CUA-14 (Systematic census of sources for economic history from the 11th to the 16th centuries) [document 5C/71].

(Total increase: $5.760.)

[29] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) said that his delegation was now prepared to amend this draft resolution so that the increased budgetary provision would only amount to $1,000.

[30] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) said that the decreased scope of the resolution must be made clear in a new draft if the budgetary provision were to be reduced.

[31] It was *agreed* that this resolution would be passed, on the understanding that its terms would probably be modified, with consequent reduction of the budgetary provision.

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

Annex VI (Mass Communication).

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.6.A].

[32] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that the last line of paragraph (*b*) should read "35 were secretaries", since he had specifically referred to secretaries and not to stenographic posts, which included typists and clerk-typists.

[33] This paragraph was *approved* with Sir Ronald's amendment.

IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATIONS [III.6.B].

[34] On the suggestion of Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), it was *agreed* to delete paragraph (*b*) of this item.

REDUCTION OF OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION [III.6.C].

[35] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that both paragraphs under this heading had been included at his request; but since his remarks had been recorded in the minutes of the Committee, he was prepared to delete these comments in the Interim Report. *Agreed.*

[36] Annex VI of the draft Interim Report was *adopted* as amended.

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions concerning the Department of Mass Communication.

MC-1 (Continuation of Braille activities) [document 5C/PRG/9, p. 10].

(Total increase: $31,585).

[37] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France)

Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the Secretariat did not consider it could secure the services of a specialist, who should be blind himself, with the high qualifications required for this task, at a grade lower than 16.

MC-2 (Course of journalistic studies leading to granting a Unesco certificate) [document 5C/24].

(Total increase: $3.025.)

[38] Since certain members of the Committee felt that the sum provided appeared insufficient to carry out this project effectively, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that Member States were expected to participate in expenditure on this project, Unesco merely being required to provide a lecturer.

[39] It was *decided* to pass this resolution to the Programme and Budget Commission with the relevant comments.

Draft Interim Report (*continued*).

Annex VII (Relief Assistance Services).

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.7.A].

[40] It was *agreed* to add the words "in 1951" at the end of the first sentence and, on the suggestion of Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), to delete the words "a very substantial" in the second sentence.

INFORMATION ON NEEDS, DIRECT ASSISTANCE AND VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE CAMPAIGNS [III.7.B].

[41] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought the Committee had agreed it would not be possible to include the comment outlined in the first paragraph.

[42] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed to the deletion of this paragraph, on the understanding that, in preparing future budgets, the Secretariat study the budgetary principle involved.

[43] With reference to item 7.35, Miss LAISE (United States of America) proposed the substitution of the wording used to cover the remarks on the CIPSH (Annex IV, item 4.11). *Agreed.*

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS [III.7.C].

[44] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) proposed the deletion of the first line of item 7.4, and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of the words "in passing" in the second line. *Agreed.*

[45] Annex VII of the Interim Report was *adopted* as amended.

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions concerning Relief Assistance Services.

REC-1 (Relief to Arab Refugees in Palestine) [document 5C/51].

[46] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) proposed that a sum of not less than $150,000 out of the total of $188,000 requested for Grants for Emergency Aid be devoted to Arab refugees in Palestine, and asked that this proposal be transmitted to the Programme and Budget Commission. *Agreed.*

REC-2 (An enquiry into the educational aspect of work camps) [document 5C/49].

(Total increase: $6,000.)

[47] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) explained that his delegation had not intended the Secretariat to make a special enquiry into this matter, but merely to conduct a survey within the Secretariat without engaging additional personnel or providing funds for travel.

[48] In reply to Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services), Professor FANTAPPIÉ agreed that his delegation should clarify the terms of this resolution to enable the Secretariat to carry out the small survey required without further budgetary provision.

[49] It was *agreed* to transmit this information to the Programme and Budget Commission.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

SIXTEENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the new Resolutions on the Programme (*continued*).

New resolutions concerning the External Relations Service.

XR-1 (Implementation of the decisions of the General Conference concerning regulatory recommendations and International Conventions) [document 5C/OXR/16].

(Total increase: $6,885).

[1] Mr. SABA (Head, Division of Legal Affairs) pointed out that, if the General Conference approved a number of proposals on its agenda, it would be necessary to prepare conventions or international agreements. Hitherto, the Organization had entrusted the drafting of such conventions or agreements to legal advisers engaged on a fee basis, but in view of the large increase of work envisaged in this field, it seemed more economical to establish two additional posts, one of a specialist in legal questions and one of a secretary.

[2] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the Committee could adopt this resolution provisionally and reconsider it when it was known how many proposed conventions or agreements the General Conference had approved.

[3] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) stated that his delegation was firmly opposed to any increase in personnel, especially on the administrative side of the Organization. He preferred that the Committee reserve its decision on this matter until further information became available.

[4] This proposal, seconded by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and by the CHAIRMAN, was *adopted*.

XR-2 (Increased Unesco Programme Activities in Germany) [document 5/55].

[5] The CHAIRMAN explained that the Secretariat had not yet been able to estimate the cost of this resolution, since further details were awaited from the delegation of the United States of America.

[6] It was therefore *agreed* to defer discussion until the necessary figures were available.

New resolution concerning the Office of the Director-General.

ODG-1 (Plan for the construction of a new building for Unesco) [document 5C/ADM/14].

(Total increase: $16,000.)

[7] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. ALMEIDA (Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) and Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the sums requested for fees and travel expenses were to finance a meeting of representative experts from Member States and to pay the services of an architect. The United Nations had financed a similar committee of ten experts for a period of four months in connexion with the construction of its headquarters in New York. After careful consideration, Unesco had decided to adopt the same principle; but, with a view to the utmost economy, it only proposed to call a committee of five experts for two months.

[8] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and Miss LAISE (United States of America) did not understand why this sum was to be drawn from the Budget and not from an eventual Building Fund if the project were approved.

[9] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) referred to the Report of the Headquarters Commission [document 5C/ADM/14] which had been established under Resolution 29.12 of the Fourth Session. This report requested the approval of the General Conference for further negotiation on this matter, together with authorization for the withdrawal of funds from the Working Capital Fund to finance such preliminary negotiations until an actual Building Fund was established.

[10] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the Budget Committee should approve the estimate submitted, but indicate that it felt

these expenses should more properly be charged against the Building Fund and not the budget.

[11] Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought the Committee might also point out the possible economy to be gained by using the experience of the United Nations in this matter instead of establishing an entirely new expert committee.

[12] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) made the further suggestion that, if the project were approved, Unesco might save expense by holding an open competition amongst architects for the design of the building.

[13] In view of the recommendations of the Committee, the Secretariat withdrew the proposal as a budgetary item.

New resolution concerning the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the General Conference [document 5C/PRO/5].

GP-1 (Total increase) [$64,080].

DP-1 (Total increase) [$35,342].

[14] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the increase required under GP-1, on account of the General Conference (I.A), was to cover the use of Spanish as a working language during the actual session of a General Conference (i.e., salaries of interpreters, minute-writers, translators, etc., as well as the necessary equipment), whereas the funds requested under DP-1, on account of Documents and Publications Service (III.9.A), were for the preparation of documents in Spanish before each General Conference and the production of the Conference records after each session. The estimate contained in GP-1 was based on a conference of twenty days to be held in Paris; if the conference were held elsewhere than in Paris, the sum of $2,400 for the rental of equipment for the transmission of simultaneous interpretation could be deducted, since it was the custom of the inviting country to provide such equipment free of charge.

[15] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) explained that the supplementary personnel for the Spanish language would be engaged on a temporary rather than a permanent basis, since Spanish would be a working language only for the period immediately before, during and after a General Conference. This consideration would apply even more if the proposal now before the Fifth Session to hold a General Conference only once every two years, were adopted. Mr. Montagnier added that this new proposal did not in any way affect the existing small Spanish Language Service, which it was proposed to continue on its present basis.

[16] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) incidentally pointed out that the sum of $7,800 for the purchase of furniture and equipment was one which would only be required for the first year.

[17] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) assured Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) that the Secretariat had very carefully taken into account the decreased number of General Conference documents which would be required in English and French when such documents also appeared in Spanish; but this decrease barely affected the total estimate, since the cost of printing the first thousand copies of documents in a new language (i.e., Spanish) was extremely high.

[18] It was *agreed* that the estimates submitted by the Secretariat under this resolution were reasonable and accurate.

New resolutions concerning the Department of Cultural Activities.

Draft International Convention for the protection of monuments, centres of historic interest, cultural institutions and works of art, in the event of armed conflict [document 5C/11 - Add. 1].

[19] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Italian delegation had submitted a proposal [document 5C/11] aimed at implementing resolution 6.42 of the 1950 Programme and resolution 4.43 of the 1951 Programme. This proposal had no budgetary implications. In the meantime, however, the Italian delegation had submitted a draft resolution [document 5C/11 - Add. 1] which required the provision of $500 (fees for a legal adviser) and $500 (fees for a military adviser).

[20] It was *decided* provisionally to allocate a sum of $1,000 to the project, pending the results of the examination of the requirements for legal advice throughout the programme (see XR-1 above).

Draft Interim Report (*concluded*).

Annex V (Exchange of Persons).

CLEARING-HOUSE AND PROMOTION [III.5.B].

[21] In conformity with the action taken

throughout the report, it was *decided* to delete the first line of the comment on this item.

Annex V was *adopted* with this amendment.

Annex VIII (External Relations Service).

HEADQUARTERS [III.8.A(1)].

[22] It was *decided* to delete the first line of paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*).

DIVISION OF LEGAL AFFAIRS [III.8.D].

[23] It was *decided* to delete the first line of the comment.

Annex VIII was *adopted* with these amendments.

Annex IX (Documents and Publications).

[24] It was *decided* to delete the first line of the comment on III.9.A.

Annex IX was *adopted* with this amendment.

Annex X (Statistical Service).

[25] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that the word "revised" in line 7 appeared to be an error, and suggested that this should read "various".

Annex X was *adopted* with this correction.

Annex XI (Part I: General Policy).

[26] On the suggestion of Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), it was *agreed* to change the word "questioning" at the end of the first paragraph to "consideration".

[27] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Committee only had authority to indicate possible areas for later consideration, whereas in paragraph (*a*) they appeared to be making a specific suggestion. He therefore proposed the substitution in this paragraph of "Length of the Sixth Session". *Agreed* .

Annex XI was *adopted* as amended.

Annex XII (Part II: General Administration).

[28] The CHAIRMAN felt that the comments of the Committee on this section should be more detailed.

After discussion, the following new text was adopted:

The Committee was concerned with the possibility of economics in this section. The following matters were noted:

(1) Without going into functions in detail, the Committee questioned duplication of responsibility between officers in the office of the Director-General, and the Directors of Departments and Heads of Services and Bureaux;

(2) The Committee felt that there appeared to be duplication of functions between the three administrative bureaux;

(3) The Committee will examine at a subsequent meeting the possibility of the integration of Archives, Unesco Library and Registry.

Annex XIII (Part IV: Common Service Costs).

[29] On the suggestion of Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), the following new text was adopted:

The Committee proposed to examine in detail the budget of Part IV at a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Recommendations with regard to the future procedure of the Budget Committee.

[1] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the report on this point be based on the assumption that the next session of the General Conference would be held in Paris. He asked that the following questions be considered:

(1) Was it constitutionally possible for the Budget Committee to be established and to meet

a few days *before* the opening of the General Conference?

(2) Could the Secretariat make available all the information required by the Budget Committee before the opening of the General Conference and not, as at present, only after three or four days?

[2] The CHAIRMAN added that it would also be necessary to arrange for delegations to submit new resolutions before the opening of a session.

[3] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) explained that the Executive Board had considered the first question raised by Sir Ronald. They had agreed that it would be quite in order for this session of the General Conference to nominate the countries which would be represented on the Budget Committee at the next session. The countries so nominated would then be required to appoint a delegate at the appropriate time, i.e., shortly before the opening of the Sixth Session. Alternatively, the Fifth Session could nominate a Budget Committee to meet before the Sixth Session, and the Sixth Session could then dissolve this Committee and constitute a new one. He emphasized that there was no connexion between the work of the Executive Board on financial questions and the work of the Budget Committee, so that there was no danger of overlapping.

[4] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) confirmed that there appeared to be no constitutional reason why the procedure outlined by the Executive Board could not be followed. The Fourth Session had designated the Headquarters Commission on the same basis, and this procedure had also been followed in the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies. However, he felt that it would be necessary to insert a paragraph outlining this new system in the Rules of Procedure. It would also be necessary to refer in the Rules of Procedure to the time-limit for the presentation of new resolutions by Member States, i.e., a fixed period before the opening of the General Conference.

[5] Miss LAISE (United States of America) pointed out that arrangements would have to be made to enable the Secretariat to ensure an earlier distribution of Conference documents, in particular the Programme and the Budget Estimates. She suggested that, in making this new proposal, delegates should carefully consider the extra burden on the Secretariat.

[6] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) agreed, and added that it would also be preferable if delegations requiring additional analyses of information not normally contained in the Budget, could make these requests to the Secretariat before the opening of a session.

[7] Mr. MONTAGNIER (Head, Bureau of Conference Planning and General Services) agreed with the Committee that it was most desirable that the Budget Committee should meet in future years one full week before the opening of the session of the General Conference. He stated that the Secretariat could ensure a sufficiently early distribution of Conference documents, provided arrangements could be made for the Executive Board to consider the Programme and Budget Estimates four months in advance of a General Conference, instead of two and a half to three months as at present.

[8] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) agreed that this could be arranged without difficulty.

After further discussion, it was *agreed* that the Secretariat should prepare a draft report to the Programme and Budget Commission outlining the foregoing proposals.

Information Annex to the Budget Estimates for 1951 [document 5C/5 (II), pages 15-26].

[9] Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether experience confirmed that the average lapse in filling new posts amounted in fact to 25 per cent [III.A.2., page 19].

[10] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that a careful analysis of recent figures showed that this estimate was actually too high. Twenty-five per cent represented a 90-day lapse on recruitment. Present figures showed an average lapse of 75 days for posts over grade 8, and 31 days for posts under grade 8. The Secretariat did not propose to alter the present estimate (25 per cent) before carrying out a careful check over a further period, but it was possible that a reduction of this estimate might be considered justifiable by the next session.

[11] Miss LAISE (United States of America) expressed the concern of her delegation that, whereas the Fourth Session had authorized a maximum of 774 posts, the Director-General had authorized the establishment of 50 new posts during the year, so that the total was now 824. There appeared to be greater flexibility for the transfer of funds within the Organization to cover increased personnel costs than was generally believed by Member States.

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that

the Director-General had made changes in the proposed staffing pattern for 1950 and had permitted certain transfers of funds in order to relieve some critical areas in the Secretariat, and he was now satisfied that a better balance had been achieved. The Secretariat was still learning from experience and certain staffing changes often became necessary during the year.

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) also pointed out that, although it should be expected that the Organization would increase in efficiency with experience, the Director-General appeared to anticipate a decrease in the volume of work with, at the same time, increased personnel costs.

[14] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the personnel costs showed an increase, although it was not proposed to increase the actual number of staff members, because it was necessary to add each year a sum sufficient to cover within-grade increments as these became due to present staff members, and other related personnel costs.

[15] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) felt that it would be unreasonable to assume that the increased efficiency of the Organization each year would be sufficient to offset the payment of within-grade increments as these became due.

[16] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) and Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) both suggested that the Secretariat be asked to study and report on questions of work-methods, efficiency and output—especially on the administrative side of the Organization.

Future procedure.

[17] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Budget Committee should discuss the procedure to be followed in the light of the existing situation. The Programme and Budget Commission had approved a provisional budget figure of $8,200,000. On the one hand, there was the Director-General's budget of $8,149,000, and on the other, a number of supplementary proposals accompanied by budget statements which were more or less fictitious, since the Programme and Budget Commission had not accepted some of the proposals.

[18] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) observed that the Programme and Budget Commission had referred a number of matters to a drafting committee, so that the Secretariat only knew unofficially which resolutions had been changed. He suggested that the best method would be for the Secretariat to report orally to the Budget Committee on the changes made by the Programme and Budget Commission, as and when they were made. In the meantime, the Committee might proceed with its detailed consideration of the Budget, chapter by chapter, tentatively agreeing on modifications; unless the Programme and Budget Commission added a large number of resolutions, the Budget Committee would not be in danger of having to make any subsequent drastic changes to its original estimates. Towards the end of the session, the Committee could hold a few meetings in order to make any adjustments rendered necessary by the decisions of the Programme and Budget Commission. Such a procedure would save the Budget Committee from going through the programme twice, first on the basis of an assumed figure, and again when the results of the work of the Programme and Budget Commission were known.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having pointed out that, while the Budget Committee was bound to produce an appropriation resolution not exceeding $8,200,000, it was not bound to produce one closely approaching that figure if the Programme and Budget Commission should consider that the programme could be carried out for $50,000 or $100,000 less, a discussion arose concerning the terms of reference of the Budget Committee.

[20] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) suggested that the best method would be to examine each chapter, deciding where economies could be made and costing new resolutions adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission; the Committee could then report back to the Programme and Budget Commission, giving its considered opinion of the new total thus reached. *Agreed.*

Detailed consideration of the Budget [document C5/5 (II)].

[21] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that a general decision should be taken to make a percentage reduction of certain items, such as travel, which occurred in all the chapters of the Budget.

[22] Supporting Mr. Weeden's proposal, Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that "Personnel Costs" be combined with "Travel". He noted that, while there were a large number of secretaries in all the departments, there appeared to be no typists or clerks. He had the impression that many secretaries could be cut out. He proposed that, in its final report, the Budget Committee should make a strong recommendation that the question of travel and personnel be thoroughly examined, with the suggestion that economies could be made on both items. *Agreed.*

1. Education.

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.1.A].

[23] *Approved* without comment.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION THROUGH THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION [III.1.B].

(1) Educational Missions.

[24] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that the Organization should be consistent in its treatment of educational missions, technical advisers and technical assistance operations, and that it would therefore be desirable for technical advisers to be sent to given countries on the same terms as the staff of educational missions. If his principle were accepted, the figure of $9,300 for travel [paragraph 11, page 81] appeared to be a little high.

[25] Mr. ELVIN (Head, Department of Education) recognized the logic of Mr. Weeden's point, but remarked that a precedent existed and that it would be difficult to change present practice without notice. He feared that, if the practice proposed by Mr. Weeden were adopted, some Member States which needed technical advisers would feel unable to pay for the service.

[26] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) agreed that it was a risk, but pointed out that less expensive technical advisers could be sent.

[27] Mr. KIRPAL (India) shared Mr. Elvin's point of view and asked that no decision be taken in 1950, but that the matter be reviewed at the next session of the Conference.

[28] In reply to a question from Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the figure of $9,300 which Mr. Weeden had mentioned included both tickets and *per diem*, as throughout the Budget. If Mr. Weeden's suggestion were adopted, the cost to the host government would be approximately $1,000 per man, consisting of board and lodging at a first-class hotel, and an allowance of $10, $12 or $15 per day for miscellaneous expenses.

[29] Recalling that technical advisers were brought to Paris to be briefed before being sent out, Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) had no objection to Unesco's paying their *per diem* allowance during that period, but was strongly opposed to Unesco's paying the $1,000 in the host country.

Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) strongly supported Mr. Weeden.

[30] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained what the Secretariat had done in the current year: it had had the choice of adopting technical assistance conditions and offering key experts a fee of approximately $1,000 a month, plus a living allowance based on the cost of living in the host country. In view of the budgetary limitations, however, it had been decided to pay a basic fee of $700 per month and a living allowance of $300. He pointed out that the Technical Assistance Board had decided that the salary of a first-class expert should be fixed at a sum which was higher than the salary paid to Unesco staff at grade 16.

[31] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was still not satisfied that all technical assistance experts needed to be paid at the same rate. He proposed that a cut of $4,500 should be made on that item.

Agreed.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

1. Education (*continued*).

EDUCATION CLEARING-HOUSE [III.1.B(2)].

Paragraph I (page 86).

[1] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that if the report required under resolution 1.121 was not likely to appear during 1951, a saving of $3,000 to $5,000 might be effected by the suppression of $2,000 for contractual printing (teaching of modern foreign languages), and some saving on the $3,000 fees for the use of the mother tongue in education.

[2] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) replied that the sum for printing would be necessary in view of preparations for the 1952 seminar on the subject.

[3] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought it unnecessary to print preliminary documents. Only the final documents should be printed. Some other method—such as offset—might be used for the preliminary documents.

[4] A discussion ensued, in wich Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico), Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) and Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) took part.

[5] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) was strongly opposed to any reduction in the distribution of preliminary documents. France had paid for 1,500 copies of the preliminary documents for teachers and professors for consideration prior to the forthcoming seminar at Montreal. He thought that the number of copies of preliminary documents should not be less than 5,000. If the seminars were thoroughly prepared in that way, some saving might be made on the estimates for the seminars themselves. He suggested that the saving on printing should not exceed $500.

[6] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed a saving of $1,500 on that item. $500 could then be used for production of special outside talks.

[7] It was *decided* to limit circulation of preliminary multigraphed documents to members of the seminar and National Commissions and to ensure that documents printed after the seminar received wide circulation.

[8] Reverting to the question of the use of the mother tongue in education ($3,000) Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked whether the estimate was really covered by a programme activity.

Pending its justification, the Committee *agreed* to delete this item.

Paragraph II (page 87).

[9] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the duplication under resolution 1.123 might have arisen on the $16,500 for the grant-in-aid to the International Bureau of Education, which showed an increase of $1,000 over the previous year.

[10] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the extra $1,000 had previously been paid from Unesco's own budget, and that it had been decided to transfer the sum to the item "grants-in-aid" in order to give a more realistic picture of the situation. Paragraph II was *approved*.

Paragraph III (page 87 and Interim Report: resolution 1.133).

[11] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having raised the question of travel, it was *decided* to return to that point later.

[12] Mr. Weeden pointed to the danger of duplication with the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. Travel of delegates to the Conference should be a shared responsibility.

[13] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the United Nations Commission had requested Unesco to investigate barriers to the education of women. This was all the project represented.

[14] Miss LAISE (United States of America)

thought that the aid of women's organizations could be enlisted through their contacts with the United Nations and Ecosoc, thus avoiding any danger of duplicating liaison work by the various Specialized Agencies.

[15] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out the dangers of overcentralization.

[16] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) said that Unesco should not be called upon to cease its liaison activities until the United Nations Co-ordinating Commission had given a verdict. The Director-General might be requested to go into the organizational problem. *Agreed.*

[17] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was concerned about the number of specialized conferences of the kind, not only because of the expenditure involved, but also because of the dislocation caused in the ordinary work of the officials who had to attend.

[18] On the suggestion of Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), it was *agreed* to postpone consideration of that question, and to maintain and comment 1.133 in the Interim Report.

Paragraph IV (page 87).

[19] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of the Netherlands, queried the figure of $28,000.

[20] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stated that the amount was less than half the budget estimates of the International Universities Bureau for the financial year 1951.

[21] In reply to a question from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) informed the meeting that the grant-in-aid for 1950 had been about $16,800.

It was *agreed* to reserve decision pending further detail.

[22] In answer to the enquiry from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) about Programme authority for the $2,000 to the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) agreed that the sum was not covered by the amended version of resolution 1.134.

The Committee *agreed* to suppress this budgetary item.

Paragraph V (page 87).

[23] Paragraph V was *approved*, and it was *agreed* that the Secretariat should be requested to give comparative figures for previous years.

Paragraph VI (page 87).

[24] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) emphasized that, even though the titles of the publications did not always appear in the programme resolutions, the budget estimates were generally covered by such resolutions.

[25] The SECRETARY informed the meeting that sub-section I had been transferred to the section on Education for International Understanding (III.1.D).

[26] Paragraph VI was *approved.*

Paragraph VII (page 88).

[27] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) expressed the hope that, in general, measures would be taken to see that exhibitions, once prepared, would be maintained by the Member States. In addition, Member States should pay costs of transportation to and fro, as well as within their own territory.

Paragraph VII was *approved.*

Paragraph VIII (page 88).

[28] After a discussion between Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education), it was *decided* that the sum of $3,000 should be deducted from the $49,500 for grants-in-aid on page 85, and added to the total grants-in-aid on page 98.

Paragraph VIII was *approved.*

STATISTICAL SERVICE [III.10.A].

[29] Dr. LIU (Head, Statistical Service) recalled that Unesco's statistical responsibilities had been specified in Article VIII of the Constitution. The Statistical Commission of the United Nations had approached Unesco about education statistics in preparing the Statistical Yearbook; but, as Unesco had not been able to collect the information required at that date, the Yearbook did not include a chapter on education.

[30] The call for education statistics, however, was not confined to the United Nations and outside bodies. Unesco itself needed the information, and there were also special questions on which statistics could throw considerable light, such as educational opportunities for women in the various countries.

The Director-General proposed.

(1) To collect and compile statistics;

(2) To publish statistics in conjunction with plans worked out with the United Nations;

(3) To improve international comparability of statistics (in 1951, the most elementary statistical series such as numbers of schools, teachers and students, would be collected).

[31] The CHAIRMAN having asked why obliga-

tions for consultants were estimated at $1,000 in 1950, but at only $700 for 1951, Dr. LIU (Head, Statistical Service) explained that the sum of $1,000 had been used for a cost of living survey, while the figure of $700 represented the first obligations for consultant experts called in by the Statistical Service.

[32] Miss LAISE (United States of America) noted that the Statistical Service scheduled new appointments throughout the year, and questioned whether a 25 per cent lapse rate was not too great.

[33] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that the Director-General avoided making appointments to the Service in order to leave Dr. Liu free in the matter of choice of staff.

[34] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) wondered whether the fee system would not be more suitable for the payment of consultants during the first year.

[35] Dr. LIU (Head, Statistical Service), replied that many problems were too intricate and too closely bound up with other problems peculiar to Unesco for the fee system to be used. As the results of the questionnaire on school statistics were coming in, sufficient data would be available in 1951 to justify the employment of consultants.

The estimates for the Statistical Service were provisionally *approved*.

FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND ADULT EDUCATION [III.1.C(1)].

Paragraph I (page 93).

[36] A discussion took place on the length of seminars, a matter which the Programme and Budget Commission had decided to leave to the Director-General.

[37] In reply to a question from Mr. FRANÇOIS (France), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that a reduction in the length of seminars from six to four weeks would lead to a saving of only $4,000 to $5,000, out of a total of $24-30,000.

[38] It was *decided* to place on record the Committee's concern about the length of seminars, so that the matter could be investigated at the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[39] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) said that, since the Report of the Budget Committee would go straight to the General Conference, it would be preferable that the wording should not state explicitly whether the matter of seminars was left to the Director-General or the Executive Board.

Agreed.

Paragraph II (page 93 and Interim Report: resolution 1.2121).

[40] The question of travel was *reserved* for study at the end of the section.

[41] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) failed to see a difference between the field counsellors provided for under resolution 1.2121 and technical advisers for whom provision was made under resolution 1.111 (paragraph II, page 81). Their conditions of work seemed similar, and criteria should therefore be similar—that is *per diem* expenses borne by the host-government.

[42] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the advisers worked primarily for Member States, whereas counsellors worked primarily for Unesco and only secondarily for Member States. Although priority was given to the States to which the missions were sent, advisers were also sent on request to other countries.

[43] Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought that six counsellors were too many, unless specific requests had been received. Any initiative under resolution 1.2121 should be undertaken in collaboration with other interested Specialized Agencies.

It was *agreed* that the final Report should mention the matter.

[44] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) supported Mr. Weeden's view that Member States receiving the counsellors should pay the *per diem* allowance.

[45] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education), as an example, informed the Committee that a counsellor would be sent to Mexico to obtain information on cultural agreements. Similarly, a field-worker and a counsellor had been sent to the Viani (Colombia) project; the former would probably receive a fee, the latter be given a temporary post. In neither case did the country pay the *per diem* allowance. This was different when a mission was sent at the request of a Member State.

[46] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the distinction was "permission" as opposed to "request".

[47] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), however, pressed his point that a reduction should be made in the item because of the *per diem* argument, and it was therefore *agreed* to reduce the item by $4,800.

Paragraph III (page 93).

[48] The Committee having found that the funds

proposed corresponded to the resolutions, paragraph III was *adopted* as it stood.

Paragraph IV (page 94).

[49] *Approved* without change or comment.

Paragraph V (page 94).

[50] There being no change by the Programme and Budget Commission and no comment by the Budget Committee, the paragraph was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (page 94).

[51] The item of travel being reserved for subsequent consideration, the paragraph was *approved.*

Paragraph VII (page 94).

[52] The Committee considered that such participation of experts was a means whereby Member States could provide information otherwise than through meetings. The question of travel was reserved, as was further consideration of the section, until the decision of the Programme and Budget Commission regarding the non-self-governing territories was known [document 5C/OXR/5-Add. 1].

Paragraph VIII (page 94).

[53] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that in future years part of the work included in this paragraph be allocated to National Commissions.

[54] It was *decided* to note this suggestion, and, there being no change by the Programme and Budget Commission or comment by the Budget Committee, to approve paragraph VIII.

Paragraph IX (page 94).

[55] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) submitted that, under the new resolution 1.2142, the sum of $6,300 for the publication of monographs could be saved. Since the second part of the former resolution, which had had budgetary implications, had been made the responsibility of Member States, the sum of $9,300 could be saved on the item.

[56] Mr. CHEVALIER (Secretary, Programme and Budget Commission) explained that, though the invitation was addressed to Member States in the new resolution, it would be for Unesco to carry out the comparative studies. Member States would only prepare lists.

It was *decided* to reserve this question.

Paragraph X (page 94).

[57] *Approved* without change or comment.

Paragraph XI (page 94)

[58] It was *decided* that the section should not be approved until the new version of 1.2121 had come from the Drafting Committee.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

NINETEENTH MEETING

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 9 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

1. Education (*continued*).

FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION AND ADULT EDUCATION [III.1.C(1)].

Resolution 1.2121.

[1] This resolution had been amended, but there were no budgetary implications.

EDUCATION CLEARING-HOUSE [III.1.B(2)].

Resolution 1.134.

[2] The CHAIRMAN returned to this item to query the provision of a grant-in-aid of $28,000 to the International Universities Bureau. There were several items in the proposed budget of this Bureau which seemed difficult to justify. In particular, the representation allowance and the Director's salary seemed out of proportion ($5,000 to $3,200), besides with an item of $1,500 was

included for rent, whereas the Bureau was actually installed rent-free in Unesco House. This grant-in-aid could not be approved until the Committee received more details.

[3] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the budget to which the Chairman referred had never been applied, and that, at Unesco's request, a new one had been established on a more realistic and solid basis. The salary of the Director had been reduced and the representation allowance abolished. After careful consideration, the Director-General had decided to permit the inclusion of the sum required for rent . . . Mr. Guiton also pointed out that the previous grant-in-aid had been reduced from $20,000 to about $16,000 as a result of devaluations.

[4] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt that, as a matter of principle recurring throughout the Budget, the Director-General should be requested to show how funds were to be used—as in the case of the ICSU grants.

[5] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) wondered how far Unesco could go in safeguarding the wise spending of the money it granted, without becoming responsible for the programme of the organizations concerned.

[6] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) further pointed out the danger of Unesco assisting too many new organizations which would then come to rely on a permanent Unesco subsidy and would never become self-supporting.

[7] It was *agreed* that a serious problem existed, in that no organ of the Organization had yet established *criteria* under which money should be granted; the main preoccupation hitherto had been with eligibility and procedure.

EDUCATION FOR MALADJUSTED CHILDREN [III.1.C (2)].

[8] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) announced that draft resolution 5C/57, which was intended to replace items 1.222 and 1.223, had been approved in a modified form by the Programme and Budget Commission, subject to the Budget Committee's estimate of the expenditure involved. The saving on items 1.222 and 1.223 would amount to $25,578, and the cost of the new proposal would be $8,122. In addition, there would be a saving of $5,053 on indirect costs for this project.

[9] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt that the overall sum of $4,000 provided for in paragraph VI (page 106) for staff travel could now be suppressed, since two of the five resolutions originally under this heading had been replaced, no travel was required under two others, and provision was made for travel under the remaining item.

[10] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) felt that some travel might nevertheless be necessary in connexion with this project, and proposed merely a reduction from $4,000 to $2,000.

[11] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that the Secretariat had already proposed a reduction of $1,000 in this provision.

[12] After further consultation, the Secretariat decided that it would be possible to reduce this amount by a further $1,500. *Approved.*

EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING [III.1.D].

Paragraph 1 (page 111).

[13] The SECRETARY announced that Resolution 1.311 had been amended, but that there were no budgetary implications. The Programme and Budget Commission had merely suggested that some of the work could be undertaken by National Commissions and Member States.

[14] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that point 1 (*b*) bore no relation to the resolution. He felt, therefore, that the Committee should delete this point and inform the Programme and Budget Commission that no budgetary provision could be made for any activity not covered by a programme resolution.

[15] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the Executive Board had amended the resolution covering this item, but that it had not been possible to make the corresponding amendment in document 5C/5 (II) which was already being printed. This accounted for the apparent lack of relation between resolution 1.311 and the work plan.

[16] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) supported the proposal of Sir Ronald Adam, but Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) felt that this was a useful project and should be maintained, providing the Secretariat felt able to carry out a reasonable amount of work in 1951.

[17] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) was able to give this assurance, as the Department of Social Sciences was also collaborating on this project and had already prepared some of the material.

[18] After further discussion it was *decided* by

8 votes to 1 to delete point 1 (b) on the grounds that it was not covered by any resolution.

[19] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of point 1 (c) on the same basis. He pointed out that the Programme and Budget Commission could re-instate this item by passing the necessary new resolution.

[20] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) showed that this item was, in fact, related to resolution 1.311, since a seminar was to be organized by the Directors of International Schools on the subject of primary and secondary education. It was therefore *decided* to maintain point 1 (c) in the budget.

Paragraph II (page 112).

[21] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) proposed a reduction in the length of the seminar from 6 to 4 weeks, with a consequential budgetary cut of $4,500. The seminar to be held in Brussels in 1950 on the improvement of history textbooks would prepare much of the work to be undertaken by the 1951 seminar.

[22] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) pointed out that the Budget Committee had previously agreed that any decision as to the lengthening on shortening of seminars must be taken by the Programme and Budget Commission.

[23] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) added that the Commission had, in fact, discussed this seminar, and had left the matter to the Director-General.

[24] Miss LAISE (United States of America) recalled the Committee's previous decision to ask the Director-General to study this matter during the year and to report next year on the appropriate length for seminars.

[25] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) suggested that, if Mr. François were prepared to withdraw his proposal, the Secretariat would not fail to examine the possibility of a reduction of expenditure on this seminar if any curtailment of the education programme became necessary during the year.

[26] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) having agreed, it was *decided* to maintain resolution 1.312 in the budget.

Paragraphs III to VI (page 106).

[27] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) pointed out that resolutions 1.321-3 had been approved by the Programme and Budget Commission with the recommendation that, if at all possible, the funds provided be increased by $10,000.

[28] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that consideration of all recommended increases be postponed until after the Committee had completed its present examination and knew how much additional money would be available. *Agreed.*

Paragraph VII (page 106).

[29] The SECRETARY announced that the Programme and Budget Commission had suggested that National Commissions and Member States should be requested to participate in project 1.331 but that no amendment affecting the budgetary provision had been made.

Paragraph VIII (page 106).

[30] Resolution 1.342 had been amended by the Programme and Budget Commission, but no budgetary change was involved.

Paragraphs X and XI (page 107).

[31] Mr. FRANÇOIS (France) felt that not only was it dangerous to separate work on projects 1.351 and 1.352, but that staff reductions could be made if the projects were combined.

[32] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that the entire amount requested for item 1.351 should be deleted, unless the resolution covering this item were modified. At the present time, the resolution called only for the dissemination of "documents already prepared", and there was no authority for the preparation and publication of new pamphlets.

[33] This proposal was seconded by Mr. FRANÇOIS (France), and it was unanimously *agreed* to delete this sum ($2,140) provisionally.

[34] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) announced that the Programme and Budget Commission had considered the possibility of agreeing to a request from the World Federation of United Nations Associations for a grant of $10,000 to assist Unesco in carrying out this project. The Commission was prepared to approve this request, provided the Budget Committee could make the necessary funds available.

[35] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) felt very strongly that the Programme and Budget Commission was the only body authorized to take decisions of this nature. The Budget Committee could merely note that the total costs of this proposal would be $10,000 and decide whether the estimates submitted by WFUNA were reasonable or not.

[36] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) and Sir Ronald

ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that no action was required by the Budget Committee, since no resolution had been submitted.

[37] The CHAIRMAN and Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) thought that the action of the Programme and Budget Commission had already indicated approval of the proposal, providing the necessary funds were available, and suggested that the Commission be requested to supply a definite resolution.

[38] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budgte) pointed out that initiative on this matter must come from the General Conference, since the Director-General had not included this as part of his programme for 1951, and, if given a choice, would prefer to spend the additional $10,000 on the programme as presented by the Executive Board.

[39] After further discussion, it was *decided* to refer the Programme and Budget Commission to the Committee's previous communication, and to request a definite resolution on the WFUNA proposal, on the understanding that the grant requested would not exceed $10,000 and might be judged less by the Budget Committee.

TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

[40] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) announced that decisions already taken had reduced the amount provided from $72,000 to $60,000.

[41] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) proposed that, as this was the figure he had previously suggested for travel in the Education Department, this amount be adopted. Provisionally *adopted.*

The meeting rose at midnight.

TWENTIETH MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

[1] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) having recalled that the question of personnel of the Education Department had not yet been dealt with, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the Director of the Department of Education had considered the question very carefully and could not see how further reduction of personnel could be effected.

Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested reverting to this question when the new resolution was being considered. *Agreed.*

2. Natural Sciences.

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.2.A].

No comments.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION: SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS [III.2.B(1)].

Paragraph 1 (page 117).

[2] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked whether money could be appropriated without a resolution, since 2.1 was merely a title without a resolution.

[3] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that titles were used in one or two places to indicate a group of resolutions on which demands for funds were based—in this case all those between 2.111 and 2.116.

[4] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought resolution 2.111 amply justified paragraph 1.

[5] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) agreed that it might be better to refer paragraph 1 to the entire group of resolutions, because the services listed on page 114 were rather too varied for particularization.

[6] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) was still not quite clear how Member States would be associated with the activities envisaged.

[7] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the Field Science

Co-operation Offices did most of the liaison work in that connexion, but they could not cope with all the Member States' requests, some of which were incidentally directly addressed to the Secretariat in Paris; paragraph 1 covered the services provided by Unesco in those cases.

[8] Miss LAISE (United States of America) was in favour of eliminating the estimate, because she could not see the necessity for fees in addition to the grants which should cover the reports mentioned under paragraph 1.

[9] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) held that the money asked for under paragraph 1 was for entirely different activities than those for which ICSU received a grant. It would probably be far less expensive to use consultants on the spot than to send people from headquarters.

[10] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that the expert personnel of the Section was really only five, the remainder being secretaries. Furthermore, it would be very useful to have independent outside opinions on the meetings and projects submitted. The funds requested represented only 1 per cent of the total and would act like a drop of lubricant to a machine.

It was *decided*, by 4 votes ot 3, with 4 abstentions, to delete paragraph 1.

[11] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) having expressed his regret at the Committee's decision, Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that the National Commissions' greater help could make up for the deletion of paragraph 1, while Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) stressed that those who had voted against the deletion wished to decline responsibility for that decision if, as he personally thought, it involved a modification of the programme. Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), however, did not think a modification of the programme was involved, since none of the resolutions in section 2.1 mentioned aid to Member States.

Paragraph II (pages 117 and 118).

[12] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked whether it was not a fact that Unesco's contribution to ICSU'S budget had now reached 60 per cent of the Council's resources.

[13] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) agreed that the figures available made it appear so, but the contribution would amount to some 35 per cent only if ICSU'S "invisible income" in services were taken into consideration.

Paragraph II was *approved.*

Paragraph III (page 118).

[14] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph IV (including a slight amendment to resolution 2.113).

[15] Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked what was last year's figure, and whether the activity was tapering off.

[16] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that the amount was the same, but in the form of a grant-in-aid instead of a contract; WHO was providing twice the 1949 amount. He pointed out that Unesco could make no promises for the future and that all figures could be reviewed every year.

[17] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) noted that Unesco's contribution was no longer for a contract, and hoped that the balance sheets of ICSU and other organizations would be available at future Conferences.

Paragraph IV was *approved.*

Paragraph V (page 118).

[18] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) advocated that the International Union for the Protection of Nature should prepare material for the publications envisaged, according to the means of particular countries.

Paragraph V was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (page 119).

[19] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VII (page 119).

[20] It was *decided* to defer discussion until the end of the Natural Sciences Chapter.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE AND MATERIAL [III.2.B(2)].

Paragraphs I and II (page 123).

[21] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph III (page 123).

[22] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) ascertained that there was no relation between the body referred to and the Council for Co-ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences.

Paragraph III was *approved.*

Paragraph IV (including a slight amendment to resolution 2.133).

[23] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) explained that the cost of the second meeting, included at the request of the Austrian delegation ($4,500), was greater than

that of the first because the participants were coming from more remote countries.

Paragraph IV was *approved.*

Paragraph V (including an amendment to resolution 2.141).

[24] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VI (page 123).

[25] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VII (page 123).

[26] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) stated that Mr. Pollock (Canada) had asked him to point out that the additional Grade 10 post (page 121) seemed to have been added only to deal with scientific apparatus coupons.

[27] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) gave an assurance that the official in question would have many other duties besides.

Paragraph VII was *approved.*

Paragraph VIII (page 124).

[28] It was *decided* to defer discussion to the end of the Natural Sciences Chapter.

FIELD SCIENCE CO-OPERATION OFFICES [III.2.C].

Paragraph I (page 131).

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) indicated that the Programme and Budget Commission had suggested the addition to the total Budget of $25,000 for the *local* recruitment of scientific personnel.

[30] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was of the opinion that the Committee's Report should include some mention that Member States could contribute to the upkeep of Field Science Co-operation Offices. Moreover, from its experience with technical assistance, Unesco could probably improve working methods.

[31] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) strongly emphasized that the Director-General, the Executive Board and the TAB believed that a clear separation should be maintained with regard to staff and activities between the regular programmes and special technical assistance activities. It should be noted that Technical Assistance emphasized economic development, whereas Unesco's regular programme concentrated primarily on education, science and culture, although some parallelism must necessarily exist between those activities.

Paragraph I was *approved.*

Paragraph II (including an amendment to resolution 2.152 and a new resolution regarding co-operation with regional offices).

[32] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph III (page 132).

[33] *Approved* without comment.

ASSISTANCE TO RESEARCH FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF MANKIND [III.2.D].

Paragraph I (including a new resolution 5C/58 to replace 2.21).

[34] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph II (page 135).

[35] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph III (page 135).

[36] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) indicated that resolutions 2.23 and 2.24 had been eliminated, with a resulting economy of $2,000.

Paragraph III was *approved.*

Paragraph IV (page 135).

[37] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked if the same amount of personnel was necessary now that only one resolution remained.

[38] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stressed that that resolution was quite general and covered the whole of Section D, which was based on resolutions 2.21, 2.22 and 2.25, and that outside assistance was often necessary. Furthermore, the new Italian proposal concerning the co-ordination of the work of National Research Centres (5C/35), which had been adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, would involve considerable extra work for the Secretariat.

Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) supported Professor Auger's point of view.

Paragraph IV was *approved.*

TEACHING AND POPULARIZATION OF SCIENCE [III.2.E].

Paragraph I (including a new resolution additional to 2.31).

[39] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph II (page 138).

[40] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that resolutions 2.32 and 2.33 had been dropped, thus saving $2,400.

Paragraph II was *approved.*

Paragraph III (page 138).

[41] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the assistance under discussion was grants-in-aid rather than payments in connexion with contracts.

[42] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, according to Unesco's present rules, some non-governmental organizations were ineligible for grants-in-aid as such. To achieve the same end, therefore, contracts had been resorted to.

Paragraph III was *approved*.

Paragraph IV (page 138).

[43] After Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) had explained that the work would be done with the help of the National Commissions, paragraph IV was *approved*.

Paragraph V (including new resolution 5C/64).

[44] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VI (page 138).

[45] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VII (page 139).

[46] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) remarked that the National Commissions should be able to produce certain filmstrips.

Paragraph VII was *approved*.

Paragraphs VIII, IX and X (page 139).

[47] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph XI (including new resolution 5C/21, reducing the additional amount from $3,200 to $2,400).

[48] *Approved* without comment.

TOTAL TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF NATURAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT.

[49] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the 1950 figure was $59,037. The $67,360 for 1951 in point of fact represented a decrease, because $20,000 were earmarked for the *new* Field Science Co-operation Offices.

[50] Miss LAISE (United States of America) declared she would not press for a $5,000 cut in view of the $3,500 reduction which the Committee had approved earlier.

[51] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) thought that that reduction might make it necessary to ask for an increase of the sum for travel expenses.

[52] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the provisional total involved an increase of appropriations for Natural Sciences of $3,600.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

3. Social Sciences.

AID TO INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COLLABORATION [III.3.B].

Paragraph I (page 147).

[1] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that secretariat services of the organizations in question had previously been financed by contract which had been changed for 1951 into a grant-in-aid.

Paragraph I was *approved*.

Paragraph II (page 147).

[2] In reply to Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) stated that the sum for fees was

necessary to secure the contributions of outstanding experts.

Paragraph II was *approved.*

Paragraph III (page 147).

[3] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph IV (page 148).

[4] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that the work could be left to the National Commissions.

[5] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt there was a strong case for associating National Commissions rather than international non-governmental organizations with Unesco's work.

[6] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) said that, although some countries had well-developed National Commissions, others had not. Unesco must therefore continue to work with international organizations in order to obtain work of a uniform quality. The money was not intended as payment to the organizations as such, but would be subcontracted.

[7] With regard to the proposed reduction, although the number of countries in which surveys would be made had been reduced from ten to four, he hoped that the estimate would not be cut down by three-fifths of the original sum. The survey to be undertaken in the United States would be particularly heavy.

[8] At the suggestion of Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), it was *decided* to make a reduction of two-fifths ($10,000).

Paragraph V (page 148).

[9] In reply to Miss LAISE (United States of America), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that the establishment of Field Science Co-operation Offices did not represent an attempt to regionalize the work of Unesco. Such offices were set up where the need existed.

Paragraph V was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (page 148).

[10] The question of travel was *reserved* for subsequent discussion.

STUDIES OF SOCIAL TENSIONS [III.3.C].

Paragraph I (page 151).

[11] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph II (page 151).

[12] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph III (page 152).

[13] In response to a request by Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) stated that Mr. Colin Clark's studies in Australia had shown that the occupational structure of a country could be related to the educational system, and that Member States would be able to forecast later needs several years in advance and consequently could adjust their educational system.

Paragraph III was *approved.*

Paragraph IV (page 152).

[14] The estimate for printing the report was questioned by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia).

The figure of $2,000 was maintained, on the assurance of Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) that the report would be published in the course of 1951.

Paragraph IV was *approved.*

Paragraph V (page 152).

[15] As the change in programme resolution 3.25 had no budgetary implications, paragraph V was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (page 152).

[16] *Approved* without change.

Paragraph VII (page 152).

[17] As the new programme resolution 3.27 had no budgetary implications, paragraph VII was *approved.*

Paragraphs VIII and IX (pages 152 and 153).

[18] *Approved* without comment.

STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION [III.3.D].

Paragraph I (page 156).

[19] Mr. SHARP (Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that the change made by the Programme and Budget Commission in programme resolution 3.31 involved a slight change in emphasis which might well have budgetary implications. If these studies were to have any practical value, they must be co-ordinated. The National Commissions could not be called upon to perform the necessary co-ordination of the couclusions reached as a result of its different activities.

[20] Having contacted the mover of the resolution, Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) informed the Committee that Sir Charles Webster had not intended the budget estimates to be reduced.

[21] It was *decided* to instruct the Secretariat to prepare a revised work plan whose cost must not exceed that of the original programme.

Paragraph II (page 156).

[22] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that each organization participating in the meeting should pay the expenses of its expert. He maintained that such joint study could succeed only if all organizations participating were sufficiently interested. If that was the case they would be willing to pay the salaries and expenses of their experts.

[23] Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked whether a reduction in the figure for conferences and meetings could be effected if the study were carried out during the session of the General Conference, when most of the experts would be on the spot.

[24] Mr. SHARP (Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that it would be difficult for the experts to leave their work during the session, but that it might be possible for the meeting to take place immediately after a Conference session, thereby saving on travel costs.

[25] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that, as the host Organization which was, in fact, receiving assistance, Unesco should not pay expenses. He asked that this should be noted in the final Report as an item which should not in future involve budgetary commitments.

[26] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) endorsed the point of view expressed by Mr. Weeden and Sir Ronald Adam, and proposed a reduction of $800 on the item Conferences and Meetings. *Agreed*

[27] Miss LAISE (United States of America) wondered whether the studies to be carried out under programme resolutions 3.32 and 3.34 could not be carried out together under one set of estimates.

[28] Mr. SHARP (Department of Social Sciences) assured Miss Laise that the studies would be co-ordinated as far as possible; however, since the site of the study of international secretariats was not yet definitely fixed, the full integration which she suggested might not be possible. *Agreed.*

Paragraph III (page 156).

[29] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) proposed the reduction of the item "Conferences and Meetings" by $400. *Agreed.*

Paragraph IV (page 157).

[30] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) asked whether the change in programme resolution 3.34 put Unesco in a position of having to disseminate the results of all the studies which it "encouraged".

[31] Mr. SHARP (Department of Social Sciences) pointed out that the word "disseminate" did not imply that Unesco should publish the results.

TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT.

[32] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) informed the meeting that the original figure for the year 1951 was $39,700, of which $6,000 was for field social science. The cost of travel in regard to work in Germany and the Far East had not been included in the 1950 figure.

[33] Dr. ANGELL (Acting Director, Department of Social Sciences) explained that the increase was necessary in order to carry out the Programme which emphasized the importance of work on Social Tensions.

The increase for travel was *approved.*

[34] At the request of Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), it was *decided* to note in the final Report the difficulty of ascertaining how much travel was involved, when the travel was included in "fees", "travel on official business", "travel of delegates to Conferences and Meetings".

1. Education (*continued*).

STUDY IN INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1].

[35] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the small size of the budget for the study of indigenous languages resulted from the fact that such studies were closely linked with the programme for fundamental education.

[36] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) and Miss LAISE (United States of America) wondered whether it would be possible for the few experts on the subject, many of them already working for Unesco, to leave their ordinary work. Miss Laise further suggested that resolution 1.2141 could be combined to a considerable extent with resolution 1.2132 and a saving effected. Moreover, the work in non-self-governing territories should be strictly defined from the start, as it would be impossible to cover all aspects.

[37] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) agreed with Miss Laise and thought that the work should begin from certain regions and certain languages. He thought that the sum of $25,050 was too much to give useful results.

[38] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) stated that it had become clear from the discussions in Washington that no savings could be effected, because the Mexico centre had different objectives.

[39] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) assured the meeting that the work would be fully co-ordinated. The fragmented presentation was caused by submission of resolutions by both the Executive Board and by delegations.

[40] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked why the projected study group was to cost six times as much as meetings mentioned in paragraph VII (page 94).

[41] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the amount for the seminar be reduced to $20,000.

Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) would not oppose a slight reduction.

[42] Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought that the programme resolution proposed by the Executive Board was a wider version of resolution 1.2132; she therefore suggested that the sum of $4,250 provided in paragraph VII be devoted to the larger project.

This proposal, seconded by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), was *adopted*.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL.

[43] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) noted that the suppression of the post of Programme Specialist (grade 15) in the Office of the Director left four secretaries serving three higher grade officials (page 76).

[44] In the section for Special Research and Studies (page 84), there was provision for four specialists, four secretaries and one shorthand-typist. He suggested that one of the secretarial posts be suppressed.

[45] Further, in the section on Teaching about United Nations and the Specialized Agencies (page 103), Mr. Brunswick suggested that the work be transferred to the section on Education for International Understanding, and the two posts (grades 10 and 3 respectively) suppressed.

[46] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) explained that the suppression of the grade 15 post (page 76) did not affect the secretarial staff, as the post was for a traveller. Moreover, the distribution of the existing four secretaries was as follows: one at grade 6 organized the secretarial work of the Department; of the remaining three, one was assistant to the administrator, one was a secretary and the third a shorthand-typist.

[47] The secretariat work under the estimates on page 84 and 85 was organized on the "pool" system, so that the true proportion was 14 secretary-typists to 18 officials of grades 8 and above.

[48] He was quite willing to see the suppression of the two posts in the section for teaching about the United Nations (page 103), as the new programme resolution had reduced the activity of that section to a routine distribution of documents.

[49] It was *agreed* that Mr. Elvin be asked to look into the matter of secretarial posts, bearing in mind that the proportion of secretarial posts to those for officials of higher grade was higher in the Department of Education than, for example, in the Department of Social Sciences.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

later: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada)

Presentation of the Annual Programme and Budget of the Organization [document 5C/12].

[1] The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the United Kingdom resolution dealing with the form of the Programme and Budget in future years, which had been referred to both the Programme and Budget Commission and the Budget Committee.

[2] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) explained that only paragraph *(b)* concerned the Budget Committee. This was a matter he had raised many times in the Committee—that is to say:

Each programme resolution in the Annual Programme shall be separately and individually accompanied by a Budget entry with full details relating to the estimated cost of carrying out the work involved in that resolution; excepting only established personnel costs and other standing administrative costs of the Organization, which may be included in a consolidated estimate placed at the beginning of each chapter of the Annual Programme.

[3] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) stated that his delegation could not support this resolution. They felt that it was a step in the wrong direction which would break up the Programme of Unesco into fragments. Neither the United States government nor any other, to his knowledge, submitted to pinpoint legislation of this type. His delegation recommended a budget on broad programme lines giving the Director-General greater flexibility and freedom to carry out his Programme. Far from adopting the United Kingdom resolution, which would only lead to greater rigidity, Unesco should abandon even its present system in favour of one giving more flexibility.

[4] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that delegations required precise information regarding the cost of each item in the Budget and that, if this were not given initially in the Budget Estimates, much time would be lost during a General Conference while Directors of departments supplied the information required.

[5] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that, while understanding and sympathizing with the object of the United Kingdom resolution, he could not support it, since it endangered that flexibility of the Programme so essential to the Director-General in carrying out his responsibilities. In addition, the United Kingdom proposal would lead Unesco away from the United Nations' endeavour to standardize the Budget presentation of all the Specialized Agencies, and further it would prevent clear annual reviews of the progress of the Organization, since this kind of budgeting on a detailed project basis would render any comparison of operations from year to year most difficult. On the other hand it was quite definitely essential for delegations, by one means or another, to have a very clear picture of the cost of each project. Mr. Pollock understood that the Economic and Social Council had just requested Unesco to provide a budget on an individual project basis for the detailed information of the United Nations. If Unesco had to prepare a budget of this nature annually for Ecosoc, it might be presented as an information annex for delegations, the main budget estimates being presented under the broad, flexible form proposed by Mr. Roseman. In any case he would be glad to hear the comments of the Director-General on these proposals.

[6] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) said that although he, too, sympathized with the desire of the United Kingdom delegation, the method of presentation of the budget was entirely dependent upon the structure of the Programme. Since 1946 efforts had been made to cost the budget entirely by programme resolution. So far none of these attempts had been successful to the extent required by the United Kingdom resolution, and a certain flexibility had remained; for instance, the Director-General had been able to increase the number of permanent posts from 774, as approved by the Fourth Session, to 824 at the present time. His delegation felt that a certain amount of freedom within the fixed budget—perhaps more than hitherto—was necessary, but that it would be dangerous for Member States to approve a budget

on lines which were too broad and vague. On the other hand, if the Programme and Budget were presented in too much detail, it would become increasingly impossible for the General Conference to complete its tasks successfully in the time available. This would raise the whole question of the structure of the General Conference. He thought that the United Kingdom resolution required amendment to render it practicable, but that the entire question was altogether too large for the Budget Committee and would have to be debated by the General Conference. However, it might be useful to hear the comments of the Director-General and the Executive Board.

[7] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) emphasized that the Board had not yet studied the proposal contained in the United Kingdom resolution; nevertheless he believed the Board would not consider it possible to maintain a complete parallel between the Programme and the Budget. It might be possible to achieve a closer degree of co-ordination than hitherto, but the United Kingdom resolution went too far in this direction.

[8] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) said that although he had not yet been able to give this matter full consideration, he was inclined to agree with the point of view expressed by Mr. Roseman.

[9] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thanked delegates for their most interesting and helpful comments, and announced that he would withdraw his resolution for the time being in order to bring these comments to the notice of his delegation.

[10] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that the Director-General recognized that this was an extremely involved problem, due mainly to the complex way in which the Programme had been developed; for instance, in 1951 approximately 279 separate actions were required. However, the Director-General was not entirely in favour of the United Kingdom resolution, since it was extremely difficult for the Secretariat to estimate the cost of each separate action with any degree of accuracy eighteen months or two years in advance, in accordance with present procedure. The detailed co-ordination of the Programme and Budget required by the United Kingdom would leave the Director-General entirely without freedom to make changes which were sometimes necessary in the best interests of the Organization during the year. Mr. Weitz pointed out that at the present time there was danger of contradiction between the terms of the Appropriation Resolution (stating that all expenditure must correspond to a programme resolution and to the budget voted by the General Conference) and the provision whereby the Director-General was permitted, with the approval of the Executive Board, to make certain transfers within the budget. He felt that matter at least required clarification.

Detailed examination of the Budget Estimates (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Part IV. Common Service Costs.

A. COMMUNICATIONS.

[11] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) referred to Resolution CSC-1, increasing postal costs by $19,000 over the given estimate, owing to the new rates in France. *Approved.*

[12] In reply to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), Mr. WEITZ explained that the Secretariat had found it difficult to establish firm rules governing the use of air freight instead of surface mail. All possible steps were being taken to ensure that documents were prepared sufficiently early to permit despatch by surface mail. Circumstances often made this impossible, but delegates could be assured that the Secretariat was making every effort to deal with this problem, and to restrict the use of airmail, air freight and cable services to a minimum.

B. BUILDING RENTS, UTILITIES AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS.

[13] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the increase provided for electricity charges in 1951 was made to allow for several extra machines and for normal improvements in the lighting system of Unesco House.

C. SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS.

[14] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) noted an increase in this estimate over the figure for 1950, and suggested a slight reduction to $125,000.

[15] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the estimate for this item had been very carefully calculated to cover no more than the Organization's actual consumption of supplies and materials for one year. However the small reduction proposed by Mr. Brunswick wat not unreasonable.

[16] In reply to Mr. ROSEMAN (United States

of America), Mr. WEITZ added that it was the policy of the Organization to maintain a six-monthly stock of expendable supplies. A large order was placed twice a year and small local purchases were made as necessary.

Mr. Brunswick's proposal, seconded by Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), was *adopted.*

D. Rental Operation and Maintenance of Equipment.

[17] No comment.

E. Staff Welfare Activities.

[18] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) raised two queries in this section: (1) The salary of $3,500 paid for the part-time services of a French physician seemed extremely high in relation to the normal remuneration of a doctor in Paris. (2) The sum of $6,000 provided for the staff language training scheme also seemed unreasonably high. In view of Unesco's limited budget, it might even be considered as unnecessary and deleted altogether.

[19] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that he could not say exactly on what terms the contract with the Paris hospital responsible for providing the Unesco medical service had been fixed. This contract, however, had resulted in a definite improvement of the medical service which was used extensively by staff members. As to the language training programme, Mr. Weitz said that all the classes were extremely well attended by the staff, who also contributed to the cost. He believed that this scheme was followed by other Specialized Agencies.

[20] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) said that he would not insist on any reduction of the estimates presented, but would propose (1) that the Secretariat study the expenses of the medical services before the next General Conference with a view to proposing economies, and (2) that the staff language training scheme be borne in mind as an area where possible savings might be effected. *Agreed.*

F. Permanent Equipment.

[21] Miss LAISE (United States of America) felt that the estimate for the replacement of furniture was extremely high.

[22] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that Unesco had insufficient experience in this matter, since the Organization had no furniture at all when it was first established. This estimate for replacements had been made with great care, but it might be possible to reduce the figure in future years.

[23] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) suggested that, in order to indicate the feeling of the Committee on this matter and since there was considerable flexibility in the budget of this section, the average of $200 per unit replacement be reduced to $175. Since 77 unit replacements were involved this would mean a total reduction of $1,925. *Agreed.*

G. Miscellaneous Common Costs.

[24] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested the provisional adoption of these estimates as this was a section in which reductions might be made at a later stage if necessary. *Agreed.*

The meeting rose at midnight.

TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. Bender (Netherlands)

Draft Final Report of the Committee: Report No. 1.

[1] The CHAIRMAN submitted to the Committee the draft report, which would form document 5C/BUD/2. If the draft were approved, it would have to be referred (1) to the Procedure Committee, in view of the changes involved in the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, and (2) to the Nominations Committee, since it would be

necessary to appoint the members of the Sixth Session Budget Committee before the end of the current session.

[2] The first three paragraphs, introducing the report, were not completely satisfactory to the whole Committee. Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Miss LAISE (United States of America) and Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt that the draft submitted to the Committee did not sufficiently indicate the usefulness of the Budget Committee during the current session, nor did it indicate the need for future sessions to make provision for the establishment of a similar committee as one of the organs of the Conference. Moreover, the second paragraph left in some doubt the responsibility which was to be entrusted to the Committee by the General Conference.

[3] It was *decided* that Mr. Pollock (Canada), Miss Laise (United States of America) and Mr. Brunswick (France) should redraft the introduction.

Examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

Part I. General Policy.

GENERAL CONFERENCE [I.A].

[4] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) observed that it might be necessary to extend the Sixth Session if the General Conference decided to hold its sessions biennially in the future.

[5] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) thought it was difficult to foresee at once what effects that decision would have on the presentation and examination of the budget. The time necessary for the consideration of the budget would vary according to the amount of detail included in its preparation.

[6] In reply to questions from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) stated that:

(1) If the duration of the Sixth Session were limited to two weeks, there might be a reduction of $21,600 in the corresponding budget;

(2) The amount of travelling expenses on official business at the time of the Conference depended on the date of the session, as the problems of recruiting temporary staff were different in the spring and autumn;

(3) The provision of $9,500 under the heading of "Other Contractual Items" covered the fees of the auditors, which had previously appeared in Section I.B.

[7] At the request of Mr. GUIGNOLET (France), Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning) explained that 16 interpreters were required during the Conference in order to comply with the Rules of Procedure. As the Secretariat had only five permanent interpreters, it was necessary to recruit 11 temporary ones.

EXECUTIVE BOARD [I.B].
No comment.

Part II. General Administration.

[8] In reply to a question from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Administrative Commission's discussion of general matters and, in particular, of the salary and allowance system for the staff of the Secretariat, had not resulted in definite recommendations which could be immediately expressed in figures.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL [II.A].
No comment.

BUREAU OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET [II.B].

[9] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) asked why the Administrative officer (grade 10), for whom provision was made in the budget of the Department of Mass Communication (page 217) was not attached to the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget.

[10] M. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that the function of that official, like that of all the Administrative officers attached to heads of departments, was to ensure, within the department, that the regulations concerning staff movements, travel on official business, provision of material or services, etc., were observed. Primary responsibility was departmental. When the Budget was being prepared, those officials co-operated particularly with the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget in drawing up the budgets of their own departments, but their contacts with other administrative Bureaux were equally close. It was therefore quite proper for them to be attached to individual departments instead of to one or other of those Bureaux.

BUREAU OF THE COMPTROLLER [II.C].

[11] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) wished to know whether the three new posts provided for in the

budget had already been filled; if not, he wondered whether it would not be difficult to fill them, in view of the Administrative Commission's decision to suspend the recruitment of "local" staff until the new salary scales had been brought into force.

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied that those posts, for which provision had been made for 1951, would not be filled in 1950.

BUREAU OF PERSONNEL [II.D].

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) remarked that the experience acquired by the Secretariat in earlier years was particularly noticeable in the administrative services, the estimates being clearly justified. He wished to point out, however, that there might be some criticism if it was impossible to make any savings in Part II. He wished to know the Executive Board's opinion on the matter.

[14] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) explained that the Board felt that the budgetary reductions made by the General Conference should affect both the programme and the general administration of the Organization, though not necessarily in the same proportion. Part II could be examined on its merits and justified or not. When the hard core was reached, the necessary amount must come from the programme.

[15] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the saving due to the adoption of a local salary scale in 1951 for staff in the lower grades would also be spread over Parts I and II of the Budget, particularly the latter.

[16] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) stressed two points to which he had already drawn the Committee's attention at previous meetings:

(1) The fact that provision was made for replacing members of the permanent staff on sick leave;

(2) The high proportion of secretaries in relation to the total numbers of the staff.

As the second point had already been considered [document 5C/BUD/1], he merely wished to remind the Committee of it. With regard to the first point, on the other hand, he suggested that the sums budgeted for the payment of temporary personnel for staff on leave should be cut out ($750 in Part II.A; $755 in Part II.C, and $830 in Part II.D). It was unusual to call in outside staff to take the place of officials on annual or sick leave. Such an arrangement was, in fact, formally prohibited in the government service of the United Kingdom and other countries.

[17] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the reason for temporary replacements for sick leave was the special nature of the work done by the Bureau of the Comptroller and the Bureau of Personnel, which could not be delayed in any way without involving serious complications in the machinery of the Organization.

[18] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought that the difficulty might be overcome by calling on the services of staff lent by departments or bureaux.

[19] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) added that it would take no longer to train such staff for the special work of the administrative bureaux than to train people recruited outside.

[20] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that, while the administrative bureaux were overworked, the Programme Departments also had to cope with a very heavy load of work, and it would be extremely difficult for them to spare any staff.

[21] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) stated that the Board would not be in favour of the idea of transferring staff normally employed on the execution of the programme to general administration.

[22] In reply to a question from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) mentioned that the staff's output had increased considerably in the last few years, instancing the case of the Bureau of the Comptroller, which was coping with a very much increased volume of work with the same number of officials. The high output was, however, necessarily accompanied by overstrain, which resulted in many periods of sick leave. This question, which was causing the Director-General serious concern, had already been brought to the attention of the General Conference by several members of the Executive Board and by Professor Piaget.

[23] The proposal made by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) that the sum of $2,335 for replacing staff on sick leave should be struck out, was seconded by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), and *adopted.*

BUREAU OF CONFERENCE PLANNING AND GENERAL SERVICES [II.E].

[24] In reply to a question from Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) regarding the sum of $12,000 provided for the payment of overtime, Mr. LEGUEN (Bureau of Conference Planning)

mentioned that this sum, which was less than that in the Budget for 1950, was accounted for by the fact that technical workers recruited outside for the maintenance of the building were paid under this heading.

INDIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS [II.F].

[25] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) was surprised at the difference between the sum of $93,076 for contributions to the Pensions Fund and Medical Benefits in 1950 and that of $107,898 applied for in 1951.

[26] Mr. WEITZ (Head of the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) answered that the figures for 1950 were only an estimate. The final figures, which he thought would be higher, could not be stated until after the end of the financial year.

[27] Before closing the discussion of Part II, the CHAIRMAN proposed that, in the final report, it should be mentioned that the Budget Committee had taken note of the problems of securing co-ordination between the Archives, the Library and the Registry, and that the Director-General should be asked to report to the Sixth Session on that matter.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada)

later: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

4. Cultural Activities.

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.4.A].

[1] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) again raised the question of consultants, pointing out that in view of the funds provided for consultants in the Office of the Director-General, it should not be necessary to make such provision in the Programme Department also. In any case he felt that saving might be achieved by including instead a smaller amount for expert advice under Fees.

[2] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that when the Director-General desired advice on a matter affecting the whole Organization, such as publications, funds for this purpose were charged on the Budget of his Office. However, it was often necessary for Programme Departments to secure expert advice on specific matters, and provision for this was made in the budgets of the various Departments. This particular case had been discussed at length with the Executive Board and it had been agreed that it would be necessary to seek expert advice on several fields of the cultural activities Programme, in particular, Arts and Letters.

[3] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) proposed the deletion of the $3,100 requested for the advice of consultants, since he felt this Department already had a sufficiently large provision for securing the advice of experts on a fee basis.

[4] This proposal was seconded by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) and Miss LAISE (United States of America) who felt that this extra provision of $3,100 for consultants was really in the nature of a contingency reserve.

[5] It was *agreed* to delete this item unless in considering the budget of this Department, the Secretariat were able to indicate a specific project where the services of a consultant would be required beyond all doubt.

UNESCO LIBRARY [III.4.B].

[6] The CHAIRMAN recalled that in its preliminary discussions the Committee had concluded that, in view of the expenditures in 1949 and 1950, the sum provided for the purchase of books in 1951 could be reduced without handicapping programme operations.

[7] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that it had been estimated that four years would be required to build up the basic needs of the Unesco Library and that within a year it was hoped to reduce the purchasing programme quite considerably. However, reference books and periodicals of the type required by Unesco were expensive, and it was not worth handicapping programme operations for the sake of the small saving which could be effected under this item.

[8] Replying to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that, out of the total of $15,000 requested for the purchase of books, the sum of approximately $4,000 would be devoted to the purchase of periodicals. Sir Ronald ADAM proposed a reduction of $3,000 under this heading.

[9] Miss LAISE (United States of America) supported this proposal, but suggested that, instead of reducing the sum for the purchase of books, the same amount should be taken off personnel costs by suppressing the file index of the Library of Congress and the corresponding post on the Secretariat.

[10] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Director-General had reduced the personnel of the Unesco Library to an absolute minimum and that it would be dangerous to make further cuts here. The proposal of Sir Ronald Adam was less dangerous, although nevertheless regrettable.

After further discussion it was *agreed* to make a general cut of $2,000 in the budget of the Library, it being left to the Director-General to decide how and where this cut should be applied.

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES [III.4.C].

Paragraphs I, II and III (page 171 and 172).

[11] The SECRETARY announced that there was no change in the budgetary implications of paragraph I, altough the Programme and Budget Commission had made certain alterations to resolutions 4.111-4.1115. As to paragraphs II and III, the amendments implied no budgetary changes.

Paragraph IV (page 172).

[12] The SECRETARY stated that there had been no change in resolutions 4.122 and 4.124.

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) proposed a cut of $2,000 out of the $4,000 provided for the preparation of individual reports on the teaching of philosophy, since several of the National Commissions could assist in carrying out this project.

After further discussion, this proposal, seconded by Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), was *adopted.*

Paragraph V (page 172).

[14] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Programme and Budget Commission had transferred the funds provided under 4.123 and 4.124.

[15] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt it was unreasonable to expect the Budget Committee to approve a sum for a publication whose size was not known.

[16] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that it was not possible at the time for the Secretariat to give accurate figures.

Paragraph VI (page 172).

[17] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Programme and Budget Commission had combined resolutions 4.13 and 4.131 in an amended form. The reference to planning an abridged version of the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind for the use of secondary school teachers had been deleted, since it was not considered that this work could be carried out in 1951; hence a reduction of $400 had been made in the cost of the project.

[18] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) having pointed out that the Programme and Budget Commission was out of order in amending a resolution without first obtaining approval of the new estimates from the Budget Committee, it was agreed that this was so.

ARTS AND LETTERS [III.4.D(1)].

Paragraphs I and II (page 179).

[19] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that under a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom, item 4.211 had been combined with 4.212 and amended. 4.211 had been maintained without budgetary provision, resulting in a saving of $8,000. 4.213 had also been maintained without budgetary provision, resulting in a further saving of $2,000. A new resolution, 4.2121, had been inserted, whereby the $10,000 saved would be used to hold a seminar and to publish the results. The Secretariat estimated that roughly $5,000 would be spent on the seminar (since the inviting country—the United Kingdom—had undertaken to bear a large part of the cost) and $5,000 on publication of the results.

[20] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) felt that the Budget Committee should state it had not had an opportunity to examine the estimates for this project. For himself he felt that the sum of $5,000 for publications was too high, and he would have liked further information on the matter.

[21] After discussion, it was *agreed* that the United Kingdom delegation would re-examine the cost of the seminar and that the Secretariat would study the publication costs involved.

Paragraph III (page 179).

[22] Resolution 4.213 had been replaced by a series of new resolutions, the estimates for which were contained in CUA-12, which had been approved by the Committee.

Draft Final Report of the Committee: Report No. 1 (*continued*).

[23] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) stated that the Drafting Committee had prepared the report containing proposals for amending the Rules of Procedure, but no remarks had yet been made on the general role of the Budget Committee and its functions at a General Conference, since it was felt that further discussion was required on this subject.

[24] It was *decided* to pass on immediately to the Procedure Committee the first part of the report, requesting new Rules of Procedure stating that: (1) the Budget Committee will meet one week in advance of the opening of a General Conference; and (2) new resolutions will be submitted by Member States two weeks before the opening of a General Conference.

[25] The Drafting Committee would meet again to consider the report on the functions of the Budget Committee, which could be presented later, since it would have no effect on the Rules of Procedure.

The meeting rose at midnight.

TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Constitution of a special committee (Committee of Eight).

[1] The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of the General Committee's decision to set up a special committee composed of some members of the Programme and Budget Commission and of the Chairmen of the Administrative Commission, the External Relations Commission and the Budget Committee. The group, which would meet once in the evening of the following day, would consider the Budget Committee's figures and recommendations.

[2] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested that the Chairman should, at that meeting, urge a study of the Programme and Budget in relation to the human resources of the Secretariat, and the necessity to reduce the present strain on the Organization's staff. *Agreed.*

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

4. Cultural Activities (*continued*).

ARTS AND LETTERS (continued) [III.4.D(1)].

Paragraphs I and II (continued) (page 179).

[3] The SECRETARY announced that the costs of the new resolution 4.2121 would be $5,500 for the seminar itself, and $2,500 for publishing the conclusions, which represented a saving of $2,000 over the original estimate. *Approved.*

THEATRE AND MUSIC.

Paragraph IV (including an amendment to resolution 4.2213).

[4] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraphs V and VI (page 180).

[5] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph VII (page 180).

[6] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) proposed two reductions: one of $3,500 for the Mozart Catalogue and the other of $2,000 for the publication of the Beethoven Catalogue. *Approved.*

Paragraph VIII (page 180).

[7] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked Mr. Thomas to consider the possibility of reducing next year the expenses connected with the translation of classics.

Paragraph VIII was *approved.*

Paragraph IX (page 180).

[8] *Approved* without comment.

VISUAL ARTS.

Paragraph X (including an amendment [document 5C/46] concerning colour reproduction, with a budgetary implication of $2,000).

[9] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) recalled that the Programme and Budget Commission had approved the appropriation without comment.

The paragraph was *approved.*

Paragraph XI (including a new resolution and an amendment to resolution 4.242).

[10] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the activity envisaged was more like purchase of material (or contractual services) than that of books.

Paragraph XI was *approved* with that reservation.

Paragraph XII (page 180).

Discussion postponed to the end of the Chapter.

Paragraph XIII (including an amendment to resolution 4.244 and a new resolution 4.245 without budgetary implication).

[11] *Approved* without comment.

LITERATURE.

Paragraph XIV (with the deletion of resolution 4.252).

[12] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the appropriation was maintained to provide a grant for the P.E.N. Club. *Approved.*

Paragraph XV (including an amendment to resolution 4.253).

[13] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph XVI (including an amendment to resolution 4.254).

[14] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought that the library authorities of the different countries could supply the information required without cost to Unesco.

[15] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) agreed that this was possible in some cases, but in many others research had to be paid for.

[16] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) was of the opinion that the countries which failed to supply information should simply be omitted in the *Index.*

Paragraph XVI was *approved.*

Paragraph XVII (including an admendment to resolution 4.255).

[17] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that the Persian draft resolution [document 5C/27] involved an extra expenditure of $3,000 while the Italian Proposal (document 5C/45) would cost only $2,400.

[18] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) did not think the entire amount would be needed in 1951, and suggested reducing it to $3,000 altogether. *Agreed.*

Paragraph XVII was *adopted,* subject to this modification.

Paragraph XVIII (page 181).

Discussion was reserved to the end of the Chapter.

MUSEUMS AND HISTORICAL MONUMENTS [III.4.E].

Paragraphs I and II (page 186).

[19] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph III (including an amendment to resolution 4.33).

[20] *Approved* without comment.

Paragraph IV (page 186).

Approved without comment.

Paragraph V (page 186).

[21] The CHAIRMAN agreed with Dr. Evans (Executive Board) that the word "permanent" did not appear in resolution 4.41; it had been retained only in the work plan, since the Advisory Committee would in fact always be composed of the same experts, even if it only met occasionally.

Paragraph V was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (page 186).

[22] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the work of the technical missions would run parallel with that of the educational missions. The Committee should express the hope that the conditions under which assistance was provided would, in principle, be the same in both cases, including economies in *per diem* allowances. Next year the Director-General should have all such items standardized throughout the budget.

[23] In reply to Miss LAISE (United States of America), Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stated that resolution 4.42 had been adopted without discussion by the Programme and Budget Commission.

[24] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the members of those missions did not receive a base salary and a *per diem* allowance, but a total remuneration of $20, $14 or $10 a day. No saving could be made on those fairly low rates.

Paragraph VI was *approved*.

Paragraph VII (including two new resolutions: 5C/11, involving an expenditure of $1,000 for legal and military advice, and 5C/22, together with its Addendum, requiring $500).

[25] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) stressed that an increase in the Legal Service had not yet been approved. The two entirely different conventions could not be drafted without the advice of different specialists.

[26] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) felt sure that it was more economical to employ outside experts than to increase the Legal Service.

[27] Miss LAISE (United States) proposed a total cut of $1,000, reducing the proposed increase to only $500. *Agreed.*

Paragraph VIII (page 187).

Discussion reserved to the end of the Chapter.

LIBRARIES AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES [III.4.F].

Paragraph I (page 193).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph II (including amendments to resolutions 4.52 and 4.521).

[28] Mr. E. J. CARTER (Head, Libraries Division) explained that the original Budget figure was $4,800. The new resolution provided for one meeting, with special legal advice, whose approximate cost would be $2,000. In addition, Unesco would have to examine the possible sources of the "external grant or loan" mentioned in the resolution.

[29] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) thought Unesco should attempt to find an outside source to finance the ex-German Libraries in Italy, but should avoid dealing with the legal problems involved.

[30] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) suggested $1,000 should be enough to carry on the proposed activity, which would give a net saving of $3,800.

[31] Mr. E. J. CARTER (Head, Libraries Division) stressed that even the question of temporary maintenance of the Libraries involved certain fairly complex legal problems.

Mr. Weeden's proposal was *adopted.*

Paragraph III (page 193).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph IV (including an amendment to resolution 4.532).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph V (including the comment previously decided upon by the Committee).

[32] In reply to Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Mr. E. J. CARTER (Head, Libraries Division) explained that, apart from contractual printing and travel, the costs of the Unesco Coupon Scheme amounted to $9,845 for an assistant, grade 6, a secretary, grade 4, a clerk-typist, grade 3 and a clerk, grade 2. In addition, Dr. Zuckerman gave part of his time to the Scheme.

[33] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. CARTER added that not all countries charged a percentage on the volume of business, and that the Secretariat was endeavouring to eliminate all such charges.

Paragraph V was *approved.*

Paragraph VI (including a new resolution 5.512).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph VII (page 194).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph VIII (page 194).

Approved, with a reduction of the amount for fees to $2,500.

Paragraph IX (page 194).
Approved without comment.

Paragraph X (page 194).

[34] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought it was contrary to practice for Unesco to pay both travelling expenses and *per diem* allowances, as indicated in sub-paragraph D.

[35] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) explained that "travel of delegates to conferences and meetings" was the usual formula, and that in this particular case no travel expenses were involved in addition to the *per diem* allowance.

[36] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) asked for the insertion after "librarians" of the words "and library administrators". *Agreed.*

Paragraph x was *approved.*

Paragraph XI (page 194).

Discussion reserved to the end of the Chapter.

COPYRIGHT [III.4.G].

[37] Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) indicated that the Programme and Budget Commission had decided to delete the $1,000 for fees (paragraph I, page 197) and the $12,000 for the Expert Committee (paragraph II, sub-paragraph A), and to retain the $6,000 for contractual printing (paragraph I). He asked the Committee to approve the additional $1,000 for consultants' fees under paragraph II. *Agreed.*

The Copyright budget was *approved* with a total saving of $12,000.

TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL ACTIVITIES.

[38] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the travel appropriation rose from $22,394 in 1950 to $31,400 in 1951. The increase was mainly under the headings of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (page 170: from $1,779 to $5,500) and under Libraries and Documentation Services (page 191: from $5,052 to $8,000).

[39] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed a cut of $5,000 for the whole Cultural Activities budget, which would be in the same proportion as the cut in the Department of Education.

[40] At Mr. BRUNSWICK's suggestion, it was *agreed* to make a cut of $4,000 in the travel budget of the Department of Cultural Activities.

5. Exchange of Persons.

[41] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) recalled that the Programme and Budget Commission had adopted resolution 5C/23 (rev.) concerning the creation of a committee to administer an international fellowship fund, resolution 5C/61 on short-term grants to young people, and an Indian draft amendment to resolution 5.23.

SERVICE COSTS [III.5.A].

Approved without comment.

CLEARING-HOUSE AND PROMOTION [III.5.B].

Paragraph I (page 209).

Approved without comment.

Paragraph II (page 209).

[42] In reply to Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) explained that the temporary posts under paragraphs II, VIII and X were indispensable to give assistance to the Department during the period of heavy pressure when *Study Abroad* was being prepared for printing in three languages.

Paragraph II was *approved.*

Paragraphs III and IV (page 209).

Approved without comment.

Paragraph V (page 209).

[43] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought this activity could be carried out under resolution 6.26 (Mass Communication).

[44] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) stated that his Service had been studying since 1948 various legal problems connected with the movement of persons across frontiers. In 1949, the report of a lawyer specializing in international law had made it possible to define Unesco's role in this matter. In brief, it was to collect and disseminate information on those problems, to assist individuals in moving from one country to another, and to utilize the information so as to ensure that those problems were discussed at various international conferences. The reason for the division of labour shown in the work plan was to promote movement from one country to another, and to provide for constant study of the obstacles to free movement. It had been found more economical to group together all the negotiation activities of the Department.

[45] Referring to the $2,000 for contractual printing, Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) asked whether the preparatory work would be ready in time for 1951, to which Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) replied that the information collected covered 72 countries, and that the money would be needed within the next four months. The resulting Manual—a functional

volume—was intended for the use of organizations which needed it to set up exchange programmes.

Paragraph v was *approved.*

Paragraphs VI, VII, VIII, IX and X (pages 209 and 210).

Approved without comment.

FELLOWSHIP ADMINISTRATION [III.5.C].

Paragraph I (page 219).

[46] Mr. W. D. CARTER (Head, Exchange of Persons Service) stressed two important points:

(1) For the first time the resolution was a general one without any limitation to some particular States, and therefore the number of potential recipients had notably increased;

(2) Some fellowships had a very positive impact on the promotion of certain Unesco aims. So far 38 States had received fellowships connected with special Unesco projects.

[47] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate for the Netherlands, declared that the Scheme was a very valuable one and that he was in favour of approving paragraph 1.

Paragraph 1 was *approved.*

Paragraphs II, III and IV (page 219).

Approved without comment.

TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS OF THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS SERVICE.

[48] The $5,000 for travel on official business (page 203) were *approved.*

INDIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS OF THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS SERVICE [III.5.D].

[49] The CHAIRMAN having questioned the figures on page 214, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, formerly, the salary costs and allowances were provided separately for each of the 75 or so project headings; for the sake of simplicity in presentation, these data had now been grouped in chapter totals. The allowance figure was no longer established by the Departments, but by the central Administration, because that method was much cheaper. It should be remembered that the form of presentation of the budget had changed, and that no adjustment had yet been made for the increase in the number of posts in the Secretariat from 774 to the present total of 820; it would take four to six months to make the necessary adjustments. The 1950 figures could have been distributed (*a*) as originally voted, (*b*) as voted and in relation to personnel changes or (*c*) in accordance with the presentation of the 1951 budget. This latter was the solution adopted, which explained the seeming disproportion in Part II, for instance. On 31 December and 30 June, those costs would appear as actual expenditure.

1. Education (*continued*).

EDUCATIONAL CLEARING HOUSE [III.1.B(2)].

Paragraph IV (page 87).

[50] The CHAIRMAN recalled that a $5,000 cut had been proposed in Unesco's contribution to the budget of the International Universities Bureau for 1951.

[51] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) recalled that the IBU had been set up as a direct result of Unesco's action. The contribution in question was intended to help in preparing the 1950 International Conference which, it was hoped, would see the birth of an International Universities Organization. Although in 1950 Unesco had borne almost the total costs of the IBU, it was proposed to limit the grant to $28,000 in 1951. Hence the suggested $5,000 cut would place the Nice Conference in a very awkward position. Mr. Guiton asked the Committee to remember that in three or four years' time, the new organization should be self-supporting.

[52] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) thought the Committee could say that Unesco's grant should be used exclusively for the programme of the IBU.

[53] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the appropriation asked for exceeded last year's figure by $3,500.

[54] Mr. GUITON (Department of Education) stated that, if the Nice Conference decided to establish the IBU's Headquarters in Paris, Unesco could continue to provide the Bureau's premises and reduce its contribution accordingly.

The cut of $5,000 in the grant in paragraph IV (page 87) was *approved.*

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Final Draft Report of the Budget Committee: Report No. 1 (*continued*).

[1] The draft report, subject to a few drafting amendments, was *adopted* [document 5C/BUD/2].

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

6. Department of Mass Communication.

PROGRAMME COSTS [III.6.A].

[2] The Committee had no comments to add to those embodied in Annex VI to its preliminary report [5C/BUD/1].

IMPROVEMENT OF MEANS AND TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNICATION [III.6.B].

Paragraph I (page 224).

[3] The amendment to resolution 6.111, adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, had no budgetary implications.

Paragraph II (page 224).

[4] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the surveyors, for whom provision was made in resolution 6.12, would receive a fixed sum of $100 a week, including their travel allowance. That type of payment was the most economical and also the simplest from the administrative point of view.

Paragraphs III, IV and V (page 225).

[5] Resolutions 6.121, 6.13 and 6.14 had not been amended by the Programme and Budget Commission. The adoption of the new resolution 6.15, relating to the Braille system, would necessitate an additional appropriation of $35,642, but that sum need not be taken into account in the Department's general budget. The new resolution 6.16 had no budgetary implications.

REDUCTION OF OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION [III.6.C].

Paragraphs I and II (page 230).

[6] The Programme and Budget Commission had not yet taken any final decision regarding resolutions 6.21 and 6.22.

Paragraph III (page 231).

[7] Resolution 6.23 remained unchanged.

Paragraph IV (page 231).

[8] Resolution 6.26 had been slightly amended, but the budget estimates remained the same.

Paragraph V (page 231).

[9] Resolution 6.29 had been left unchanged.

ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO [III.6.D].

Paragraphs I and II (page 239).

[10] Implementation of resolutions 6.31 and 6.32 had no budgetary implications.

Paragraph III (page 240).

[11] Mr. KAYSER (France) thought it would be possible to reduce the sums set aside for the remuneration of writers and specialists [B (1), B (2) and B (3)] by concluding preliminary contracts with newspapers and broadcasting stations, or by calling upon members of the Secretariat to write more articles.

After discussion, it was *decided* to reduce the sum of $1,800 mentioned in B (1) by $300.

[12] With regard to paragraph c, Miss LAISE (United States of America) having asked whether the work of the two experts employed for six weeks could be expected to yield effective results, Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that recent experience had in fact proved that the period was too short for carrying out effective work.

It was *decided* to delete paragraph c and to cancel the corresponding appropriation of $2,200.

Paragraph IV (page 240).

[13] The amendment made to resolution 6.331 had no budgetary implications.

Paragraph V (page 240).

[14] In answer to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) explained that the renting of film vaults was compulsory under French law.

Paragraph VI (page 240).

[15] In reply to Mr. CORRÊA do LAGO (Brazil), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stated that the Department was hoping to have six to ten short films shown in 1951.

Paragraph VII (page 240).

[16] At the request of Miss LAISE (United States of America), it was explained that the meeting of experts mentioned would be the first convened by Unesco to deal with films.

Paragraph VIII (page 241).

[17] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) enquired whether the work for which provision was made in resolution 6.35 was not covered by the Fundamental Education Centre, to which Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that the present resolution was concerned with rapid features designed to stimulate public interest but not to serve education in the strict sense of the word.

Paragraph IX (page 241).

[18] In reply to various questions from Miss LAISE (United States of America) and Mr. KAYSER (France), Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) stated that the great majority of broadcasting stations requested radio scripts ready for use, rather than texts on which they could base their own scripts. He reassured the meeting that the Press and Radio Divisions co-operated very closely in that work.

Paragraphs X and XI (page 241).

[19] Resolutions 6.36 and 6.37 remained unchanged.

Paragraph XII (page 242).

[20] The deletion of resolution 6.38, for which no appropriation had been made, did not affect the Department's budget.

Paragraphs XIII and XIV (page 242 and 243).

[21] The Programme and Budget Commission had adopted no amendments likely to modify those two paragraphs.

[22] The total reduction in the budget estimates for the Department of Mass Communication amounted to $2,500, distributed as follows: $300 to paragraph III.B (1) and $2,200 to paragraph III.C.

Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) congratulated the Department on the remarkably clear presentation of its budget,

7. Relief Assistance Services.

SERVICE COSTS [III.7.A].

[23] No comments.

INFORMATION ON NEEDS, DIRECT ASSISTANCE, AND VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE CAMPAIGNS [III.7.B].

Paragraph I (page 254).

[24] The amendment made to resolution 7.11 had no budgetary implications.

Paragraph II (page 254).

[25] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) enquired into the possibility of increasing the proposed appropriation of $188,000 in order to provide further assistance for Arab refugees, and Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Reconstruction Service) replied that the Programme and Budget Commission had stressed the high importance of the educational needs of refugees, but had adopted no resolution allowing for an increase in the funds available to the Relief Assistance Service.

[26] After representatives of the Secretariat had clarified a few points in the *Report on the Effectiveness of the Reconstruction Programme, 1947, 1948 and 1949* (Unesco Publication No. 732), it was *decided* that the Committee would include in its report some mention of the special importance of providing assistance for refugees in the Middle East.

Paragraph III (page 254).

[27] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) having enquired whether the proposed appropriation for "other contractual items" ($2,000), covering photographs for publicity purposes, did not overlap with the sum already authorized for the same purpose in the budget of the Department of Mass Communication, Mr. BARGER (Reconstruction Service) replied that the present appropriation was for very special publicity necessitating a particular technique, which could not be carried out by the publicity services of any other department. The photographs in question were enlargements for the preparation of exhibition panels.

[28] As an amendment had been made to resolution 7.35, deleting the proposal for the establishment of an International Relief Council, Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) seconded by Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) proposed that the sum of $1,840 set aside for that activity be cancelled. *Agreed.*

Paragraph IV (page 255).

[29] No comments.

[30] Mr. KAYSER (France) announced that the French delegation had considered the *Report on the Effectiveness of the Reconstruction Programme, 1947, 1948 and 1949* and had found it highly satisfactory. It commended the report to the Committee's attention, as it proved that the funds had been wisely managed.

The CHAIRMAN noted that statement.

[31] Mr. BARGER (Reconstruction Service) announced that resolution 7.32 had just been amended on the basis of a proposal regarding refugee intellectuals, presented by the delegation of the United States of America, and it was therefore *decided* to consider that resolution, which had substantial budgetary implications, at a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

7. Relief Assistance Services (*continued*).

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS [III.7.C].

Paragraph I (page 258).

[1] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) indicated that as resolution 7.41 had just been shifted to the Education chapter, it had not been possible at 24 hours' notice to examine the effects of this transfer.

[2] In reply to Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom), Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) explained that, during the winter, the camp libraries became travelling lending libraries, and were thus ready for the following year's camps.

Paragraph 1 was *approved.*

Paragraphs II and III (pages 258 and 259).

[3] *Approved* without comment.

INFORMATION ON NEEDS, DIRECT ASSISTANCE AND VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE CAMPAIGNS *(continued)* [III. 7.B].

[4] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) referred to the amendment to resolution 7.32, proposed by the United States of America, concerning the extension of direct assistance to all intellectual refugees.

[5] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) warned the Committee that the amendment might have grave budgetary implications of unknown extent.

[6] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) formally proposed informing the Programme and Budget Commission that the amendment was not sufficiently clear and that budgetary implications might be either slight or very considerable; further, that the Committee was concerned at the possibility of adding to the Secretariat's administrative burden. *Agreed.*

TOTAL TRAVEL COSTS FOR RELIEF ASSISTANCE SERVICES.

[7] The total sums requested for Travel on Official Business (pages 248, 253 and 257) were *approved.*

8. External Relations Service.

HEADQUARTERS [III.8.A (1)].

[8] Miss LAISE (United States of America) thought the Committee should express its general

feeling that the External Relations Service was too large.

[9] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) held that this very important service was not too large for the world-wide work it was expected to do. It should be remembered that the rules for correspondence with Member States were not yet standardized. If it was to ensure the smooth working of the Organization and to harmonize its liaison not only with Member States, but with National Commissions, with the other Specialized Agencies and non-governmental organizations, the External Relations Service had a very heavy task to perform.

[10] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the question had been raised whether some of the work of the External Relations Service could not be done by the Departments themselves.

[11] Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy) supported the view of the delegate for France.

[12] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) agreed with the delegates for France and Italy, and pointed out that the development of the External Relations Service was justified by experience and results.

[13] Mr. SMITH (Australia) stressed that he was not questioning the great importance of the Service; but he did not think that liaison and co-ordination work of that kind should have so large a budget.

[14] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed with Mr. Smith. He would not disagree with what the delegate of France had said: the size, not the justification, of the External Relations Service was the question before the Committee.

[15] Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) associated himself with the two previous speakers. In his opinion many functions of the Service could be decentralized without any harm to the Organization. In addition, he was concerned about the large number of high-grade officials (grades 14 and above) in the Service; there was no unit in the Secretariat with more officers of that rank.

[16] Miss LAISE (United States of America) agreed that the co-ordination functions of the External Relations Service were a heavy and important task, but she felt sure that some reduction in its budget was possible.

[17] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) was not opposed to certain specific reductions, but only to general criticism of the size of the Service.

[18] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that the integration of services and the reduction of appropriation for the External Relations Service were the result of the views expressed at the last General Conference. He stressed that some functions should be dissociated: Liaison with Germany and Japan (III. 8.B) for instance, was in fact a programme activity, while the Legal Division (III.8.D) was responsible for the study of all legal questions raised within the entire Organization. He drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the appropriation of the Service amounted to 8.5 per cent of the 1949 budget, to 11.2 per cent of the 1950 budget, and to only 9.8 per cent of the total 1951 budget. The four regional units listed on page 262 were indispensable to ensure and stimulate the normal development of National Commissions, and they required very specialized staff. The Field Services could function only through the presence at headquarters of a competent personnel to co-ordinate their activities with those of the Organization itself. Liaison and co-ordination with the United Nations and Specialized Agencies was absolutely essential, and the personnel of the Office had been pared down to a minimum. The burden of the External Relations Service had greatly increased during 1950, and the only possible reductions would fall on travel, certain external posts and on national correspondents.

In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. de BLONAY confirmed that the $20,000 for fees on page 265 were intended to cover national correspondents in five or six countries.

It was *decided* to recommend the deletion of those $20,000.

[19] In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that the $17,000 for contractual printing on page 265 covered the publication of the *Official Bulletin* in two languages, of special reports to the United Nations and of a supplement to the United Nations *Handbook*.

[20] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked why, with such a large liaison office with the United Nations in New York, so many journeys to America of members of the staff were necessary.

[21] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that the New York Office had only recently received its full staff and should in future be able to fulfil a larger part of the work, but that a limited number of such journeys would always be necessary because of the complex problems which often had to be solved.

[22] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) asked the

Committee to bear in mind all the different functions of the New York Office, whose staff was, however, smaller than those of ILO or WHO. Briefs for the New York Office for discussions at the working technical level were not difficult to prepare, but at the *agreement* level it was usually found necessary to send a substantive officer from Headquarters to Lake Success to commit the Organization, in so far as rules and regulations allowed.

[23] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) was of the opinion that the size of the New York Office should be inversely related to the number of journeys from Headquarters. Either the one or the other ought to be reduced.

[24] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested saying that savings could be made on travel.

[25] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) declared that the Director-General would strongly resist any wholesale last-minute general cuts in a budget which he considered an absolute minimum to carry out the Programme approved by the Conference. He urged the Committee to propose only specific functional cuts.

The CHAIRMAN supported Mr. Weitz.

FIELD RELATIONS SERVICE [III.8.A (2)].

[26] It was *decided* to recommend that the total travel figure in Latin America and the Middle and Far East should be reduced by $4,500 to $25,000.

LIAISON WITH GERMANY AND JAPAN [III.8.B].

[27] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) asked whether the posts listed on page 273 would entail a reduction of the number of programme specialists in the other departments, to which Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that their activities were intended to be complementary. Special projects must be closely related with the normal programme, but they required specialized staff.

[28] Dr. THOMPSON (Head, Unesco Office in Germany) stressed that special as well as general activities in Germany were increasing rapidly. None of the programme specialists on page 273 were engaged in educational work, except indirectly with regard to the revision of textbooks.

[29] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) entirely agreed that the staff demanded for activities in Germany was not excessive, but he felt sure that not all the contemplated activities could be carried out during 1951, and that Unesco's rate of expansion would not be as rapid as anticipated. In consequence, he proposed an arbitrary cut in one of the sections shown in paper XR-2 (Rev.), relating to the United States' proposal 5C/55.

[30] Dr. THOMPSON (Head, Unesco Office in Germany) asked the Committee to remember that the task to be performed in Germany was an urgent one: Unesco must win or lose in 1951.

[31] Sir Ronal ADAM (United Kingdom) having proposed that one of the External Relations specialists be replaced by an Education specialist, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) emphasized that the departments themselves had to have special staff in order to enable the team in Germany to do more effective work.

[32] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that the least harmful cuts would be the elimination of one field worker (the Press specialist—grade 14) and one of the liaison programme specialists at headquarters. In addition, the secretary of the Department of Mass Communication could be dropped.

[33] It was *agreed* to recommend a total appropriation of $80,000 for the increased programme activity in Germany. The reduction of $18,000 would be made up of $12,100 saved on two grade 14 posts, $1,000 on travel on official business, $1,000 on travel of delegates, plus a balance of about $4,000 to be found by the Secretariat, which would not be strictly tied to the work plan outlined on page 2 paper XR-2 (Rev.).

[34] The SECRETARY stated that the proposal for Japan involved an additional expenditure of $25,000.

[35] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) recalled that the relevant resolution had been adopted at the end of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Budget and Official and External Relations Commissions. The proposal was for an additional expert on Japan at Headquarters, about $10,000, and for special activities —youth clubs and meetings, etc., in Japan—about $15,000.

[36] Mr. SMITH (Australia) proposed that, in the absence of a paper on the subject, the Committee should recommend a cut on the same scale as for Germany.

[37] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) proposed reducing the $25,000 by $3,000, and leaving it to the Secretariat to decide which activities could be dropped.

[38] Miss LAISE (United States of America) did not approve of cutting for cutting's sake; it might seriously hamper a very useful activity without producing a really significant economy.

[39] In reply to Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that the $10,000 in the project for Japan were not only for the salary of a consultant but also for his travelling expenses.

The Committee *approved* an arbitrary cut of $3,000, as proposed by Mr. Pollock.

UNITED NATIONS LIAISON OFFICE IN NEW YORK [III. 8.C].

[40] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) thought that when the United Nations Headquarters were moved to New York, Unesco's New York Office would have many opportunities to save valuable time and effort, so that a small cut should be possible.

[41] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) agreed that, when the New York staff no longer had to travel to Lake Success, they would not be compelled to work the present excessive overtime. A saving of time would mean better reports to headquarters, more efficient work, etc.

It was *decided* to reduce arbitrarily the total appropriation by $1,672 to $60,000.

DIVISION OF LEGAL AFFAIRS [III.8.D].

[42] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) introduced document 5C/OXR/16, which contained a proposal to increase the Legal Division at a cost of $11,078.

[43] Mr. SABA (Head, Division of Legal Affairs) explained that the Italian proposal [5C/11] for the protection of monuments in the event of armed conflict, and the Mexican proposal [5C/22] concerning the protection of historic monuments and art treasures had been adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, which had also decided that Unesco should collaborate very closely in the drafting of conventions relating to Articles 26 and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was to carry out those additional tasks that the $11,078 were necessary.

[44] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) was in favour of reinforcing the Legal Division, in view of the new tasks it would be called upon to perform, but consultants might be more indicated than an increase of staff, where only part-time activity was concerned.

[45] Mr. SABA (Head, Division of Legal Affairs) explained that it was intended to engage permanent personnel in 1951, and to concentrate the work in one service, so as to secure greater unity of form and wider experience. Furthermore it was absolutely necessary that co-operation with the United Nations in implementing Articles 26 and 27 of the Universal Declaration should be carried out by persons possessing a thorough knowledge of the structure of the Secretariat.

The increase of $11,078 in the appropriations of the Legal Division was *approved*.

[46] On the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, it was *agreed* to cut the amount for fees on page 280 by $750.

[47] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the Committee had reduced by $26,922 the original total appropriation figure of $613,890 requested by the External Relations Service, and increased it by $113,078. The net increase was thus $86,156.

9. Documents and Publications Service.

DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS [III.9.A].

[48] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) having asked whether it might not be possible to provide the necessary services on approximately the same budget as the preceding year, Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) pointed out that III.9.A would actually have more obligations than the appropriation because of nine new posts: additional staff were necessary in order to use printing funds more efficiently and to enable the Service to function satisfactorily. He stated that in his considered opinion no individual cuts were possible.

[49] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that, if the Committee wished to maintain the 1950 appropriation figure for the whole of the Documents and Publications Service, the only way to do so was to eliminate the Spanish and Arabic translation services, since only functional cuts could be made in this Service.

[50] Mr. CAIN (France) declared that he wished to be associated with the praise which had been expressed for Mr. Delavenay's work. He asked to what extent the recommendations of the Expert Committee on Publications could be put into practice.

[51] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) said that the recommendations in question did not concern the method of

work of the Service, but general publications policy. The publications budget was used by, but not administered by, the Documents and Publications Service.

[52] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) stressed that he was looking to future economies as a result of the re-organization of the Service, and felt sure that an increase of staff would result in a decrease in the cost of publications.

[53] In reply to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) explained that the $21,500 for fees (page 289) were intended to cover outside translations for which no staff could be made available within the Organization.

[54] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) added that exceptionally long, but not very urgent, documents were also given to outside translators.

[55] Mr. CAIN (France) was in favour of the policy of contracting out that type and other kinds of specialized work.

[56] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) stated that, by careful pruning, a certain saving in operational time might be effected. He wished to make it quite clear that the staff at his disposal was inadequate in view of the increasing volume of work, and asked the Committee for a little latitude to enable him to complete the re-organization of the Service.

[57] Miss LAISE (United States of America) asked for some information regarding control over the distribution of documents, and thought the Committee might say that publications were too diffuse in comparison with the results achieved. In her opinion, their number should be decreased, while every effort was made to increase their audience.

The CHAIRMAN postponed this important discussion until the afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. SIDNEY POLLOCK (Canada),

Detailed examination of the Budget (*continued*) [document 5C/5 (II)].

9. Documents and Publications (*continued*).

DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS SERVICE *(continued)* [III.9.A].

[1] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of a publications policy in the past. The cost of individual publications was high; for instance, each copy of the *Copyright Bulletin* seemed to cost about $1. It would seem that many publications were produced for which there was no demand. He asked whether there was a committee in the Secretariat responsible for screening requests for printing submitted by the various Departments.

[2] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) replied that there were two separate problems:

The first was how to control the work at its various stages. A new system of document symbols was being instituted which would enable savings to be made in terms of man-hours and to reduce the considerable overtime being worked at present.

[3] The second problem was the proper functioning of a Publications Board. The present Board, presided over by the Head of Documents and Publications Service, included a representative of the Director-General, a representative of the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget, a representative of the Department of Mass Communication and a representative of the unit requesting publication, but had full responsibility only on paper.

[4] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) again drew

attention to funds set aside in the various Departments for the hire of temporary staff for conferences and meetings. A better co-ordinated schedule of meetings should make it possible to avoid these expenses.

[5] Mr. DELAVENAY (Head, Documents and Publications Service) pointed out that the established interpreting and minute-writing staff had already been reduced, as had the number of meetings scheduled for the coming year.

[6] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) felt that one way of ensuring proper co-ordination would be to cut provision for temporary conference assistance in other parts of the budget.

[7] Miss LAISE (United States of America), supporting the views of Sir Ronald Adam, expressed the hope that, during the coming year, the Publications Board would really function and exercice a firm control over publications; with this understanding, the United States delegation was ready to agree to the project costs of this Service as submitted.

[8] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, while the Committee had expressed concern at the high figure estimated for this part of the budget, no specific recommendations for a new figure had been made. However, the Director-General should take note of the views expressed by Sir Ronald Adam and Miss Laise.

[9] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) proposed that the Executive Board be requested to follow this matter closely and report to the next session of the General Conference.

[10] Miss LAISE (United States of America) observed that the re-organization would not necessarily mean economy, but a more effective publications programme.

[11] It was *agreed* to maintain the total figure estimated under section III.9.A.

SPECIAL LANGUAGE SERVICE [III.9.B].

[12] The CHAIRMAN suggested pointing out to the Programme and Budget Commission, without recommendation, that it would be possible to make a saving of $47,087 by deleting this Service from the programme. *Agreed.*

Local Salary System.

[13] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget), explaining the implications of the resolution of the Administrative Commission adopting a local salary system, stated that, during the coming year, this new system would be effective only for new staff members; present employees would only be affected during 1952. Savings in 1951 would therefore come from four categories of staff:

Category 1: those hired between the time of the decision of the General Conference and the end of 1950;
Category 2: staff filling new posts contained in the budget approved for 1951;
Category 3: staff hired as replacements due to turnover during 1950;
Category 4: temporary staff hired for conferences during 1951.

[14] The Secretariat had made assumptions as to which of these staff would be hired locally and which would be hired on a non-residents' basis, with the appropriate allowance. On the basis of these assumptions, adjustments had been made in the funds estimated for dislocation and installation allowances, and for the Pension and the Medical Benefits Scheme, all of which were affected by the new system.

[15] Taking into account the reduction which could be made in the 1951 Budget by adopting the United Nations system with regard to travel allowances—which was another decision by the Administrative Commission—estimated savings were as follows:

Category 1	$ 4,000
Category 2	$22,500
Category 3	$27,500
Category 4	$ 8,600
General and secretarial for Sixth Session of General Conference.	$ 8,000
Travel allowances	$19,400
Total estimated saving	$90.000

[16] Since it was impossible at the moment to distribute the savings throughout the different sections of the Budget, Mr. Weitz suggested that the Committee recommend the adoption of an appropriations table for 1951, whose total would exceed the actual ceiling by $90,000, and that the final total be reduced by this amount, with instruction to the Director-General to assess against the appropriations. *Agreed.*

[17] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) proposed that the provision for overtime payments to present staff retaining their high salaries might be cancelled, and arrangements made for them to take compensatory leave in lieu thereof. This would effect an economy of approximately $25,000.

[18] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stressed the

gravity of such a proposal; the payment of overtime constituted one of the rights of lower-graded members of the Secretariat. From the point of view of staff morale, it would be preferable not to take such a step.

[19] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as delegate of Canada, recalled that the Administrative Commission had requested the Director-General to introduce new local salary scales and salary differentials *at the latest* by 1 January 1951, and asked what further economies might be made through their earlier introduction.

[20] He also enquired whether the adoption of the proposed new United Nations regulations governing home leave and carry-over of annual leave would not make further savings possible; if staff members took their annual leave regularly and carry-over were limited to 60 days instead of 100, the hire of staff as replacements on a temporary assistance basis might be reduced. If these points were borne in mind, the Chairman believed a further $10,000 might be saved, and he proposed a round sum of $100,000 as estimated savings on the introduction of the new salary system.

[21] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that, as the Paris cost of living survey had not yet been completed, it was not determined to what extent salary differentials would have to be applied.

The Secretariat had taken 1 January 1951 as the basis of their calculations of the $90,000 savings, for the sake of convenience. Earlier application of the new scales would obviously mean savings of some magnitude. As the Director-General was requested to apply them as soon as possible, Mr. Weitz proposed the addition of a paragraph to the appropriations resolution, requesting the Director-General to put into reserve until the Sixth General Conference any amounts resulting from the application of differentials prior to 1 January 1951.

[22] The United Nations had decided that the new home leave provisions should not affect the next home leave of eligible staff members and there would, therefore, be no budgetary repercussions here during 1950 and 1951. As regards annual leave, the new provisions would no doubt necessitate more extensive employment of temporary assistance, as staff members would be more inclined to take their full leave.

Finally, Mr. Weitz agreed that the anticipated saving of $90,000 was a conservative estimate.

[23] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that Mr. Brunswick's proposal to cut overtime payments would not conform to United Nations regulations. It was undesirable that the staff should feel that the General Conference had deprived them of any of their rights.

[24] While agreeing with this viewpoint, Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) maintained that a cut of $10,000 in overtime should be possible by granting compensatory leave for extra hours of work, and he supported the Chairman's proposal to estimate the savings that might be made at $100,000.

[25] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) having agreed that this latter figure was acceptable, Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) withdrew his proposal, but requested the insertion in the Committee's report of a recommendation that overtime be avoided wherever possible.

[26] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) gave the present budget status, excluding any resolutions adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission during the preceding 24 hours, and excluding additional items "suggested if funds were available", such as the sums of $25,000 for field science missions, $10,000 for textbooks, $10,000 for the World Federation of United Nations Associations:

The present total was	$8,314,000
Less anticipated savings under new local salary scheme	$ 100,000
New provisional total	$8,214,000

This total included such items as the use of the Spanish language, the projects in Germany and Japan, education in non-self-governing territories, etc.

[27] The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Secretariat now be given an opportunity to translate into appropriations tables the decisions taken by the Committee; but no final figure would be decided until the last resolutions of the Programme and Budget Commission were received.

[28] In reply to a comment by Mr. BRUNSWICK (France), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that the Director-General would be glad to put forward suggestions for economies to guide the Committee in arriving at the total.

Effect of Devaluation on the 1950 Budget [document 5C/ADM/17].

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Committee was asked to anticipate whether, in 1950, there could be any savings from devalua-

tion other than those foreseen by the Director-General. The savings thus effected would be a surplus to the 1950 budget.

[30] Miss LAISE (United States of America) pointed out two recommendations of the Administrative Commission:

(1) That no surpluses should be surrendered unless they corresponded to actual receipts;

(2) That the Director-General should regulate expenditure in 1950 to keep within his income.

[31] In reply, the CHAIRMAN stated that the Administrative Commission had decided that the 1950 programme should be kept within the income which it might reasonably be anticipated would be received, that is to say, $7,500,000. On the recommendation of the Director-General the Administrative Commission had further decided that the funds made available by devaluation should go to surplus and should not be expended.

[32] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that, if the General Conference ruled that the saving of $167,496 resulting from the devaluation of the 1950 budget were to be considered as cash received and surrendered to the 1951 budget, it would push the level of expenditure in 1951 down to $7,233,000.

[33] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) could not see how, if the new ceiling were set at $7,500,000, the savings would make a reduction below this figure, unless the Executive Board were deprived of its power to transfer funds to other parts of the budget.

[34] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the actual saving on devaluation was 22 per cent; but that in his report, the Director-General had worked only on 15 per cent, reserving the other 7 per cent for price rises following devaluation. He agreed that funds saved in one part of the budget could be used in another part.

[35] Dr. EVANS (Executive Board) felt that in that case the General Conference should make the $167,496 available for later transfer, so that Unesco could maintain a level of expenditure of $7,500,000, or, if that were the figure finally to be adopted, of $8,000,000.

[36] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that, if $167,496 were treated as a surplus to 1950 in accordance with the new financial regulations, the Director-General would not need to consider the effects of devaluation on programme and non-programme items, but might spend $7,500,000 in cash.

[37] After further discussion, during which Mr. WEITZ pointed out that the saving of $167,496 was based on an assessment of $8,000,000, so that, if the budget were only $7,500,000, the savings would be less, it was *agreed* to inform the Administrative Commission that the Committee found the basis on which the Director-General had estimated the savings to be sound, but that their utilization did not fall within its competence.

Final Report of the Committee: No. 1 [document 5C/BUD/2].

[38] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the report tabled at the morning meeting be sent forward, together with a resolution for submission to the General Conference, drawing attention to the existence of the interim report 5C/BUD/1 and the minutes of the Committee's meetings. The Director-General should be requested to act on the Committee's recommendations and to reflect their decisions in the estimates for the coming year. The Chairman proposed further that the Secretariat formulate an appropriations resolution, subject to minor changes that might have to be made in the light of later decisions of the Conference.

[39] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) felt there was some difficulty in the proposed reference to minutes and interim decisions of the Committee, as some of these decisions had later been withdrawn. He asked that the resolution on the Documents and Publications Service adopted that morning also be mentioned.

[40] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) undertook that the Secretariat would examine the resolutions finally adopted by the Committee and put them into effect in the course of the year.

[41] It was *agreed* that it should be left to the Secretariat to evaluate which decisions should be included in the appropriations resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Friday, 16 June 1950, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. F. BENDER (Netherlands)

Appropriation Resolution for 1951.

[1] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) presented the draft document, which would be published as 5C/BUD/4.

Covering note.

Approved without comment.

Draft resolution.

[2] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were self-explanatory. With regard to paragraph 5, he explained that the Appropriation Table added up to $8,300,000, but that at the end of the Table there was a saving of $100,000, accruing from the installation of the local salary scales and from other changes in the salaries and allowances system. It had not yet been possible to make a detailed calculation of the saving in question, not to indicate precisely where it would take effect, but this would be done shortly.

[3] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) thought the Appropriation Table would be valid only when both the purpose and amount of each item was clearly set forth in it. He suggested that paragraph 5 should be incorporated in paragraph 1.

[4] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested the insertion in brackets, after the words "Appropriation Table" in paragraph 1, of the words "as amended in accordance with paragraph 5 below". *Agreed.*

[5] After some slight drafting amendments, the Appropriation Resolution for 1951 was *adopted.*

Appropriation Table..

[6] In reply to Professor FANTAPPIÉ (Italy), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the figure for "General Conference" had had to be increased from $123,860 to $187,940, because of the addition of Spanish as a working language.

[7] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that, two evenings previously, the budget total had stood at $8,214,000, plus $10,000 for the World Federation of United Nations Associations and $50,000 for the dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Committee of Eight having decided to leave it to the Director-General to reduce that total by $74,000, this had been done in accordance with the wishes expressed by the Budget Committee; the alterations, which brought the total budget figure down to the required $8,200,000, would be submitted that afternoon to the Programme and Budget Commission.

[8] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) warmly praised the Secretariat for the magnificent work it had done.

Final draft report of the Budget Committee: Report No. 2.

[9] The final draft report No. 2, to be published as document 5C/BUD/3, was *adopted* without comment.

The meeting rose at noon.

THIRTIETH MEETING

Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 8.30 a.m.

Chairman: Miss CAROL LAISE (United States of America)

Aid to the Arab refugees in Palestine [document 5C/51].

[1] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) recalled what he had previously said in the Budget Committee, namely that he had asked for an increased budget item for educational assistance to Arab refugees in Palestine, and failing that, the provision of at least $150,000 for this purpose to be requested of the Programme and Budget Commission. Iraqi delegation considered that this matter was a responsibility which Unesco could not evade, and which was for the time being far more pressing than the issue of documents or the erection of public monuments.

[2] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that Unesco had worked on the principle with regard to relief assistance that, since the funds available were never adequate to the needs, Member Governments should primarily be encouraged to subscribe to such purposes on their own. Last year, for example, while Unesco had contributed $60,000 to this end, the Governments of France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom had contributed far bigger sums. The important thing was that the flow should not be interrupted.

The resolution in document 5C/120 encouraged the Director-General to do more, but still left it to Member States and their national organizations to do the main work.

[3] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that the Committee was not concerned with document 5C/120, which had already been adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission, and in any case had no budgetary implications.

[4] If the delegation of Iraq maintained that $150,000 were needed to provide for both adequate educational facilities and scholarships, as suggested in its draft resolution, the Committee had two alternative courses: either to instruct the Director-General to use $150,000 of the budget of $188,000 provided under the Relief Assistance Programme, or to decide that those $188,000 should remain available for war and other emergency relief, and that a sufficient sum be added to the 1951 budget for Arab refugee problems.

[5] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) asked whether the sum of $150,000 could be found within the economies already made on the $8,200,000 budget, or whether the Budget would have to be raised or new economies made. If they adopted the first proposal suggested by Mr. Weitz, the amounts available for emergency relief would be seriously depleted. He wondered whether this could not be ranked among the special projects concerning which the Director-General could appeal for funds from public or private institutions outside the regular budget.

[6] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) thought that, as had been indicated by Dr. Drzewieski at a previous meeting, they might be able to find approximately $60,000 for this purpose out of the fund of $188,000, as had been done in past years.

[7] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said there was nothing sacrosanct about the way in which this fund was distributed by the Executive Board. It had in fact been allocated on an increasingly broad basis over the past four years.

[8] In answer to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. WEITZ added that it would be in order for the Committee to point out that the only alternative to dropping other items or increasing the budget, would be to fall back on the $188,000 fund.

[9] Commenting on a suggestion from Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) that they should recommend dropping certain items with less priority, Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) pointed out that this was impossible now that the programme and budget had been approved.

[10] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) also thought it would be impraticable, in the light of the fixed policy of the Conference to limit the funds for relief assistance during the past three years and to prohibit transfers for its increase, to suggest augmenting that fund now. The question was whether the Committee was accepting the sum

of $150,000 without further examination. For himself, Mr. WEEDEN feared that, the more Unesco contributed directly to this purpose, the more it would prejudice the chance of successful appeals as contemplated in document 5C/120.

[11] In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) suggested that, in the first resort, his delegation would put the figure needed at $250,000 rather than $150,000.

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) wanted to know whether the main operative clause of paragraph (*a*) was to instruct the Director-General to provide education facilities, or to co-operate with other authorities and agencies, since the figure would not be the same in either case. For the past five years, it had been the policy of the General Conference to finance relief projects of this type by only a token amount, and to rely on the Organization's ability to raise outside funds for the bulk of the needs. The Committee was embarking on a question of substance.

[13] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) reinforced the plea put forward by Mr. Weitz for more information, and thought they should confine themselves to the provision of co-operation.

[14] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) wanted to know the relationship of the proposed project to the Klatt Plan of the United Nations. The United Nations had already made available $40,000,000 for Middle East relief, and France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom had in addition contributed large sums during the past year.

[15] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) did not know to what extent the United Nations funds were to be devoted to educational needs as opposed to general relief.

[16] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) proposed a statement on the following lines:

The Budget Committee having considered the main document and the amendment in the light of previous policy, consider that a sum of not less than $150,000 is necessary to provide the relief services required, and understand that of this amount about $60,000 would in the normal way be obtained from the budget appropriation of $188,000.

[17] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) suggested that the reference to a total figure be omitted, since they were unfortunately unable to obtain detailed figures at this stage.

[18] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) agreed that the question of cost was a very difficult one. He suggested that they should rather say that $150,000 was the most reasonable cost beyond which they should not go.

[19] Professor FANTAPPIE (Italy) was afraid that the adoption of such a figure now might upset the balance of the budget.

[20] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) did not agree that there was such a danger. Resolution 5C/51 included an appeal for funds to competent authorities and agencies, and there had not so far been any question of exceeding the budget limits.

[21] The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since the problem was to decide what instructions to give the Director-General, they might accept the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom delegate, amended by the delegate of Australia, stating that they were unable to discover the true budgetary implications but that, within the sums available for emergency relief, up to $150,000 might be allocated for this purpose.

[22] Sir Ronald ADAM (United Kingdom) suggested that the $60,000 made available last year might be mentioned, and that some of the scholarships could be provided out of this.

[23] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) stated emphatically that he could not commit himself without knowing more about the relationship of this project to the Klatt Plan. The sum of $150,000 was a drop in the ocean compared with the $40,000,000 voted by the United Nations for this relief and by other countries individually. His Government would want to know what additional purpose could be served by this sum.

[24] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) suggested that the United Nations fund was for general relief and not intended to cover educational needs. There were 200,000 children of school age in Palestine for whom no schools were available.

[25] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a new fund was now being started by the United Nations, and that the Director-General had already approached the Secretary-General of the United Nations with a suggestion that some of it be used for providing educational facilities. She suggested that the Committee might recommend that something be done by Unesco if it appeared that the United Nations plan included no provision for such facilities.

[26] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) said he was willing to accept this proposal and the figure of $150,000.

[27] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) moved that the Chairman be asked to report to the Programme

and Budget Commission in the light of the proposal put forward by the United Kingdom delegate and of the discussion thereon.

[28] It was *agreed* that the Chairman would present to the Programme and Budget Commission a report on their discussion with a recommendation that a maximum of $150,000 be allocated for the purpose of educational assistance to the Arab refugees, in the event of the United Nations plan not including adequate provision for this purpose.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE OF EIGHT

FIRST MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Committee had decided to establish the present committee (composed of eight members, five of whom were chairmen of other commissions and committees of the Conference) to adjust the final 1951 Programme to the total budget figure for that year.

[2] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) stated that the Budget Committee had made total savings of $39,659. However, there was a large increase of $204,000 due to new resolutions (this included provision for the Spanish language at General Conferences, and an enlarged programme for Germany and Japan). At the present time, therefore, the budget estimates were $114,327 over the ceiling figure of $8,200,000. On the other hand, there would be a further saving of $100,000 when the local salary scales were introduced in 1951.

[3] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) added that some resolutions had still not been received from the Programme and Budget Commission but that, as far as he knew, only one of these required budgetary provision; this concerned dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the estimate was expected to be approximately $50,000.

[4] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) said that it was not clear wheher the estimated saving of $100,000 on the local salary rates was to be included in the Budget or not, and a discussion ensued on this point.

[5] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that the Budget Committee had assumed that this sum would be available for spending in the 1951 budget. He explained that, out of the total budget of $8,200,000, the Organization expected to receive contributions amounting to only $7,700,000. An additional sum of $180,000 would be available from the contributions of new Member States not included in the 1950 budget, and a further $247,000 representing the surplus for 1947 was to be surrendered. The remaining $73,000 would be made up from miscellaneous income and, if necessary, by withdrawal from the Working Capital Fund.

[6] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) felt that it would be far more realistic for the Organization to expect a total income from contributions of only $7,500,000.

[7] Miss LAISE (United States of America) confirmed that her delegation had felt that the $100,000 saving on the local salary scales should be available for spending in 1951, in order to ensure that the Organization would be able to carry out its full programme.

[8] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was not competent to reopen a discussion as to the total income the Organization might expect in 1951, since this had been decided in the Programme and Budget Commission. The business of the Committee was merely to decide by how much present estimates would have to be reduced, and where this reduction was to be effected.

[9] It was finally *agreed* that the $100,000 estimated saving on the local salary scales would be available for spending in 1951. This left the Committee with the sum of $14,327 over the budget ceiling, plus an estimated $50,000 for the dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, i.e., approximately $65,000.

[10] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Admini-

strative Management and Budget) added that there were three further resolutions which had been passed by the Programme and Budget Commission with a request that funds be provided if available after budgeting had been completed. The sums involved were:

(1) Field Science Offices $25,000
(2) Education Textbooks $10,000
(3) Grant-in-Aid to WFUNA $10,000

[11] The CHAIRMAN knew for certain that the resolution concerning the World Federation of United Nations Associations had been passed without this reservation of funds being available; the total sum to be reduced was therefore $75,000.

[12] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Director-General was completely at liberty to propose a reduction in the grant to WFUNA, as in other cases, if funds were not available.

[13] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) then raised the basic question of whether the Emergency Fund for relief should be maintained in its present form, or whether the practice of the United Nations and WHO should be followed: no actual Emergency Fund existed, but the Director-General and the Executive Board were authorized to withdraw sums up to a certain limit from the Revolving or Working Capital Fund for emergency relief. The General Conference, in the following year, authorized the replacement of such sums. He felt that this question should be studied as a matter of principle, especially since there was a tendency to spend the total amount of any sum provided for a specific purpose (i.e., the Emergency Fund), whereas expenditure would probably be less if withdrawals had to be made from the Working Capital Fund.

[14] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this question was outside the competence of the Committee and Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) added that the Budget Committee had already discussed this matter and decided that it would involve much study by the Secretariat, the Executive Board and the different organs of the General Conference. Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) therefore agreed that the question should be deferred for consideration in future years.

[15] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the term "Emergency Fund" was used in Unesco to cover not only emergencies arising in the course of the year, but also what the General Conference considered to be emergency situations already existing. Apart from a small sum for relief aid for unpredictable disasters, the money allocated to the Emergency Fund was actually appropriated in advance by the General Conference for specific purposes. Dr. Zook's proposal was interesting in so far as provision for disasters was concerned, but the Deputy Director-General agreed that it would be more appropriate to deal with this matter another year.

[16] He was glad to see that the gap between the programme and the budget was so small. He suggested that it might help the Committee if the Secretariat were to prepare concrete proposals indicating where the necessary cuts might be effected, and what consequent modifications of the programme would be necessary.

[17] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) welcomed this suggestion, but felt that the opinion of the Budget Committee should also be sought: the Budget Committe had carried out a detailed examination of the Budget estimates and had indicated certain areas where further savings might be effected. The Secretariat should consider these indications in formulating its proposals for the further reductions necessary.

It was *agreed* that this would be done

[18] Dr. ZOOK (United States of America) suggested that the Secretariat might prepare two proposals: one including the two resolutions on Field Science Offices and Educational Textbooks for which provision had not yet been made, and another excluding these items.

[19] Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) pointed out that the Secretariat could either propose small reductions on a large number of projects, or make one or two large cuts involving one or two specific projects. He would prefer the second alternative.

[20] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that this was the Secretariat's only alternative, since the Budget Committee had reduced the estimates for all projects to an absolute minimum and it would not be possible to make further cuts without deleting functions or eliminating a project completely. He would make the reservation that the Secretariat be authorized to reinstate any function so deleted if funds were to become available during the year. *Agreed.*

[21] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) suggested, however, that it might be possible for the Secretariat to make certain small cuts which the Budget Committee had not been able to make through its lack of experience of the Organization.

The meeting rose at 11.10 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ROGER SEYDOUX (France)

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that, following the directions indicated by the Committee, the Secretariat had re-examined the 1951 Budget Estimates and proposed additional adjustments to bring the total within the provisional ceiling of $8,200,000 that is to say reductions totalling $74,327. He suggested consideration of these proposals item by item.

Part II. General Administration.

Reduce $3,400 from Travel and Other Objects of Expenditure in the Office of the Director-General, the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget, and the Bureau of Personnel.

Approved.

Part III. Programme Operations.

1. Education.

(*a*) EDUCATION CLEARING-HOUSE [III 1.B (2)].

(1) *Reduce by $2,000 the grant-in-aid to the International Bureau of Education by the elimination of the study on the Administrative Status of the Teaching Profession* (resolution 1.123, paragraph II, page 87).

[2] The CHAIRMAN felt that this was an important item which would suffer from the reduction proposed.

[3] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) agreed that it would not be possible to carry out more than a preliminary study of the question in 1951.

[4] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) and Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) supported the reduction proposed. *Approved.*

(2) *Reduce by $2,500 Contractual Printing for the Proceedings of the Joint Annual Conference on Public Instruction* (paragraph II, page 87).

[5] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that this reduction would eliminate publication in English of the reports of proceedings concerned. The International Bureau of Education was responsible for the publication in French and this would be carried out.

The reduction was *approved.*

(3) *Reduce by $4,000 Contractual Printing for the Supplement to the Statistical Yearbook on Education* (paragraph V, page 87).

[6] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) said that, as only three Member States had so far replied to the questionnaire on this matter, it had been decided to postpone the activity. He made it clear that the yearbook itself would not be affected (since this was on the 1950 Budget) and would be published at the end of 1950 and be distributed in 1951. It was only publication of the Supplement which was to be postponed.

The reduction was *approved.*

(4) *Reduce by $2,000 Travel on Official Business* (item VIII, page 88).

[7] This was *approved.*

(*b*) EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING [III.1.D].

(1) *Reduce travel of Delegates to Conferences and Meetings by $2,040 and Fees by $200, by the suppression of the Conference of Directors of International Schools* [paragraph I (c), page 105].

[8] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) explained that the Budget Committee had challenged this item, since it was not covered by a programme resolution; the Secretariat therefore proposed to delete it. *Approved.*

(2) *Reduce Fees by $2,000 by the elimination of the preparation of the List of Chairs where International Relations are scheduled* (resolution 1.331, paragraph VII, page 106).

[9] This resolution had been challenged quite strongly in the Programme and Budget Commission and its deletion was therefore proposed. *Approved.*

[10] Mr. ELVIN (Director, Department of Education) having said the Secretariat had not known whether or not it was free to cut new resolutions submitted by the General Conference, a discussion ensued on the proposal for a Friendship Flag (document 5C/74), still under consideration in the Programme and Budget Commission. It had been estimated that this resolution would cost $8,710, but the CHAIRMAN, Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee), Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) and others felt that the resolution, if passed, should be maintained without budgetary provision.

[11] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) pointed out that resolutions passed without budgetary provision still cost the Secretariat a certain amount of personnel time.

[12] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) stated however that, whereas the Committee could recommend the deletion of a budgetary provision, it had no authority to suppress a resolution.

2. Natural Sciences.

(*a*) PROGRAMME COSTS [III.2.A].

Reduce travel on Official Business by $1,000, following recommendation of the Budget Committee (page 113).
Approved.

(*b*) DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION [III.2.B.(1)].

(1) *Reduce by $2,000 contract with International Union for the Protection of Nature by eliminating the contribution towards the continuation of the "Survival Services"* (paragraph v, page 119).
Approved.

(2) *Reduce travel on Official Business by $1,000, following recommendation of the Budget Committee* (paragraph VII, page 119).
Approved.

[13] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) asked whether the Director-General had considered a further cut on resolution 2.142. On the proposal of the Executive Board, half the budgetary provision for this item had already been eliminated, it being agreed that the necessary printing and publishing would be contracted for by Unesco on a commercial basis, instead of being undertaken by the Organization itself. Mr. Cowell suggested that a further reduction could be made by requesting the publishing house concerned to participate in the preparation of the dictionaries.

[14] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) replied that it had been decided to keep the functions of planning and preparation for this project within the Secretariat, but Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) wished to point out that his delegation felt that this was one of the places where further cuts might be made in the Programme.

3. Social Sciences.

AID TO INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COLLABORATION [III.3.B].

Reduce various objects of expenditure to delay by six months the establishment of one Social Science Field Office (paragraph V, page 148):

Fees	*$3,000*
Travel	*$1,500*
Miscellaneous Common Service Costs	*$1,800*
Total reduction	*$6,300*

Approved.

4. Cultural Activities.

PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES [III.4.C].

Reduce by $8,000 Fees for the Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind (paragraph VI, page 172).

[15] The CHAIRMAN felt that the reduction was somewhat high, but Mr. THOMAS (Director, Department of Cultural Activities) and Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) considered that the sum remaining was sufficient for the amount of work which could be accomplished on this project in 1951. *Approved.*

5. Exchange of Persons.

CLEARING-HOUSE AND PROMOTION [III.5.B].

(1) *Reduce by $2,000 Contractual Printing by obtaining further commercial support for* "Study Abroad" (paragraph II, page 209).
Approved.

(2) *Reduce by $300 Temporary Posts for the meeting of administrators of teacher's interchange programmes, following comments of the Budget Committee* (paragraph VIII, page 209).
Approved.

(3) *Reduce by $400 Temporary Posts for meet-*

ing of organizers of youth exchange programmes, following comments of the Budget Committee (paragraph x, page 210).

Approved.

6. Mass Communication.

(*a*) PROGRAMME COSTS [III.6.A].

Reduce various classes of expenditure: Eliminate an Executive Officer (grade 12) responsible for dealing with public information queries and for relations with Unesco Clubs (paragraph III, page 219):

Personnel Costs (page 217)	*$5,180*
Chapter 6: Indirect Personnel Costs (page 244)	*$1,770*
Common Service Costs (Part IV) . . .	*$ 313*
Total reduction	*$7,263*

[16] The CHAIRMAN and Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) were most anxious that the Organization should assist Unesco Clubs in Member States, and asked whether this assistance would be completely eliminated if the budgetary provision were deleted as proposed.

[17] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) replied that all requests for assistance from Unesco Clubs would most certainly be met to the best of the Secretariat's ability. It was now hoped, however, that this task would be shared by all departments and services of Unesco, instead of being concentrated in the Department of Mass Communication.

On this understanding the reduction was *approved.*

(*b*) ACTION THROUGH PRESS, FILM AND RADIO [III.6.D].

Reduce fees for special assignments covered under resolution 6.33 [paragraph III, B (3), page 240]: *$5,000.*

[18] Mr. SCHNEIDER (Director, Department of Mass Communication) said that it was hoped that this reduction in fees would be offset by more Member States agreeing to participate in the project without charge. *Approved.*

7. Relief Assistance Services.

Reduce $9,960 on direct and indirect personnel Costs under Chapter 7: Further re-organization of the Relief Assistance Services following a consolidation of Budget lines III.7.A and III.7.B through the transfer to the chapter on Education of activities relating to Children's Communities and International Voluntary Work Camps.

[19] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, as the projects on Children's Communities and Voluntary Work Camps had been transferred to the Department of Education, the Director-General hoped to re-organize the Relief Assistance Services and effect a reduction of personnel. *Approved.*

8. External Relations Service.

(*a*) LIAISON WITH GERMANY AND JAPAN [III.8.B].

(1) *Reduce Personnel Costs* (page 273) *by $6,050 and Indirect Personnel Costs of the External Relations Service* (page 283) *by $2.039, by the elimination of a general programme specialist in the Field Staff, following comments of the Budget Committee (reduction is from the supplementary proposal for item III.8.B).*

(2) *Reduce local field help* (page 274) *by $1,500, consequent on the foregoing reduction.*

[20] Miss LAISE (United States of America) said that, as the Budget Committee had already cut one field officer and one secretary on this project, this further cut might be too much. She felt that it would be preferable to make this reduction elsewhere in the External Relations Service.

Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) supported these remarks.

[21] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) said that the Budget Committee had taken into account provision made elsewhere in the programme for activities relating to Germany and Japan, and Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) added that the Head of Service, in agreeing to this further cut, had pointed out that the tempo of the work would be slowed down in consequence.

[22] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) felt that, as the General Conference had laid great stress on an increased Unesco programme in relation to Germany and Japan, it would be wrong to make too many personnel cuts in this section.

[23] After a discussion during which all members agreed that it would be preferable to maintain the present provision for this project on as high a level as possible, the CHAIRMAN suggested that only about $5,000 be deducted from this project, the remaining sum being found elsewhere. *Agreed.*

[24] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that the additional $5,000 could be deducted from the grant-in-aid of $10,000 requested for the

World Federation of United Nations Associations, since this was a resolution which had only been passed with hesitation by the Programme and Budget Commission.

(b) DIVISION OF LEGAL AFFAIRS [III.8.D].

Reduce fees for outside legal assistance by $750, following comments of the Budget Committee. Approved.

9. Documents and Publications Service [III.9.A].

Reduce the provision for outside payments by $1,625, following the comments of Budget Committee.

Approved.

Part IV. Common Service Costs [IV.E].

Reduce the provision for Language Training Courses by $1,000, following comments of the Executive Board.

Approved.

[25] At the request of Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board), Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) gave the following list of reductions made in order that the balance between the various departments and services of the Organization might be seen:

Part II. General Administration . . .	$ 3,400
Part III. Programme Operations (including several small consequential reductions which would be applied to Part IV):	
1. Department of Education . . .	$14,740
2. Department of Natural Sciences .	$ 4,000
3. Department of Social Sciences .	$ 6,300
4. Department of Cultural Activities	$ 8,000
5. Exchange of Persons Service . .	$ 2,700
6. Department of Mass Communications	$12,263
7. Relief Assistance Services . . .	$ 9,960
8. External Relations Service . . .	$10,339
9. Documents and Publications Service	$ 1,625
Part IV. Common Service Costs . . .	$ 1,000
TOTAL	$74,327

[26] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) pointed out that the Department of Natural Sciences had not had as great a cut as the other Departments, whereupon Professor NIELSEN (Denmark) suggested that a reduction might be made on item 2.111 in this Department.

[27] The CHAIRMAN however said that he could not authorize the Committee to reopen a debate on Programme resolutions which had already been passed by the Programme and Budget Commission and the Budget Committee. He felt that the additional reduction of $5,000 should be made on one of the new resolutions which had only passed the Programme and Budget Commission after long discussion and with much hesitation.

[28] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), seconded by Dr. ZOOK (United States of America), formally moved a reduction in the grant-in-aid to WFUNA by $5,000 with a consequential increase in the German programme.

[29] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) said that the Director-General would have no objection to this proposal.

The motion was *adopted* unanimously with one abstention (Iraq).

[30] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) then raised the question of the amount of money under the Relief Services programme which was to be allocated to Arab refugees in Palestine and the education of refugee children in Palestine, as it was his impression that the Programme and Budget Commission had requested the Executive Board to find additional sums from other parts of the Programme for this purpose.

[31] Sir John MAUD (Chairman, Executive Board) felt that this must be a misunderstanding, since the Board had no competence to make such transfers.

[32] The CHAIRMAN said that, as this question was entirely outside the authority of the present Committee, he could not allow any further discussion.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

FIRST MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

Opening of the Session.

[1] The CHAIRMAN expressed his sincere gratitude to the delegates who had honoured him with the Chairmanship of the Commission. He recalled that the Officers of the Commission had already been appointed by the Nominations Committee.

Adoption of the Agenda [document 5C/OXR/1].

The Provisional Agenda [document 5C/OXR/1] was *adopted*.

Future policy with regard to annual reports by Member States [document 5C/OXR/3].

[2] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) recalled that, following a decision taken by the Fourth Session of the General Conference, the Executive Board had, at its Twentieth Session, suggested four possible solutions. These were set out under Section IV on page 3 of document 5C/OXR/3. It was now for the Commission to decide one of these solutions.

[3] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) asked whether, at their recent meeting, the representatives of National Commissions had considered the desirability, as a future policy, of examining the Reports of Member States for the purpose of extracting their main ideas.

Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) replied that no such question had been raised at the meeting of representatives of National Commissions, as they had not known what procedure would be adopted by the Conference.

In the circumstances, Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) moved that the Commission should formally propose that reports of Member States should be examined each year by the representatives of National Commissions, meeting before the opening of the General Conference.

[4] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) stated that his delegation attached great importance to the annual reports of Member States, and hence to the procedure to be adopted for their examination. The matter had been before the General Conference on several previous occasions and no decision had been reached. The United States delegation regretted that the report contained in document 5C/OXR/3 did not constitute an adequate basis for a discussion of the merits or demerits of the four alternatives suggested on page 3. However, his delegation had carefully considered these four alternatives and had reached the following conclusions: (1) the present system of examining the reports in plenary session had already been tried and found unsatisfactory; (2) the Executive Board was too occupied by other responsibilities to be able to give the reports the careful consideration which they required; (3) it would be inappropriate for reports from Member Governments to be examined by members of National Commissions, who in many cases were not governmental representatives; the reports should be examined by an inter-governmental body.

There remained, therefore, the suggestion that the reports should be examined by a special committee of the General Conference. The United States delegation would be prepared to accept that suggestion with a slight amendment: that the report be examined by a special committee of the

Official and External Relations Commission which might also examine many inter-related problems, such as the usefulness of the reports and the procedure for their examination in the future.

[5] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said that, while feeling considerable sympathy for the Belgian proposal, his delegation was in general agreement with the United States delegation. The United Kingdom delegation would prefer, however, to maintain alternative (2) in its original form.

[6] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) thought that alternatives (1) and (3) should be eliminated for the reasons explained by Mr. Mulliken. Personally, he would gladly accept a compromise, namely to adopt Mr. Mulliken's proposal, adding representatives appointed by the National Commissions as advisers to the members of the Special Committee.

[7] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) seconded the proposal made by the United Kingdom delegate, and stressed the need for a thorough and unhurried examination of the reports. He considered that a too complicated procedure for nomination of such a committee was undesirable; therefore he was not prepared to support the Belgian proposal.

[8] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) regretted that he was unable to support proposals which, although based on a consideration of facts, led to faulty conclusions. Reports of Member States were undoubtedly very important, and it was obvious that they were given insufficient attention during the discussions of the General Conference. The only effective measure would be to invite Member States, in preparing their reports, to follow more closely the procedure laid down by the Conference. Mr. Mulliken's proposal to entrust the examination of the reports to representatives of Member States encountered the difficulty that those representatives were under instructions from their governments, so that they would have no choice but to defend their country's report. This did not apply to the National Commissions, which, as a group, represented Unesco's conscience.

Finally, therefore, if the Commission decided not to maintain the existing procedure, which would be the most reasonable solution, Mr. de Lacharrière would willingly support the procedure proposed by Professor Verniers. Failing that he would agree to the reports being examined by the Executive Board, which, in spite of its heavy tasks, had shown that it could carry out any additional responsibilities imposed upon it.

Proposal (1) [document 5C/OXR/3, page 3] was *rejected* by 11 votes to 6.

[9] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) announced that his delegation would withdraw its amendment to the second alternative and support the United Kingdom proposal to maintain the original text.

Proposal (2) was *adopted* by 14 votes to 5.

[10] The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Commission wished to vote on proposals (3) and (4).

Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) observed that proposal (4) should have been put to the vote first, since it implied the greatest change.

[11] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) stated that his delegation would vote against the fourth proposal as not being in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 6 of the Constitution; the adoption of such a procedure in the future would necessitate an amendment to the Constitution.

Proposal (4) was *rejected* by 18 votes to 3, and 1 abstention.

Proposal (3) was also *rejected*.

[12] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that proposal (2) just adopted could be applied during the current Session if it were ratified by the General Conference. He therefore hoped that delegates would agree to request the Chairman to transmit the proposal to the General Committee. *Agreed.*

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on education problems in the non-self-governing territories [document 5C/OXR/5].

[13] Mr. BERKELEY (External Relations Service) announced that, at its Nineteenth and Twenty-First Sessions, the Executive Board had considered the important group of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, as set forth in Annexes I and II to document 5C/OXR/5. As stated in the third paragraph on page 1 of document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1, the Executive Board, realizing that enquiries carried out in pursuance of the resolutions would have budgetary implications, recommended that the proposals presented by the Director-General and the question of their budgetary implications should be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission and to the Budget Committee, which would then report back to the Official and External Relations Commission.

It was *decided* to submit the matter to the Programme and Budget Commission and to the Budget Committee, and to await their reports.

Collaboration with the Trusteeship Council [document 5C/OXR/6].

[14] The draft resolution at the bottom of page 3 of document 5C/OXR/6 was *adopted* by 20 votes to none.[1]

Consideration of the Provisional Agreement between the International Bureau of Education and Unesco [document 5C/OXR/7].

[15] Professor SOMMERFELT (Executive Board) stated that the Board considered collaboration between Unesco and the International Bureau of Education to be very satisfactory, and therefore submitted to the Conference the draft resolution [document 5C/OXR/7, page 2] proposing that the Agreement between the two Organizations should be extended for a period of twelve months.

[16] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) announced that his delegation had examined the Provisional Agreement contained in Annex I and desired further information on certain points before approving the resolution. Mr. Mulliken asked what progress had been made in the past three years in carrying out the central purpose of Article 9 of the provisional agreement. He also enquired as to the status of present arrangements between Unesco and IBE. He was also suprised to see that there were certain Articles relevant only to 1947.

[17] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that the joint Unesco-IBE Committee, set up under the terms of the provisional agreement, had not yet studied the final agreement provided for under Article 9. It had felt that the provisional agreement had so far constituted a satisfactory basis for collaboration between the two Organizations. With regard to the second question, Mr. de Blonay requested that the Secretariat be authorized to give a detailed reply in writing.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) was satisfied with the explanation given, but hoped that in its written document, the Secretariat would reply to both his questions.

[18] Mr. ABRAHAM (France) thought that collaboration between the two bodies had been so satisfactory that the need had not been felt to reinforce it by a new text. Certain of the terms of the provisional agreement were obviously out of date; but exchange of staff was still frequent. The aim of the provisional agreement was quite clear: it was to ensure a co-ordination of Unesco and IBE activities and to enable Unesco to entrust IBE with work which, if carried out by the Organization's own services, would involve heavy expense. The Commission should therefore refrain from intervening and taking steps that might hamper or suspend a harmonious and fruitful collaboration.

However, Mr. Abraham gladly supported Mr. de Blonay's proposal, being convinced that the Secretariat's explanations would make it possible to strengthen still further the satisfactory agreement between the two Organizations.

[19] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) wished to add a few words on his own behalf: when attending one of the IBE conferences, he had been impressed by the great educational value of the discussions, in which certain countries that were not members of Unesco had taken part. Moreover, certain work entrusted to IBE would have cost three times as much, had it been carried out by Unesco's services. There was therefore every reason to continue the provisional agreement, leaving the door open for the subsequent conclusion of a final agreement.

[20] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) also stressed the importance of the annual IBE Conference, in which several States not yet represented in Unesco took part. Unesco should take advantage of IBE'S experience.

[21] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) did not object to the slight delay which would be caused by the production of a written report, although he would have felt able to vote forthwith for the proposal presented to the Commission. He understood the legal objections behind Mr. Mulliken's scruples, but the essential importance of the provisional agreement was that it contained a promise of mutual collaboration. Harmonious collaboration did indeed exist, and that was what mattered.

[22] Professor PIAGET (Director, International Bureau of Education) observed that no disagreement could exist on the question of principle: the few out-dated terms in the provisional agreement could not possibly lead to confusion. It had to be remembered that Unesco's legal services had drafted the provisional agreement. IBE, which had not prepared any text of its own, had objected to certain drafting points, but, in a spirit of collaboration, it had accepted the document proposed to it. It had therefore been decided to submit the provisional agreement to a practical test before giving it final form. When the question arose, the representatives of the two Organizations had agreed to extend an arrangement which satisfied them both, especially as there could be no question of absorption, since certain countries represented in IBE were not members of Unesco.

1. In final form: Resol. 31.3 and 31.31.

All IBE'S work, moreover, was controlled by the Joint Unesco-IBE. Committee, set up in accordance with Article 1 of the provisional agreement.

With regard to the division of work, the borderline was clearly drawn: IBE carried out investigations, while Unesco took direct action. Finally, IBE'S total budget was less than $40,000 whereas, if its work were done by Unesco, the cost would be $300,000. As an example of IBE'S concrete accomplishments, Professor Piaget quoted the permanent exhibition and centre for the study of school textbooks organized in Geneva. It was obvious that Unesco would have had neither sufficient room nor staff to organize these.

It was *decided* to await a written report from the Secretariat before taking any action in the matter.

Agreement between the International Committee of Weights and Measures and Unesco [document 5C/OXR/8].

[23] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) introduced the draft resolution on page 1 of document 5C/OXR/8. During its session held in the summer of 1949, the Economic and Social Council had studied the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on relations between the United Nations and specialized intergovernmental organizations, with a view to strengthening existing collaboration and avoiding overlapping. In its ensuing resolution, the Economic and Social Council had congratulated Unesco and the International Committee of Weights and Measures on their harmonious collaboration.

[24] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) requested the Secretariat to give an account of the action taken by Unesco and the International Committee of Weights and Measures under the terms of the agreement. He added that the request for information was not intended as criticism, but was prompted by the desire for an assurance that the agreement was effective.

[25] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) said that details regarding the application of the agreement were given in the Director-General's Report [document 5C/3, page 100]. If the Commission thought it necessary, the Director of the Natural Sciences Department could give further details at the following meeting.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) stated that if no other delegation shared his concern, he would withdraw his request.

The draft resolution [document 5C/OXR/8, page 1] was *adopted* by 18 votes to none and 1 abstention.[1]

Report on the result of the negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement with the Organization of American States [document 5C/OXR/11].

[26] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) recalled that, in implementation of the resolutions adopted at the Fourth Session of the General Conference [document 4C/Resolutions 32.3 to 32.34], the Director-General had drawn up the report contained in document 5C/OXR/11, which was only provisional, as there was still one problem which the Negotiating Committee had not yet solved. The Director-General had subsequently learned that the matter had been settled, and he had therefore prepared a supplementary report which would shortly be presented to the Commission. The draft agreement would be communicated to Member States before being submitted to the Executive Board, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations would be informed of the nature and scope of the agreement before it was finally concluded.

[27] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) proposed that the discussion of the item should be postponed until the Commission had the supplementary report before it.

As the Report had been submitted to the Commission only for its information, it was *agreed* to take note of document 5C/OXR/11.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 32.2 to 32.22.

SECOND MEETING

Wednesday, 24 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. LUIS A. BARALT Y ZACHARIE (Cuba)

Work of the Commission.

[1] The CHAIRMAN read out a letter from the President of the Conference, addressed to all Chairmen of Commissions and Committees, informing them of the request formulated by the General Committee at its second meeting that no decision be taken on any proposal having budgetary implications until it had been referred to the Budget Committee and received the latter's report.

[2] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) informed the Commission of the decisions taken by the General Committee concerning certain items on the agenda:

(*a*) Item 5.1 (Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies: document 5C/OXR/4) would first be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative Commission, whose report would then be considered by the Official and External Relations Commission; finally, the latter would draft a report and recommendations for submission to the General Conference;

(*b*) Item 5.2 (Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on educational problems in the non-self-governing territories: document 5C/OXR/5) would be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission, which would draft a report on the subject before it was considered by the Official and External Relations Commission;

(*c*) Item 8.1 (Draft regulations concerning the approval by the General Conference of recommendations to Member States and of international conventions: document 5C/OXR/16) would be referred to the Procedure Committee.

[3] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) having asked whether item 8.1, and arising out of it, item 8.2 of the agenda would be discussed as a matter of form before being referred to the relevant Commissions, Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) thought that it would be wiser not to start a general discussion before receiving the reports of the Commissions concerned.

[4] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) was rather puzzled, because certain important policy considerations affecting Unesco's relations with Member States were involved; he thought a discussion in the Official and External Relations Commission would have been appropriate.

[5] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) agreed with Mr. Mulliken: it was not merely a question of procedure, but of considerations of vital importance to Unesco's work.

[6] The CHAIRMAN suggested that items 5.1 and 5.2 could quite appropriately be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission prior to discussion by the Official and External Relations Commission; as to item 8.1, it could be given preliminary consideration by the Commission.

[7] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) thought that if such was the opinion of the Commission, the Chairman should so inform the President of the General Conference.

[8] The CHAIRMAN suggested that, when they reached that item, a decision could be taken as to whether the Commission should discuss it or not.

[9] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) agreed. He thought Mr. de Blonay's suggestion was useful, and the General Conference might be told that the Commission had shown considerable interest and some anxiety lest they should not have an opportunity of debating the points of principle likely to emerge.

The CHAIRMAN concurred with Mr. Cowell.

International Non-Governmental Organizations [documents 5C/OXR/9, 10, 12, 13 and 14].

[10] Professor SOMMERFELT (Executive Board) presented documents 5C/OXR/9, 10, 12, 13 and 14. In the opinion of the Board, collaboration with a great number of the international non-governmental organizations had been fruitful for Unesco which in many cases had been able to hand over work which could be done by them more professionally and more cheaply.

[11] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) suggested a general discussion on consultative status for international non governmental organizations, which raised important questions of grants-in-aid, contracts or formal agreements. He thought that, after the discussion, a committee might be appointed to deal with those problems.

[12] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) believed that Unesco was the one Specialized Agency which had made it a deliberate and important part of its policy to use existing international non-governmental organizations to carry out its main objectives, and that the Executive Board was convinced of the importance of continuing that policy. An important principle emerging from document 5C/OXR/10 was the clear distinction made between the awarding of consultative status to international non-governmental organizations and the granting to them of financial aid. Previously, a grant-in-aid was contingent upon the prior award of consultative status.

[13] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) said that his delegation attached great importance to the system of consultative status; they believed that it was one of the principal means of making available to Unesco the views and experience of many groups of people, and it also offered opportunities to Unesco of making known the nature of its programme. It was because of that importance that the United States delegation had been concerned with the effectiveness of the system and dissatisfied with the way in which it had been operated up to the present time, though they recognized the difficulties involved. The United States delegation would, at the appropriate time suggest several changes in the Directives proposed by the Executive Board [document 5C/OXR/10, Annex II] and would make additional suggestions regarding opportunities for circulation to, and consideration by, Unesco's appropriate bodies, of written communications from international non-governmental organizations; but opportunities should also be afforded for verbal communications from them.

The United States delegation believed that the General Conference should be the body to grant consultative status; this was the practice of other Specialized Agencies and of the Economic and Social Council. Motivated by the desire to raise the status of consultative relations, the United States delegation would suggest that no reference to informal relations be included in the Directives. They would like the Directives confined to formal consultative relationships. The United States delegation would also prefer to see eliminated from the Directives any reference to contracts entered into with such organizations by Unesco. Such contracts were, in the view of his delegation, no different from those entered into with a private individual or an institution.

[14] The United States delegation would not separate the granting of subsidies from enjoyment of consultative status. A subsidy should be given because an international non-governmental organization was closely concerned with Unesco's general activities. It would be money given for which no specific return was expected; otherwise, it was a contractual relationship. If an international non-governmental organization was not sufficiently interested in Unesco's work to apply for consultative status, such an organization was certainly not entitled to receive a gift of money. Mr. Mulliken did not think that there should be formal agreements with only a limited number of international non-governmental organizations of a group or class. Those enjoying consultative status should be subject to the same obligations.

The United States delegation was in wholehearted agreement with the Executive Board that formal agreements should be discontinued. It was further thought that there should be no provisions for the establishment of new organizations in the directives, though occasions might arise when Unesco would wish to assist in establishing a new organization; but the United States delegation hoped that such occasions would become increasingly rare; those cases should become a programme responsibility and financed as part of the programme.

[15] Professor KRUYT (Netherlands), referring to Mr. Mulliken's statement that there were two categories of formal agreement with international non-governmental organizations, said that, in his view, this was absolutely logical. The organization in the first category was really a consulting organization; the second was a partner. Many of the latter received grants-in-aid and did work which, if they did not exist, Unesco would have to do itself. He mentioned in particular the International Council of Scientific Unions, which was quite different from Boy Scouts or *Pax Romana*, for example.

[16] Professor AGO (Italy) agreed with Mr. Mulliken's point of view regarding subsidies: these should be reserved for organizations enjoying consultative status. On the other hand, when it came to the question of formal agreements, he seconded the remarks made by Professor Kruyt.

[17] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) announced that his delegation would comment at a later stage on certain points, but wished first of all to know

the opinion of the international non-governmental organizations on the various questions. He thought that the Commission could allow itself to be guided by their opinion.

[18] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) agreed with Mr. Mulliken on the importance of consultative status for international non-governmental organizations, but did not agree with what had been said concerning certain bodies, of which there were several, with which Unesco had formal agreements that the Executive Board proposed to abolish. He thought such a move would be a great mistake, because it would create bad feeling among those who had hitherto aided and worked with Unesco, and would give rise to misunderstanding and criticism. Those organizations were working in Unesco's field more cheaply and more effectively than Unesco could itself. With regard to the International Council of Scientific Unions, a glance at document 5C/6 would show that a great deal of international work had been done by them in recent years.

[19] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) said it was not easy to refuse consultative status to international non-governmental organizations of established reputation. If the lists were kept within reasonable limits, however, the temptation to apply for consultative status in order to get money would be removed. Turning to Mr. Mulliken's suggestion that contracts should be eliminated from the Directives, Mr. Cowell pointed out that such contracts were the means by which an international non-governmental organization could be indirectly subsidized for an important purpose. Such a purpose, however, would not be achieved if that organization were unable to devote the necessary funds to carry out its task. In fact, departure from the Directives would tend to lead to greater inflexibility.

The Executive Board felt that the Directives would lack completeness if some reference were not made in them to informal relationships. What had obviously aroused great concern was the proposal that formal agreements should be given up; Mr. Cowell could assure Professor von Muralt that Unesco had no intention of ceasing relationship with such an important body as the International Council of Scientific Unions. The United Kingdom delegation was prepared to move the adoption of the Directives as they stood.

[20] The CHAIRMAN thought it would be necessary to have a committee to consider the opinions expressed during the discussion. However, if Mr. Cowell's motion was seconded, it could be voted on forthwith.

[21] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) thought that the Executive Board had prepared its proposals in full knowledge of the facts, and he declared himself entirely in agreement with Mr. Cowell's suggestions. If, however, the latter were not accepted, he would support the idea of a small committee which would report back to the Commission.

[22] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that a general meeting of all the observers of international non-governmental organizations invited to the Conference had been held the previous day. That Conference had prepared a series of resolutions which were to be submitted to the General Committee, before the Director-General referred them officially to the Commission.

For information, however, Mr. de Blonay read four of the resolutions, which were relevant to the current discussion.

[23] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) considered one of the resolutions particularly important, namely the one containing a declaration that the international non-governmental organizations were in favour of formal agreements. He asked whether one of the observers appointed by the non-governmental organizations had obtained authority to state the point of view of those organizations.

[24] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) had not yet been notified that such authority had been given to anyone, but if the Commission so desired, steps could be taken to obtain authorization for the following day, in accordance with Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure.

[25] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) thought that, as opinions were divided, it would be useful to set up a committee to study the whole question. The representative of the international non-governmental organizations could report first to that committee, and afterwards perhaps to the Commission.

[26] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium), seconded by Professor von MURALT (Switzerland), suggested that the Rapporteur of the Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations, held the previous day, be invited to present the views of that Conference.

[27] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that the Conference in question had decided to appoint a small committee. He also read out the names of the Conference officers.

[28] It was *decided* that the liaison committee set up by the Conference of Observers of Inter-

national Non-Governmental Organizations should choose the person most appropriate to give their views, first to the sub-committee to be appointed by the Official and External Relations Commission, and then to the Commission itself.

It was *decided* to appoint a sub-committee, consisting of the delegates of Belgium, Brazil, France, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, to study documents 5C/OXR/9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 in the light of the afternoon's discussions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

International Non-Governmental Organizations (*continued*) [documents 5C/OXR/9, 10, 12, 13 and 14].

Work of the Sub-Committee.

[1] On the suggestion of Professor KRUYT (Netherlands), it was *decided* to add the delegate of Australia to the sub-committee appointed at the end of the previous meeting.

Report on the Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations.

[2] Mr. ENNALS (Chairman, Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations) expressed his appreciation of the opportunity given to him for reporting on the Conference held on 23 May 1950 at the invitation of the Director-General of Unesco, under the Honorary Chairmanship of Ambassador Cora.

It was the first time that all non-governmental organizations having consultative relations with Unesco had been invited to discuss their relationship. Despite the variety of interests represented and the fulness of the discussions, all the recommendations adopted by the Conference were unanimously approved. These proposals therefore represented the wishes of all the forty-two non-governmental organizations represented.

[3] Mr. Ennals read the text of the letter addressed on 24 May 1950 to the Director-General of Unesco by himself as Chairman, and by Miss Charrot, as Rapporteur, of the Conference:

You were kind enough to invite the international non-governmental organizations enjoying consultative status with Unesco to send representatives to a special conference in Florence, at the same time as the Fifth Session of the General Conference.

That invitation has made it possible for the representatives of forty-two international non-governmental organizations to consider the relations between Unesco and non-governmental organizations and to make a detailed study of the Executive Board's proposals, submitted to the Fifth Session of Unesco's General Conference, regarding future relations between Unesco and those organizations.

You have done us the honour of telling us, in a brief speech, how much importance you attach to our collaboration with Unesco.

In the spirit of that collaboration, after a member of your Secretariat had explained the Executive Board's proposals, and following a discussion between representatives of organizations with very varied interests, having relations with different Departments of Unesco, the Conference unanimously adopted a series of resolutions, which we have the honour to transmit to you herewith.

At the end of the Conference, a Committee of twelve was set up, with instructions to draw the attention of Unesco's General Conference to these resolutions.

On behalf of that Committee, we would request you to be so kind as to transmit the resolutions to the competent body of the General Conference, in order that the wishes expressed by the international non-governmental organizations may be taken into account by Unesco when it prepares directives for relations with international non-governmental organizations.

[4] Mr. Ennals pointed out that the twelve organizations represented on the continuing committee had been chosen as representing the various aspects of the co-operation of non-governmental organizations with Unesco.

[5] Mr. Ennals then read out the five resolutions adopted by the Conference [document 5C/OXR/10 - Addendum 1].

Referring to Resolution II, recommending increasing use to be made of the non-governmental organizations, Mr. Ennals said that its authors had noted that their co-operation with the External Relations Service had greatly improved during the past year. They had further taken note of the Director-General's remark that certain organizations were not co-operating as effectively as others, and they were calling on all to do so more fully and thus to justify the confidence placed in them by Unesco.

Turning to Resolution IV, being proposed amendments to the Directives presented by the Executive Board, Mr. Ennals expressed the hope that he would be given an opportunity to be present when this matter came up before the sub-committee.

As to amendments (v), (vi) and (vii) on page 3, he stated that, while the present proposal of the Executive Board was a great improvement on the existing situation, the non-governmental organizations nevertheless felt that their views should be presented to the different organs of Unesco, either orally or in writing, according to a reasonably liberal procedure, which would incidentally correspond to that adopted in other international bodies.

The point dealt with in Resolution V, recommending closer contact between National Commissions and non-governmental organizations, had in fact been discussed the previous week by the Conference of representatives of National Commissions, and Mr. Ennals believed that the National Commissions were greatly interested in it.

[6] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France), seconded by Professor AGO (Italy), proposed that the representative of the non-governmental organizations should be invited to attend the meetings of the Sub-Committee, in order to reply to precise questions. *Agreed.*

[7] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) wondered whether religious organizations could be considered as contributing to the spread of Unesco's ideas, and whether it was on that account that they had been granted consultative status. Referring to certain non-governmental organizations whose usefulness to Unesco was indisputable, he expressed the opinion that longer-term agreements should be substituted for annual agreements with them, in order that they might prepare long-term programmes for certain activities which took more than a year to carry out. He proposed that those organizations, like Member States, should be invited to attend the General Conference with full voting powers, on condition that they presented an annual report on their activities. Finally, Anas Khan agreed with Mr. Ennals that there should be closer collaboration with National Commissions.

[8] Mr. ENNALS (Chairman, Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations) stated that some religious organizations had been included, because they had made a useful contribution to the work of Unesco during the past years, and also because many of them grouped large sections of public opinion throughout the world. If there were any non-governmental organizations with religious associations which were not yet included among them, Mr. Ennals was sure that they would be warmly welcomed.

Turning to the question of the adjustment of programmes to those of Unesco, he pointed out that the answer was to be found in document 5C/OXR/9. Besides, many non-governmental organizations whose activities had previously been rather limited, had, since their association with Unesco, increasingly drawn attention to both Unesco and the United Nations.

The proposal that the non-governmental organizations prepare a report every year, instead of every three years as at present, seemed a good one. As regards the suggestion that they should have the same status as government organizations and the right to vote, Mr. Ennals could not agree. At no stage had the non-governmental organizations asked for such a status or such a right.

[9] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) was surprised to see that inter-American organizations did not appear in the list of non-governmental organizations with consultative status. He recalled that those organizations, which had been set up during the war to carry on the activities of international organizations which were paralysed by war condition, were directly concerned with Unesco's work, and that, moreover, Unesco had accepted the invitation to send observers to their meetings. He regretted that Unesco had not returned the compliment.

[10] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) observed that close and cordial working relations had existed for a long time between the Secretariat and the inter-American organizations; those relations were to be strengthened by the opening of a Liaison Office for the Western Hemisphere in Havana. The reason why none of the inter-American organizations had been invited to send observers to the General Conference was that none of them had asked for consultative status.

[11] Mr. ENNALS (Chairman, Conference of

Observers of Non-Governmental Organizations) pointed out that the non-governmental organizations having consultative status with Unesco were on a world level, and that many of them had branches in Latin America which automatically participated in the activities of the central organizations.

[12] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) was satisfied by the Secretariat's explanation, and hoped that the inter-American organizations would make the necessary application for consultative arrangements. In his opinion, Mr. Ennals was mistaken in using the term "world"; it would be preferable to retain the word "international" which was generally used in that connexion.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1940, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions [document 5C/OXR/16].

[1] The CHAIRMAN proposed that a sub-committee be appointed to consider the legal question on the agenda, but that item 8.1, which concerned the Rules of Procedure, should be referred to the Procedure Committee.

[2] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) pointed out that document 5C/OXR/16 contained on page 6 a specific recommendation for the establishment of a legal committee, on which a decision should be reached by the Official and External Relations Commission.

[3] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that it would be difficult to choose between the two solutions proposed in document 5C/OXR/16 (pages 6 and 7) before possessing certain data which might emerge from the discussion of document 5C/PRG/13, relating to the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was being considered by the Programme and Budget Commission; a certain number of conventions or recommendations might result from the examination of that document.

[4] Mr. Saba recalled that, in order to obtain a precise definition of a "recommendation", the Fourth Session of the General Conference had instructed the Director-General to prepare the report which was before the Commission and which concluded with some draft rules of procedure. The report was to have been submitted to Member States, giving them time to present comments or proposed amendments; time had, however, proved too short, and it had not been possible to discover their reactions. Mr. Saba suggested that delegates should submit their comments on document 5C/OXR/16 to the Secretariat in writing, in order to complete the existing document.

[5] The CHAIRMAN proposed that Member States be given an opportunity for further study of the document and that a notice be inserted in the *Journal of the Conference* asking delegations for their views within a time-limit to be fixed by the Commission. No final action would be taken by the Commission until these views were received.

[6] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) did not like the idea of establishing any further committees; this was a manifestation of the tendency continually to increase the complexity of Unesco institutions. The same ends might be attained by somewhat enlarging the number of competent legal staff already employed as members of the Secretariat, who would have the responsibility for drafting regulations and conventions.

[7] The CHAIRMAN felt that there were two aspects to this question, the first being purely legal and statutory and therefore falling within the competence of the Procedure Committee, and the second being concerned with the general directives to inspire such statutory considerations.

[8] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) agreed

with Dr. Beaglehole and hoped the Commission would consider a certain number of questions before embarking on the detailed discussion of document 5C/OXR/16.

He wished for further information regarding the composition of the proposed committee of lawyers and experts, its precise functions, as well as how it would be financed, either by the governments themselves or by Unesco; in the latter case, Mr. de Lacharrière would have liked information on the budgetary provision that would have to be made for such a committee. He observed that if the alternative solution were adopted, namely, the extension of the Secretariat's legal services, contribution of Member States would be affected by the consequent increase in the budget.

Mr. de Lacharrière thought, however, that the adoption of either solution would depend entirely on the number and scope of the questions calling for the drafting of recommendations or conventions, and here again he would have liked further information. He also wished to know whether the procedure applying to the signature of conventions differed from that which was already in force and which had been used for the Convention on audio-visual aids.

[9] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that the idea of setting up a committee of jurists had not originated in the Secretariat; the General Conference, at its Fourth Session, had adopted a resolution whereby it reserved the right to submit draft conventions to a committee of lawyers and experts, which might meet between sessions of the General Conference. It should be noted that the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) had already set up such a committee, which had the advantage of ensuring the continuity of work of the General Conference and, through frequent contacts with States, of a better knowledge of the possibilities of applying the conventions in each country.

Replying to Mr. de Lacharrière, Mr. Saba recalled that the frequency with which the proposed method of work should be applied would depend upon the decisions of the Programme and Budget Commission. With regard to the procedure for the signing of conventions, there were two possible methods: the first, followed by the International Labour Organization, made it unnecessary for a convention adopted by the General Conference to be signed by Member States; the second, more formal in character, required that, after adoption, conventions should be submitted for signature to Member States. The Secretariat had not preference for either method, and Mr. Saba suggested that the matter should be referred to the legal committee if the latter were set up.

[10] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) agreed with the Chairman's proposal that no definite action be taken on the draft rules of procedure until the Commission had received a report embodying the views of the Member States.

[11] The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission whether the draft rules should be referred to the Member States for verbal or written comment, it being understood that, when the views of all parties were received, they should be put before the Procedure Committee.

[12] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) declared that his delegation found the proposed rules satisfactory, subject to one or two minor alterations which would be submitted to the Procedure Committee. As regards the proposal to establish a legal committee, he associated himself with Mr. Davies and Dr. Beaglehole, and preferred the proposal [document 5C/OXR/16, page 3, item 34.1224] that the Secretariat frame the initial draft of any convention, calling upon the assistance of lawyers or other experts when desirable.

[13] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba), pointing out that very often the recommendations resulting from the General Conferences were not put into practice, felt that this might be due to the fact that no expert body had existed with responsibility for drawing up international agreements covering those recommendations. He therefore supported Mr. Cowell's suggestion and felt that this question called for immediate decision by the Commission.

[14] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) having pointed out that the Procedure Committee was composed of lawyers, Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) drew attention to the fact that if the Procedure Committee decided to make any changes in the rules, the latter could not be adopted by the General Conference until its next session.

[15] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) stated that his delegation had some comments to make concerning the wording of the draft rules, and would submit them to the Procedure Committee. As regards the establishment of a legal committee, he agreed with Dr. Beaglehole's and Mr. Cowell's proposal to make an enlarged legal section of the Secretariat responsible for drafting conventions.

[16] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) hoped that the Commission itself would study document 5C/OXR/16. He wondered whether it was advisable to ask lawyers to prepare conventions which might bear upon many entirely different technical matters. In preparing the draft convention on the Free Circulation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials for example, the Secretariat had

called for the assistance of experts who were not lawyers, but customs specialists.

[17] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that, in preparing the draft, it had not been the Secretariat's intention that the proposed committee should be composed only of lawyers. It seemed indispensable, however, to have lawyers constantly available who were capable of solving the preliminary problems, while providing them with the assistance, in each particular case, of an expert specialized in the technical questions covered by the draft convention; that was, incidentally, the method used by the committee set up by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

[18] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) queried the advisability of extensive activity by Unesco in the field of international conventions. Conventions should only be made when the governments of Member States were interested in such international agreements; it was certainly desirable to establish conventions in certain fields, such as that covered by the Convention on audio-visual aids, but the United States Government hoped that Unesco would not embark on a spate of unratified conventions.

[19] Pointing out that the General Conference could at any time make recommendations to Member States by the simple procedure of adopting resolutions, Mr. Mulliken felt that the formulating of any further elaborate procedure was unwise and unnecessary. It would be preferable to incorporate any additional regulation required within the established rules of Unesco. A statement on action taken by Member States to implement these recommendations might be embodied in their annual reports; these could then be examined by the special committee on the reports of Member States whose establishment had been recommended.

[20] Mr. Mulliken agreed with Messrs. Beaglehole, Cowell and Davies that it was unnecessary to establish a permanent legal committee. He suggested a third alternative, to appoint *ad hoc* expert committees to deal with individual questions as they arose; the members of those committees would not necessarily be lawyers, but might be experts in other fields. He proposed the motion:

That it is the sense of the Official and External Relations Commission that there is no need to establish a legal committee as contemplated by Article 9 of the draft rules of procedure contained in document 5C/OXR/16.

The motion was supported by Messrs. DÜRING (Sweden), DAVIES (Australia), MASSAQUOI (Liberia), von MURALT (Switzerland) and COWELL (United Kingdom).

[21] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) also supported Mr. Mulliken. To this effect he proposed a new wording of Article 9 to the effect that, when the General Conference had taken the decision provided for under the terms of Article 5,

> . . . a committee of experts, composed of representatives of the different States parties to the draft convention, shall be responsible for preparing a draft for submission to the following session of Unesco's General Conference.

[22] Replying to an objection by Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba), the CHAIRMAN stated that, if delegates did not find it advisable to establish a legal committee, it would not be necessary to put this point before the Procedure Committee. However, any technical procedural aspects of the draft regulations should be submitted to the Procedure Committee, together with the comments of Member States on the general principles governing conventions and recommendations.

[23] Dr. HENAO HENAO (Colombia) thought it premature and financially difficult to set up a legal committee, and preferred the proposal to enlarge the legal section of the Secretariat. However, it might be advisable to set up a service responsible for keeping Member States informed of all Unesco projects and conventions and the implementation of recommendations.

The motion proposed by Mr. Mulliken was *adopted* by 26 votes to none, with one abstention.

[24] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) observed that, for the preparation of texts for submission to the committee of experts, the strength of the existing legal service would have to be increased by one legal expert and one secretary, which would imply an additional cost of about $10,000. Furthermore, it would be necessary to allow for the preparation of each convention to fit in with the programme department concerned. Funds would also have to be found for the meeting of experts recommended by Mr. de Lacharrière. Mr. de Blonay proposed that the Programme and Budget Commission should be requested to bear those considerations in mind when it examined the budget as a whole. Document 5C/OXR/16 contained no budget estimates because, when it was drawn up, the Secretariat did not know what solution the Commission would adopt. Mr. de Blonay thought, however, that the solution advocated by the delegates of the United States and France would prove less expensive than the appointment of a legal committee.

[25] In reply to a question from Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that the Programme and Budget Commis-

sion alone was competent to decide upon the number of recommendations and conventions to be prepared. The Programme and Budget Commission was to consider the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the fields of education and culture and in that of copyright, and a certain number of draft conventions might result from that examination. Mr. Saba thought it would be desirable to lay down a general policy, standardizing the methods to be followed in preparing the preliminary documents which had to be submitted to the General Conference before any draft convention could be adopted. At the present time, the Secretariat could not undertake those preliminary studies, which involved a considerable amount of work.

[26] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa), moved that, the elimination of the proposed permanent legal committee having been decided, the counter-proposal to increase the legal staff of the Secretariat be communicated to the Budget Committee, for information on the budgetary implications.

The motion was *adopted* by 15 votes to none.

[27] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) thought it difficult for the Commission to take a decision on the document as a whole without possessing any precise data. He therefore proposed that the matter should be reconsidered when the Programme and Budget Commission had defined the fields in which it desired the Director-General to initiate preliminary studies for the preparation of conventions; in certain fields, such as copyright, there were services already working on a draft convention, while in others, such as the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, no special service yet existed.

[28] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) emphasized the fact that the budgetary implications mostly depended on the possibility of standardizing procedure for the preparation of conventions, and also on the extent of the preliminary work. If several commissions and committees were to deal with the question of procedure, it would have to be decided which of them was to recommend the adoption of the rules, which body was to adopt them and which commission or committee was to submit the necessary budgetary recommendations to the General Conference.

[29] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) suggested that the General Committee could give a ruling on this point.

[30] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that it had been suggested that the procedure under discussion should be incorporated in the Rules of Procedure, in which case it would be for the Procedure Committee to take a decision.

[31] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) felt that the views expressed by Member States, the actions taken, and the document under discussion should be communicated to the Procedure Committee, whose responsibility it would be to make amendments to the draft, and to inform other commissions and committees of matters falling within their competence.

[32] Taking into consideration the various proposals put forward, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Budget Committee be informed of the decision not to establish a legal committee, and be requested to report to the Procedure Committee, so that the latter might make a final report to the General Conference.

[33] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), supported by Mrs. ROSS (Denmark), felt that it was the responsibility of the General Committee to assign to the various commissions and committees those matters which it was appropriate for each to handle.

[34] It was *decided* that the matter should be submitted to the Procedure and Budget Committees, through the General Committee, so that the latter might be aware of the recommendations and take appropriate action.

Cultural agreements and conventions now in force and proposals likely to facilitate the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral cultural conventions [document 5C/OXR/17].

[35] Mr. GARCIN (External Relations Service) reminded the Commission why the study set out in document 5C/OXR/17 had been undertaken: the Secretariat had felt that it was necessary to collect the texts of approximately two hundred cultural agreements between various Member or non-member States, in order to make universally available information of great diversity and also of great importance for the extension and improvement of international cultural relations. Unesco had been requested to prepare models of contracts and clauses, in the hope of standardizing cultural relationships and initiating a real international policy in that field. Mr. Garcin pointed out that the Secretariat had managed to make an almost complete collection of existing agreements, and had studied their contents, their application and, to some extent, the results obtained. The study had shown that certain tendencies existed, and had made it possible to

define a certain technique for international cultural exchanges. Such exchanges were often implemented generally by joint committees, composed of representatives of the signatory States, who were often called upon to do more than merely apply the agreements, having also to smooth out unforeseen difficulties. However, these joint committees were composed of technicians of civil servants who were not sufficiently in contact with the nation's intellectual circles, and Unesco consequently thought that it would be desirable to establish a very close relationship between those bodies and Unesco's National Commissions.

Mr. Garcin stressed the fact that document 5C/OXR/17 was submitted to the Commission in order that the General Conference might decide whether it wished the study to be continued on the lines indicated on page 4 of the document.

In conclusion, Mr. Garcin expressed the conviction that, in studying concrete evidence of the broad trends of intellectual exchanges, Unesco would perceive the strength and weaknesses in that field and would be able to help in establishing a world cultural policy.

[36] Replying to a question from Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that the budgetary implications of the study would depend upon the way in which the Conference decided to develop it, what had been done so far was a mere beginning, and it was already apparent that the work would be extended beyond the scope foreseen by the General Conference when it passed the resolution given at the beginning of document 5C/OXR/17. The General Conference should therefore decide whether or not it was useful to continue such a study, and refer the matter, together with the recommendations of the Official and External Relations Commission, to the Budget Committee.

[37] Mr. BRUNSWICK (France) wanted to know which Unesco Department was responsible for the study. He also asked whether the Social Sciences Department, and especially the service concerned with international co-operation, had had an opportunity to give its opinion of this work.

[38] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) replied that the agreements, which touched upon many diverse subjects, had been studied by different Departments; since the last Session of the General Conference, however, the Director-General had instructed the Legal Service, in consultation with programme specialists, to take over the study. Mr. de Blonay saw no reason why that method should not be continued.

[39] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan) drew attention to his country's difficulties in connexion with the equivalence of degrees: students wishing to continue their studies in another country were often prevented from doing so, owing to the lack of an international ruling in that field; he therefore hoped that this gap would be filled.

[40] He also asked that teachers in advanced countries should be given the opportunity of going to teach in less developed countries and that, in exchange, students of the latter countries should be able to continue their studies in foreign lands. Anas Khan noted with regret, on pages 9 and 10 of document 5C/OXR/17, the difficulties encountered in Switzerland and the United States of America, and hoped that National Commissions would make every effort to eliminate them.

[41] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) requested that discussion of document 5C/OXR/17 be postponed. The work done so far had been one of compilation; its development would require extensive investigations and evaluations. The Commission should consider whether this should be a function of the Secretariat, or whether some outside expert should be called upon to make the necessary surveys.

[42] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba), congratulating the Secretariat on its work, pointed out that the number of agreements of this nature proved the interest of all countries in cultural exchanges; however, some of the agreements did not work. It might be advisable to set up a commission to study them, and to develop the research. There should be two aims in this work: (1) to facilitate multi-lateral and bilateral conventions; (2) to study the co-ordination and implementation of those agreements. It would be profitable to have increased exchanges of teachers and students, and a wider distribution of books.

[43] Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia) noted that the question of cultural conventions involved one of the basic functions of Unesco; he suggested that action should be postponed until each member had had an opportunity to study the agreements listed in document 5C/OXR/17.

[44] Mr. KUŠEJ (Yugoslavia) wished to make a correction in the list of agreements concluded by his country: since the decision taken by the Cominform in 1948 in relation to Yugoslavia, the countries mentioned in document 5C/OXR/17 (Annex II, pages 9 and 12) had broken their agreements with Yugoslavia, the latter having no responsibility in the matter.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

Consideration of the Provisional Agreement between the International Bureau of Education and Unesco (*continued*) [document 5C/OXR/7 and Addendum].

[1] In examining the Provisional Agreement between the International Bureau of Education and Unesco, Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America), had noted certain anachronisms, such as the provision made for a committee later to draw up a definitive agreement and the proposal for the fusion of the two organizations. He therefore proposed the deletion of these items. Furthermore, the third solution for the future relationship of the two organizations, as proposed in the third paragraph of document 5C/OXR/7, Addendum, should now be eliminated.

[2] He proposed further that, at some later date, the Unesco Department of Education might issue a brochure explaining the relationship between the clearing-house functions of Unesco and the work of IBE, whose task it was to assist Ministries of Education and educators throughout the world.

[3] Mr. MONTEL (France) thought it impossible, during the current session of the General Conference, to make the changes requested by the United States delegate. He therefore suggested that the Joint Unesco-IBE Committee should place on the agenda of its next meeting the revision of the text of the provisional agreement, in accordance with the views expressed by the United States delegation.

Professor PIAGET (Director, International Bureau of Education) saw no objection to this procedure.

[4] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) proposed that the following words be added to the last paragraph of the resolution on page 2 of document 5C/OXR/7: "after revision of its wording in the light of experience, and taking the changed circumstances into account".

At Professor PIAGET's request, the words "the changed" were altered to "present".

The resolution was *adopted*, subject to the foregoing amendment.[1]

Recommendations submitted to the General Conference by the Second Meeting of Representatives of National Commissions [document 5C/OXR/2].

Consideration of the draft resolutions.

[5] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) said that if the Commission should decide to adopt the text, the draft resolutions would be included in the Report submitted to the General Conference.

[6] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed the substitution of the word "invites" for "requests" throughout the text of the resolutions, as this was in conformity with the ruling of the Procedure Committee.

[7] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that the implications of the various terms used in drafting the resolutions had been studied with great care by the Executive Board, which considered that the word "invites" implied a more imperative demand than the word "requests".

It was *decided* to replace "requests" by "invites" in the four paragraphs of Resolution A.

Resolutions A and B.

[8] Mr. HOWELL (United States of America) emphasized the importance of adequate representation of both public and private institutions in National Commissions; in the United States, the work of the National Commission had received a strong impetus through association with labour, youth and educational organizations.

[9] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) confirmed this view from the experience of the United Kingdom.

1. In final form: Resol. 32.1 to 32.12.

[10] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) wished to raise a point which he thought had not yet been considered. In some countries the National Commission, which was under the authority of the Ministry of Education, collaborated closely with the local organizations directly responsible for carrying out the programme. But in other countries, and particularly in Brazil, the National Commission was quartered in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and was therefore outside the organizations dealing with activities of concern to Unesco.

[11] In order to minimize the disadvantages arising from this lack of liaison, he suggested the addition of a fifth paragraph to Resolution A, recommending that Member States establish in their Ministry of Education or other bodies entrusted with carrying out Unesco's Programme, a department with direct responsibility, which would ensure contact with the National Commission attached to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

[12] The CHAIRMAN expressed interest in Mr. Murtinho's proposal, which would affect many countries in the same position. However, this must be stated as a recommendation not of the National Commissions, but of the Official and External Relations Commission.

[13] Mr. MONTEL (France) considered that this problem did not arise in France. The French National Commission was responsible both to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, where it was quartered, and to the Ministry of Education, which had set up a permanent department to maintain contact between the French authorities and Unesco. He did not think it advisable to insert a new paragraph in Resolution A, and considered that a slight change in the text of paragraph 2 would meet the Brazilian delegate's point.

[14] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) stated that the Cuban National Commission would find itself in a difficult situation if tied to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The National Commission received assistance from Governmental Bodies and from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Education. However, in order to avoid duplication of work, he proposed that Unesco should transmit information to the National Commissions through normal international channels. National Commissions in some countries were linked with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and in others with the Ministry of Education. The Cuban National Commission was linked with both. It submitted to each Ministry questions which fell within the competence of that body. The structure of the National Commission would be endangered if it were to be tied exclusively to the Ministry of Education.

The situation explained by Mr. Murtinho was an international problem, and in each country the position was different and required individual solution. It had been agreed in the Procedure Committee that invitations to the next General Conference should be sent by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, as well as by the Ministry of Education. It was inadvisable to have two Ministries dealing with the same question.

[15] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) maintained his original stand-point. In his opinion the Ministry of Foreign Affairs could only act as a "post office". It seemed to him that, in each Member State, questions of education, science and culture should come within the orbit of three organizations: the appropriate Ministry, the National Commission and an executive body.

[16] Dr. HENAO HENAO (Colombia) seconded the Bazilian point of view, and asked whether he might make a definite proposal for the constitution of such a body.

[17] Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) stressed that, as the situation varied so greatly from country to country, no specific recommendation could be made. He proposed, therefore, that the best way of meeting Mr. Murtinho's wishes was to adopt an amendment to resolution A, paragraph 2, as proposed by Mr. Montel, and to call attention to the records of the discussion on this matter.

[18] The CHAIRMAN agreed that it was undesirable to interfere in the local problems of Member States, and found Mr. Weeden's proposal acceptable.

[19] Mr. MONTEL (France) proposed that resolution A, paragraph 2, be amended by the addition of the following words: "and to link the National Commissions with the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of Education."

[20] Referring to Article VII of the Constitution, which leaves Member States free to make such arrangements as suit their own particular conditions, Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) could not agree to the inclusion of any recommendation such as that proposed by Mr. Montel.

[21] Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America) proposed that the Commission take no action beyond advising Member States in an informal manner of the proposal made by the delegate of Brazil, and calling attention to the record of the discussion on the subject.

[22] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq), while agreeing that a modification of resolution A, paragraph 2 would be acceptable, could not agree with Mr. Montel's specific recommendation.

[23] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there were two solutions to the discussion; (1) as the delegate of Brazil was now ready to withdraw his original proposal, resolution A, paragraph 2 might be slightly amended; (2) no action should be taken for the time being, but the records of the discussion should be available for future action.

[24] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) agreed that it was inadvisable to recommend that governments should link National Commissions to Ministries, and thought governments might be requested to provide National Commissions with adequate opportunity for consultation with the Ministries.

The United States proposal was seconded by the delegates of DENMARK and EGYPT, and *adopted* by 16 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Resolution A was *adopted* in its original form.

Resolution B.

Adopted without discussion.

Resolution C.

[25] Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America) supported the proposal to strengthen the liaison between National Commissions and Unesco, but stressed the desirability that this liaison be closely integrated with the promotion of action on Unesco programmes; often it seemed as though funds were expended too liberally on liaison work in proportion to the amount spent on the major projects of the Organization. In order to relate liaison work more directly to the programme, Unesco officials on mission in Member States should be given the opportunity for discussions with members of National Commissions, and be provided with a background enabling them to give advice and information on the many varied aspects of the programme.

[26] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed an amendment to paragraph 3 (*b*), to read:

To co-operate closely with National Commissions in the implementation of Unesco's programmes, particularly in selecting experts, in planning activities and in preparing publicity material.

[27] The CHAIRMAN drew attention to two small errors in paragraphs 2 and 3 of resolution C. The first concerned only the French text: in the third line of paragraph 2, "l'inclusion *des* projets" should read "*de* projets". In paragraph 3 (*a*), "in the implementation of *the* programme" should be changed to "*this* programme".

Following a comment by Mr. MONTEL (France), a further drafting amendment was *agreed* in the French text of paragraph 2 of the same resolution.

The first three paragraphs of resolution C were *adopted* as amended.

[28] In reply to a question from Mr. WEEDEN (Australia), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) said that, if the Commission should decide to adopt the fourth paragraph of the resolution, the proposals contained in it would have to be forwarded to the Budget Committee for examination, in view of their budgetary implications.

[29] Mr. MONTEL (France) and Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) thought the Commission should discuss the paragraph before submitting it to the Budget Committee.

[30] Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America) thought the substance of the proposal might be approved before submission to the Budget Committee, whereas Dr. KADHIM (Iraq), seconded by Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), thought it wiser to defer action until the latter's report had been received.

Mr. WEEDEN (Australia) pointed out that the Budget Committee had never assumed that it could decide on questions of programme or of substance. It would place that Committee in a difficult situation if the Official and External Relations Commission were to take a decision, hoping that the Budget Committee would save it from any unfortunate budgetary consequences.

[31] The motion of Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) to postpone a decision until the receipt of the Budget Committee's report was *adopted* by 13 votes to nil.

Future policy with regard to annual reports by Member States [document 5C/OXR/3].

[32] The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been decided to form a sub-committee to consider the reports of Member States. The Commission must now decide the size, membership and terms of reference of this sub-committee.

Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America), seconded by Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), proposed that the sub-committee be formed of the following countries: Australia, Austria, Cuba, France, India, Persia, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Venezuela. *Agreed.*

[33] Mr. ABRAHAM (United States of America) pointed out that the reports of Member States were one of the most useful sources of information on the work of Unesco. Too often in the past

they had not been properly studied, and he therefore welcomed the step now being taken to form a special sub-committee for this purpose. He proposed that this sub-committee be required to analyse and report on the action taken in the Member States to implement the resolutions of the General Conference. The sub-committee should recommend procedure for the future handling of reports and for the form they should take; it should study the relationship between the report of the Director-General and the reports of the Member States.

[34] The CHAIRMAN having pointed out that Section V of document 5C/OXR/3 provided for study by the sub-committee of the form that reports should take in future, Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed that the sub-committee be requested to draw up a schedule of its own functions in the light of this paragraph.

[35] It was *agreed* that the terms of reference of the sub-committee be that that body should analyse and study the reports of Member States and make a concise report to the Official and External Relations Commission.

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies [document 5C/OXR/4 - Corr. 1].

The resolutions were *adopted* without comment.

Report of the sub-committee for relations with international non-governmental organizations [document 5C/OXR/21].

[36] Introducing the report, Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the sub-committee) stressed that the most important detail was that of formal agreements with non-governmental organizations; after considerable discussion, it had been decided that formal agreements should be restricted to a limited number of organizations whose relations with Unesco were of the utmost importance. The group of organizations having agreements had therefore been reduced, but this did not mean that those not included would be in a less advantageous position. This had seemed to the sub-committee a more reasonable arrangement.

[37] It was *decided* to postpone discussion on the new text of the directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations until members had had time to study them.

Agreement with the French Government on Unesco's Privileges and Immunities [document 5C/OXR/18].

The Commission *took note* of this report.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

Report of the sub-committee for relations with international non-governmental organizations to the Official and External Relations Commission [document 5C/OXR/21].

Annex I (New text of directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations).

PREAMBLE.

[1] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) said he would confine himself to restating certain matters of principle.

The first concerned formal agreements, a question which had been very thoroughly considered by the Sub-Committee; unfortunately, the latter had been unable to accept the United States point of view. Formal agreements had been developed in order to enable non-governmental organizations to receive grants-in-aid or subventions from Unesco: under the new directives, however, it was provided that they could

receive grants or subventions without having a formal agreement. Recognizing, therefore, that formal agreements had outlived their purpose, the Executive Board had recommended their discontinuation, a decision which was strongly supported by the United States delegation.

[2] Another reason which prompted the United States delegation to support the Board's decision was that it considered it unwise to make a distinction between the non-governmental organizations admitted to consultative status.

Mr. Mulliken therefore formally moved the deletion of the reference to formal agreements in the Preamble and throughout the document.

The CHAIRMAN stated that Mr. Mulliken's proposal would be examined together with Section I.

SECTION I (PLAN OF RELATIONSHIPS).

A. *General Arrangements.*

[3] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) briefly stated the views of the majority, which were as follows: certain organizations, some of them older than Unesco, occupied a special position, in that they co-operated very closely with Unesco and actually carried out certain parts of its programme: the majority of the Sub-Committee had therefore felt that those organizations should receive the special recognition expressed in a formal agreement, although the latter did not imply any special privileges.

[4] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), seconded by the delegates of AUSTRALIA and INDIA, again moved the deletion of the references to formal agreements in the new directives.

[5] Speaking in opposition to the United States motion, Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) gave the following reasons in favour of the retention of formal agreements:

(1) As Dr. Huxley had pointed out in the Sub-Committee, formal agreements were valuable as a form of mutual recognition between Unesco and the organizations concerned.

(2) In the field of natural sciences, much work had already been done by ICSU and, in order to avoid any duplication of work, Unesco had entered into a formal agreement with that body, handing over much work to it and considering it as a business partner; such formal agreements had proved satisfactory to both partners, and there was therefore no reason to abolish them.

(3) It had been suggested that formal agreements should be discontinued because their wording was out-dated and clumsy, but the Sub-Committee had agreed that the wording could easily be simplified and standardized and that there was no reason to abolish them on that account.

(4) It was not a question of making a distinction between different organizations, as suggested by Mr. Mulliken, but of giving certain of them a greater assurance of continuity than they could otherwise expect from Unesco, whose programme and budget were on an annual basis: even if it were decided to hold the General Conference biennially, it would still not be a sufficient guarantee to organizations like ICSU, ITI, etc., which had to work on a programme extending over several years; formal agreements were also a stimulus towards active co-operation in Unesco's programme.

(5) The Director-General himself had recommended to the Executive Board at its Nineteenth Session that formal agreements should be retained for organizations "covering a large area of Unesco's interests".

(6) The Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations, held during the current Session, had unanimously voted in favour of maintaining formal agreements.

[6] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) seconded these remarks, and expressed the hope that the Commission would support the Sub-Committee's conclusions.

[7] Professor AGO (Italy) favoured the retention of formal agreements. It seemed to him that there were two main reasons to be considered. For one thing, a privileged position should be reserved for certain organizations of very wide international scope. Then again, the termination of formal agreements concluded between Unesco and certain international organizations might be taken as a sign of disagreement between Unesco and these organizations, and might even compromise a form of collaboration that had so far proved fruitful.

Professor Ago nevertheless emphasized that his approval of the text submitted by the Sub-Committee, advocating the retention of formal agreements, was conditional upon a particular point. He drew attention to Paragraph (2) on page 7 of Annex I, which specified that the organizations eligible to conclude formal agreements should be "of a professional character". Now this clause limited unnecessarily the choice of organizations with which Unesco might wish to conclude agreements. It also prevented the conclusion of agreements with two out of seven of the organizations already enjoying the advantages of a formal agreement. These organizations were the World Federation of United Nations Associations and the

International Studies Conference, both of which were older-established than Unesco, had great authority and had accomplished most important work in the field of education for international understanding.

[8] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) agreed with Professor Ago, adding that his own advocacy of the retention of formal agreements was also conditional on the deletion of the words "of a professional character".

[9] The motion to delete the words "which are of a professional character" in the first paragraph of sub-section (2) on page 7 of Annex I, seconded by Dr. KADHIM (Iraq), was *adopted* by 12 votes to 4 and 2 abstentions.

[10] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) also proposed the deletion of the word "professional" in line 9 of the same paragraph. *Adopted.*

[11] Returning to the general question of formal agreements in Section I, A (2), Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) strongly supported the United States motion for the deletion of formal agreements. He regretted the decision which had been taken to delete the words "of a professional character", as he feared that it would open the door to a large number of organizations with consultative status, which could henceforth request and expect to receive a formal agreement.

[12] Dr. AWAD (Egypt) seconded the remarks made by Mr. Cummins. He also feared that the distinction made by the conclusion of formal agreements with certain organizations would be resented by others, and he did not think that the fact of having a formal agreement would make any organization more useful to Unesco.

[13] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom), seconded by Professor von MURALT (Switzerland), considered that Mr. Cummins' fears were groundless, as the definition of organizations eligible for formal agreements was sufficiently precise to show the special position of the organizations concerned.

[14] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) disagreed that formal agreements ensured greater continuity than consultative arrangements which were reviewed only every three years. Further, although the Director-General had favoured the maintenance of formal agreements, Mr. Mulliken pointed out that the Executive Board had favoured their discontinuation. With regard to the Conference of non-governmental organizations to which reference had been made, Mr. Mulliken understood that not more than fifteen minutes had been devoted to the subject of formal agreements, and that the reasons for the Executive Board's attitude had not been fully given: in the light of later discussions, many organizations would not again vote in favour of the continuation of formal agreements.

Finally, Mr. Mulliken observed that, throughout the debates, it had not been explained what could be gained by formal agreements, except that they conferred a certain status on a number of organizations; an argument that was not persuasive in the view of the United States delegation.

The United States motion to abolish formal agreements was put to the vote and *rejected* by 14 votes to 7 and 2 abstentions.

Sub-section I.A was *adopted* as amended.

B. *Financial arrangements.*

[15] A proposal by Dr. AWAD (Egypt), seconded by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), to substitute the words "are making" for "can make" in paragraph (1) (Subventions) was *rejected* by 14 votes to 8.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) moved the insertion in the first paragraph of point (2) (Contracts) of the words: "whether or not it enjoys consultative arrangements" after "an international non-governmental organization". *Adopted.*

Sub-section I.B was *adopted* as amended.

SECTION II (GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS WITHOUT DIRECT FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS]).

A. *Organizations eligible for Consultative Arrangements.*

[16] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) thought that there should be a clearer definition of an "international" organization, in order to ensure that organizations with only a regional scope were not included under that heading.

[17] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba), referring to the distinction made between international and regional organizations, recalled that inter-American organizations, which fell under neither of these headings, were admitted to these arrangements. It would therefore be as well to remove the distinction, and to simplify sub-section A by amalgamating points (1) and (2).

This proposal was seconded by Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark).

[18] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) pointed out that both Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and Unesco had admitted to consultative arrangements some organizations which, while not entirely international in char-

acter, had undeniably a very wide outlook and sometimes carried out very important social work.

[19] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) reiterated the advisability of amalgamating points (1) and (2) since, as they now stood, they implied approval of an undesirable distinction between international and regional organizations. He pointed out that paragraphs (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) were identical in both cases, and considered that in paragraph 2 (*a*), the words "main cultural regions of the world" should be replaced by "main *geographic* regions of the world". He added that all the relevant organizations should be called *"international"*.

[20] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) pointed out that points (1) and (2) had been inserted in order to make it clear what was meant by international and regional organizations: he was in favour of their retention, because they left the door open and did not exclude any organizations whose collaboration might be valuable to Unesco.

[21] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) drew attention to the large measure of help that many organizations of a regional nature could give to Unesco. In his opinion the removal of the distinction between the two classes of organization would tend to belittle the assistance given by the regional organizations.

[22] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that the present wording was the result of very thorough consideration of the question now under discussion. In point of fact, there was an essential difference between the concepts of "regional" and "international". The latter implied a trend towards universality. Besides, if point (2) were eliminated, the General Conference, at its Sixth Session, would find itself unable to admit regional organizations to consultative arrangements. In his opinion, paragraphs (1) (*a*) and (2) (*a*) at least ought to be retained.

[23] Speaking as delegate of Cuba, the CHAIRMAN proposed the insertion of the words "geographic or" before "cultural regions of the world" in the third line of paragraph (2) (*a*).

[24] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) felt that the Chairman's proposal would provide a satisfactory solution to the problem under consideration. He stressed the influence of geography on the cultural and political evolution of the States of the American continent.

Moreover, it was advisable to follow the example of the United Nations and remove so far as possible the restrictions which prevented the admission of organizations to consultative arrangements with Unesco.

[25] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) opposed the insertion of the word "geographic" in paragraph (2) (*a*). He considered that as a general rule the organizations admitted to consultative arrangements should be of an international nature and that an exception should be made in favour of organizations representing one of the main *cultural* regions of the world. Indeed it was to Unesco's interest to ensure the co-operation of this latter type of organization. He wondered whether the delegates who favoured inserting the word "geographic" had any particular case in mind.

[26] In reply to the delegate of France, the CHAIRMAN gave an example of a regional organization whose collaboration would be valuable to Unesco; the Inter-American Academy of International and Political Law was a continental organization, not comprising a cultural group in the limited sense, but representing all the nations of the New World which, for geographic and historical reasons, had common problems.

[27] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) believed that the solution lay in a very flexible interpretation of the words "cultural region".

[28] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) supported the Cuban delegation's second proposal, which was to use the wording "one of the main geographic *or* cultural regions of the world" in paragraph (2) (*a*).

Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) withdrew his first proposal, but maintained his second one.

This proposal was *adopted* by 13 votes to 7.

A proposal by Dr. AWAD (Egypt), seconded by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), to delete the word "primarily" in paragraphs (1) (*b*) and (2) (*b*) was *rejected*.

A proposal by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) to substitute the word "substantially" for "primarily" in the same paragraphs was not seconded and *lapsed*.

Sub-section II.A was *adopted* as amended.

B. *Procedure for selecting the Organizations with which Unesco may enter into Consultative Relationship.*

Adopted without change.

C. *Scope of Arrangements for Consultation and Information.*

[29] Referring to sub-paragraphs (v) and (vi), (page 6), Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) pointed out that, whereas the provision for oral communications from non-governmental organizations to the General Conference and its

subsidiary bodies was considered too generous by the United States delegation, there was no provision for direct oral communications from the non-governmental organizations to the Executive Board. His delegation therefore wished to move the following amendment to the last sentence of sub-paragraph (v):

Organizations approved for consultative arrangements may be heard by the External Relations Committee of the Executive Board, which will report on such hearings to the Executive Board. Upon the recommendations of the External Relations Committee, the Executive Board may decide that the organizations shall be heard by that body.

Further, the United States delegation proposed that sub-paragraph (vi) be replaced by the following:

May be heard by the Sub-Committee of the Official and External Relations Commission of the General Conference, which shall report on such hearings, through the Official and External Relations Commission, to the General Conference. Upon the recommendations of the Sub-Committee, reporting through the Official and External Relations Commission, the organizations may be invited by the General Conference to be heard by that body.

The United States proposal was seconded by Dr. KADHIM (Iraq).

[30] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) regretted that the United States delegate should have raised a matter which had been given full consideration by the Sub-Committee, and which raised detailed administrative questions. The Sub-Committee had opposed Mr. Mulliken's proposal on the ground that it would place a heavy burden both on the Executive Board and upon the Secretariat. He pointed out that in any case the last sentence of sub-paragraph (v) enabled organizations to make oral statements to the Board in certain cases.

[31] Mr. ENNALS (Chairman, Conference of Observers of International Non-Governmental Organizations) reminded the Commission that the United States motion did translate the request unanimously made by that Conference. The non-governmental organizations had no wish to make complaints to the Executive Board about the Secretariat, but they felt that they would be better able to co-operate in the execution of Unesco's programme if they were able to give oral advice to the Executive Board when the latter considered programme matters of concern to them, rather than at the General Conference when the programme was already crystallized. He recalled that it was the practice of the Economic and Social Council and the other Specialized Agencies to allow non-governmental organizations to speak before their Executive Boards, and experience had proved that the method was very effective.

It was *decided* to postpone further discussion until the next meeting.

SECTION III (SUBVENTIONS).

E. *Conditions and Procedure.*

[32] At the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, it was decided to refer paragraph (2) (page 12) to the Budget Committee, in accordance with the comments in the fourth paragraph of the original document 5C/OXR/21 (page 2).

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. LUIS A. BARALT Y ZACHARIE (Cuba)

Report of the sub-committee for relations with international non-governmental organizations to the Official and External Relations Commission [document 5C/OXR/21].

Annex I (*continued*).

SECTION II.C (SCOPE OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSULTATION AND INFORMATION) (*continued*).

(1) (a) *Individual consultations* (continued).

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the United States delegation had proposed amendments to paragraphs (v) and (vi), on which discussion had begun at the previous meeting.

[2] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the last sentence of paragraph (v) already contained a mention of the possibility of the Board being consulted. This point had been discussed fully in the Sub-Commission, and it had been agreed that if a non-governmental organization had a grievance, the Board could consider it, but that it would not be available for all questions. The United Kingdom delegation wished to see paragraphs (v) and (vi) maintained.

[3] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) pointed out that the relations between the Board and non-governmental organizations had always been excellent, and that the Board would not deliberately refuse to hear an organization if there were an important issue to be decided.

[4] Professor MURALT (Switzerland) subscribed to what Sir Charles Webster had said. Every possibility had been left open for non-governmental organizations to present their case orally. He therefore moved that paragraphs (v) and (vi) be maintained as they stood.

[5] In reply to Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that the only official ruling governing the right of a non-governmental organization to be heard by the Board was in Article V, paragraph B.10 of Unesco's Constitution.

[6] Mr. ENNALS (Chairman, Conference of Observers of Non-Governmental Organizations) pointed out that the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations had adopted a resolution by which a non-governmental organization would be enabled, at its request, to be heard by the Executive Board. While he was sympathetic to Sir Charles Webster's comment, he felt the compromise proposals suggested by the United States delegation would go far towards meeting the request of non-governmental organizations, and would reserve the right of the Executive Board not to be disturbed too frequently. This procedure worked efficiently in the Economic and Social council, in FAO, WHO, and ILO.

[7] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the situation was not the same as in the other Specialized Agencies, since there existed the National Commissions of Unesco. He hoped that the United States delegation and Mr. Ennals would accept the text of paragraphs (v) and (vi).

The United States amendment was *rejected.*

[8] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) proposed changing paragraph (ii) on page 5, so that it would read:

> May be invited by the Director-General to participate in expert meetings, technical conferences or seminars. . .

[9] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that in practice it might be difficult to give effect to this proposal. It was only in so far as Member States had not used all the places reserved for them that the non-governmental organizations would be entitled to occupy them.

The Belgian proposal, seconded by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), was *adopted.*

Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) (pages 5-7) were *adopted* subject to this amendment.

(2) *Formal agreements.*

[10] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed an amendment ot the third paragraph on page 8, calling for approval by the General Conference instead of by the Executive Board. The paragraph would then read:

Such formal agreements shall be circulated in draft form to the governments of Member States for comments, prior to their submission to the *General Conference.*

[11] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) asked whether the United States delegation would be prepared to accept the text:

. . . prior to their approval by the Executive Board, which would subsequently be ratified by the General Conference.

This would leave the onus on the Board.

[12] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Commitee) thought that submission to the General Conference only, might cause delays in important matters.

[13] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) agreed to accept the United Kingdom amendment.

[14] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) recalled that, under Article XI of Unesco's Constitution:

Any formal arrangements entered into with such organizations or agencies shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Board.

The United States amendment was *rejected.*

(3) *Informal relations.*

[15] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) recalled that he had already suggested at an earlier meeting that any reference to informal relations should be deleted from the present directives, as it seemed to him to detract from the importance of consultative arrangements. He now raised the question of the formal Register, and proposed deleting the second paragraph of this section, and also the words "listed on the Register" in the fourth paragraph.

[16] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) seconded this proposal, but Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) opposed it, considering that a register should be kept and be available for consultation by the United Nations.

The United States proposal was *rejected.*

[17] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) proposed the deletion of the word "specialized" in the fourth paragraph of this clause (line 3).

Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) wanted the word to be retained, since the organizations listed on the Register were only interested in specialized meetings.

The Iraqi proposal, seconded by the delegates of INDIA and ITALY was *rejected.*

Sub-Section II.C was *adopted*, subject to the Belgian amendment to paragraph (11) on page 5.

SECTION III (SUBVENTIONS).

A. *Definition.*

[18] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) asked the meaning of the phrase "to a *limited number* of international non-governmental organizations".

Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) explained that a distinction had been made between subventions and contracts.

[19] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) emphasized that, in accordance with the general tendency to concentrate Unesco's efforts, only a small number of organizations capable of making a useful contribution towards those efforts should receive subventions. Moreover, it was for the Director-General to associate international non-governmental organizations in the implementation of certain projects, by concluding contracts with them.

[20] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Programme and Budget Commission had discussed international scientific groups. The Official and External Relations Commission might therefore wish to reserve their decision until they heard the result of the discussions in the former Commission.

[21] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) said that a new resolution 2.25, submitted by the Executive Board [document 5C/5 (I) (Rev.)-Add. 2], had recently been discussed in the Programme and Budget Commission.

Such a recommendation had been found necessary because no provision had so far been made on behalf of certain international laboratories which had previously received funds, and which acted through the International Council of Scientific Unions. Mr. Cummins had been asked by the Programme and Budget Commission to prepare a new clause, and he suggested leaving this paragraph open.

[22] The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission could either approve the paragraph provisionally or hold it over pending official information from the Programme and Budget Commission.

Sub-section A was provisionally *approved.*

B. *Beneficiaries*

[23] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee), explaining the detailed definitions contained in this section, said that, since the present document was a directive, it had seemed better to have clear statements, even if it meant a repetition.

[24] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) pointed out that the second paragraph of clause (1)

corresponded exactly to the introductory sentence of clause (2) of Section II.A (page 3). Since there were financial implications, it would be as well to re-consider the conditions.

[25] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) recalled that there had been an extended discussion of this matter in the sub-committee. The important issue was whether an organization should have consultative arrangements with Unesco in order to receive money from the Organization.

He proposed amending the second paragraph of clause (1) to read:

Save for the exceptional category under (2) below, an international organization *shall enjoy consultative relations before receiving a subvention*, and shall comply with the following criteria.

[26] Baron van der BRUGGEN (Belgium) pointed out that the four criteria set out in sub-paragraphs (*a*) to (*d*) in clause (1) merely repeated the conditions governing the admission of organizations to consultative status in Section II.A. He therefore proposed amending the opening of clause (1) to read:

International non-governmental organizations *approved for consultative* arrangements which make an essential contribution. . .

The second paragraph, beginning "Save for the exceptional category. . ." would be deleted to the end of (*d*).

[27] Mr. MONTEL (France) said that the four conditions governing the admission of organizations to consultative arrangements were necessary but inadequate. Consequently, the Belgian delegate's proposal would tend to limit the number of organizations to which subventions could be given. The French delegation was in favour of maintaining the present text.

[28] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) recalled that hitherto, only an organization approved for consultative arrangements could receive a subvention. On several occasions, the Director-General had been obliged to conclude contracts with organizations whose collaboration was needed, but which had not been approved for consultative arrangements and were consequently not entitled to subventions. Consequently, the Executive Board had recommended greater flexibility in the conditions governing the granting of subventions, so as to permit stricter application of the conditions for obtaining consultative arrangements.

[29] Referring to the similarity between the criteria at present under discussion and those in Section II.A, Mr. CHANDIRAMANI (India) thought that the last sentence of the first paragraph ("Organizations which, by their statute, are confined to a limited region of the world are excluded") implied that certain other regional organizations not confined to a limited region would be entitled to receive subventions. He therefore suggested adding a phrase to the second paragraph, so that it would read:

Save for the exceptional category under (2) below, international non-governmental organizations *shall enjoy consultative arrangements* and shall comply with the following criteria.

[30] Professor von MURALT agreed that some flexibility was desirable. If a non-governmental organization wanted to have a subvention, it could be transformed into the sort of organization to which the Director-General would be able to give a subvention. He seconded the United States proposal.

The United States amendment to clause (1) was *rejected.*

[31] Mr. CUMMMINS (Australia), seconded by Mr. CHANDIRAMANI (India) proposed the addition of the words "or regional, as defined above" after "Be international" in paragraph (*a*).

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) objected that that amendment would be incompatible with clause (1).

Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that regional organizations were incomplete international organizations in the sense that their representation throughout the world was not adequate. They were therefore not eligible for subventions or consultative arrangements.

[32] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) moved the deletion of the sentence in the first paragraph of (1): "Organizations which, by their statute, are confined to a limited region of the world are excluded." Regional organizations which had qualified for consultative status would then be included.

[33] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) explained the difference between organizations whose statutes and tasks were regional, and those which, although international in scope, were continued *de facto* to a limited part of the world. He did not think the Sub-Committee was against including such incomplete organizations.

[34] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) recalled that the meeting had previously approved certain regional organizations [Section II.A(2) (*a*)], and had favoured a provision for granting them subventions. He therefore proposed inserting "regional or international, as defined in Section II.A".

[35] Mr. CHANDIRAMANI (India) suggested that it would not be proper to exclude regional organizations altogether.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) thought the proposal of the United States delegation did not clarify the position. He therefore suggested dividing up sub-section III.B as had been done with II.A, giving exact definitions under (1) and (2).

[36] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) was of the opinion that this amendment would probably have to be made in addition to the one already proposed by him. The question at issue was whether regional organizations were to be eligible for subventions. He thought Mr. Cummins' point could be met by adding to the text of paragraph III.B(1) (*a*) on page 9 the word "or", followed by the text of paragraph II.A(2) (*a*) on page 3.

Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) agreed, but suggested adding "or be a regional organization" between the texts instead of merely "or". *Agreed.*

[37] In reply to Mr. CUMMINS (Australia), Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) explained that the sub-committee had intended to exclude from eligibility for subventions those regional organizations which were limited by statute.

[38] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) pointed out that if it were not decided to adopt his motion to delete the sentence "Organizations which, by their status, are confined to a limited region of the world are excluded", it would be impossible for Unesco to make a grant-in-aid to the Organization of American States in connexion with the fundamental education programme, one of Unesco's major projects.

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) pointed out that it would still be possible to enter into a contract.

[39] The United States proposal, seconded by Dr. FAWZI (Egypt) was *adopted.*

Sub-section B was *adopted* as amended.

C. *Purpose for which subventions may be granted by Unesco.*

Clause (1).

Adopted without comment.

Clause (2).

[40] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) moved the insertion of the words "educational, cultural" before "scholarly, scientific or professional objectives" in the fifth line of paragraph (*b*). *Agreed.*

Clause (2) was *adopted.*

Clause (3).

It was *agreed* to alter "governing board *on* its committees" to "*or*" in the second line.

Clause (3) was *adopted.*

Clause (4).

Adopted without comment.

Clause(5).

[41] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed the insertion, at the beginning of the paragraph, of the words "In exceptional cases", since he was of the opinion that, if a non-governmental organization had any stability, Unesco could reasonably expect it to finance the expenses of its normal permanent activity.

[42] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee), pointed out that this proposal was not the majority view. Organizations working in Europe were meeting great difficulties at the present time.

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) proposed adding to Mr. Mulliken's suggested phrase the words: "provided that these are related to Unesco's activities".

The United States proposal, seconded by Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) was *rejected.*

Clause (5) was *adopted.*

Clause (6).

[43] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) moved the insertion of a new clause (6), relating to certain international laboratories for which funds had been made available through the International Council of Scientific Unions, as follows:

Part of these expenses of a limited number of existing laboratories of international standing sponsored by organizations with which a formal agreement has been concluded, provided that the work of these laboratories is related to Unesco's activities.

[44] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that the Australian proposal amounted to re-introducing a clause that had been deleted. Formerly, the funds allotted to the three international laboratories in question had been paid to them through ICSU which, as an organization approved for consultative arrangements, could receive funds directly. Under the present text, the three laboratories were regarded as non-governmental organizations; but they could not receive a subvention, because the criteria established were not applicable. It was to get around this difficulty that the Executive Board had adopted a special resolution.

[45] Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) remarked that the High Altitude Research Station at the Jungfraujoch, the Zoological Institute at Naples, and the Oceanographic Institute in Monaco were doing excellent work for Unesco. He warmly supported Mr. Cummins' proposal to insert a new text as clause (6).

[46] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) stated that, in order to avoid legal difficulties, it should be clearly indicated that the funds would be paid by Unesco to ICSU, which would hand them over to the three laboratories.

[47] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) asked for detailed information about the institutes mentioned. He wanted to know whether they were private organizations, in what manner they contributed to the purpose of Unesco, and what activities on the part of Unesco were envisaged by this resolution.

[48] Professor AUGER (Director, Department of Natural Sciences) pointed out that a partial answer was given in the last sentence of clause E(1) on page 12:

It is understood that organizations receiving such subventions shall make every effort to increase progressively their own share in the financing of the activities for which Unesco has granted a subvention.

Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) explained the constitution of the Jungfraujoch station.

[49] Mr. CUMMINS (Australia) felt that any international laboratory which fostered good will and the interchange of ideas was something at which Unesco was aiming. Unesco should make available funds which could be passed to such bodies. He added, in reply to Mr. MONTEL (France), that the matter had referred to the Commission by the Programme and Budget Commission.

Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) suggested changing "*sponsored* by organizations" in the text of the resolution to "*through* organizations".

The Australian proposal, seconded by Dr. FAWZI (Egypt), Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) and Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom), was *adopted* as clause (6).

Clause (7) [formerly (6)].

Adopted without comment.

Clause (8) [formerly (7)].

[50] Mr. HEWITSON (United of South Africa) explained that the Executive Board had laid down the principle that funds should be made available for administrative expenses only in very exceptional circumstances. He therefore suggested altering the words "where such help appears to be in the interests of Unesco in furthering its objectives" to "appears to be *essential to the furtherance of Unesco's activities*". *Agreed.*

Clause (8) [formerly (7)] was *adopted.*

Clause (9) [formerly (8)].

[51] Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) proposed altering the last two lines of the second paragraph to read: "to carry on an activity which *would otherwise have to be assumed by Unesco*". *Agreed.*

Clause (9) [formerly (8)] was *adopted.*

Sub-section C was *adopted* as amended.

D. *Duration.*

[52] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed adding a third paragraph, as follows:

At the same time, it is the policy of Unesco that the subventions granted shall constitute a progressively decreasing proportion of the total income of an organization.

[53] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) suggested a modification, such as the insertion of "where possible", so as not unduly to restrict European organizations.

Professor von MURALT (Switzerland) thought that decreasing subventions should apply only where the work had been completed. He therefore moved the adoption of the original text.

Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) thought the insertion of the words "where possible" would meet this case, and he therefore seconded the United States amendment.

Mr. MONTEL (France) thought that Unesco would be led to increase, rather than to decrease the subventions. He would oppose the amendment.

The United States amendment to insert a third paragraph was *rejected*, and Sub-section D was *adopted* without change.

E. *Conditions and procedure.*

[54] A proposal by Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) to delete the words "It is understood that" in clause (1) was *adopted.*

A proposal by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) to change "new organizations set up under the auspices of Unesco" in clause (1) to "set up pursuant to a resolution of the General Conference" was *adopted.*

Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) thought the new wording would not prevent Unesco from assisting organizations established as the result of a decision by the General Conference.

[55] The CHAIRMAN stated that, as no report had been received from the Budget Committee concerning clause (2), it could not be discussed during the present meeting.

Clauses (3) to (6) were *adopted* without discussion.

Sub-section E was *approved*, with the exception of paragraph (2).

SECTION IV. REVIEW OF RELATIONSHIPS.

[56] The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been decided that formal agreements should in future be reviewed by the General Conference.

To meet this decision, Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) suggested inserting the words "or formal agreements" after "consultative arrangements" in the second line, and deleting the rest of the sentence after "considered necessary or appropriate" in the third line of clause (1). *Agreed.*

Clause (1), accordingly amended, was *adopted.*

[57] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed deleting clause (2). *Agreed.*

Clauses (3) and (4) were *adopted* without comment.

It was agreed to alter clause (5) to read:

The Executive Board will submit to the General Conrence, *which will* review them at each session, all formal agreements which are in force.

[58] In reply to Professor von MURALT (Switzerland), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that the new directives would come into force, together with the new programme, on 1 January 1951.

Section IV was *adopted* as amended.

The text of the Directives concerning relations with international non-governmental organizations was *adopted.*[1]

Co-operation with the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER) [document 5C/OXR/15].

[59] Dr. LOWRIE (TICER) gave a brief outline of the history of TICER. TICER had been severely criticized on occasion, but on the positive side he could report increased knowledge of each other and better co-ordination of the efforts of all the organizations concerned, including Unesco. TICER's work had been valuable, in that it had provided a sound-board for Unesco. The dissolution of TICER was now envisaged, as, in accordance with the new Directives, closer contacts were expected with non-governmental organizations.

[60] Dr. KRUYT (Netherlands) stressed the importance of the annual meetings of international non-governmental organizations, and moved a resolution providing for a second meeting of the international non-governmental organizations having consultative status with Unesco.

[61] Mr. BARGER (Relief Assistance Services) expressed appreciation on behalf of the Secretariat for the work done by TICER. TICER had been actively engaged in procuring popular support of voluntary organizations for association with Unesco's reconstruction programme. It had however been decided to create a much smaller group of bodies for the sphere of reconstruction only. It was merely a matter of changing the methods. The goal, they were all agreed, was the same. The Secretariat would like closer day-to-day relationships with the reconstruction bodies. They desired to have Working Parties and *ad hoc* meetings, and it was their aim to collaborate very closely with voluntary bodies.

[62] Sir Charles WEBSTER (United Kingdom) suggested the postponement of any discussion on the Netherlands resolution until the next meeting. His delegation was averse from making any new permanent body as the work was going through a transition period.

[63] Dr. LOWRIE (TICER) advocated the more flexible arrangement now proposed, in the form of a general conference of international non-governmental organizations and an interim committee. He welcomed the Netherlands resolution on behalf of a second conference.

[64] The CHAIRMAN invited resolutions for submission to the Commission. The Secretary of the Commission would also prepare a draft.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

1. In final form: Section V, Annex II.

EIGHTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. Luis A. Baralt y Zacharie (Cuba)

Co-operation with the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER) (continued) [document 5C/OXR/15].

[1] The SECRETARY read the text of the resolution drafted by the Secretariat.

In reply to Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that TICER itself must decide on the terms and length of its duration. Budgetary provision had been made by the Programme and Budget Commission for co-operation with organizations of this type.

[2] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) was in favour of formally submitting to the Commission the Secretariat's resolution, which simply expressed Unesco's satisfaction with its past collaboration with TICER, and of declaring that the Director-General would continue that collaboration with non-governmental organizations, without anticipating the form it would take.

Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) seconded the motion.

[3] Mr. ENNALS (Vice-Chairman, TICER) announced that this Organization would take a decision concerning its future in the autumn of 1951. As, under its constitution, TICER must meet twice yearly, he asked for this fact to be mentioned in the draft resolution. He wished to express TICER's appreciation for the collaboration afforded by Unesco's Department of Reconstruction, a collaboration which he hoped would continue in the future with other departments of Unesco also. Pointing out that the Unesco programme at present provided for working parties, which he felt were the best means of co-operation between non-governmental organizations, he asked for clarification of the provision in the 1951 Programme for the establishment of an International Relief Council, and asked whether this was intended to replace TICER.

[4] Dr. DRZEWIESKI (Head, Relief Assistance Services) replied that there was no provision in the Unesco budget to cover the cost of the second bi-annual meeting of TICER, though that Organization was, of course, free to call such a meeting at its own expense. If the Secretariat's resolution were adopted, it would be necessary to request an alteration to resolution 7.35 of the programme, as there would then be no justification for the establishment of an International Relief Council.

Dr. Drzewieski added that Unesco would lend TICER technical and secretarial assistance for its second biannual meeting, but could not pay fares of delegates, nor *per diem* allowances.

[5] Mr. ENNALS (Vice-Chairman, TICER) asked that the resolution should mention that TICER would meet in Paris towards the end of the current year.

This request received no support, and the resolution submitted by the Secretariat was *adopted* in its original form.[1]

Report of the Sub-Committee for relations with international non-governmental organizations to the Official and External Relations Commission (*continued*) [document 5C/OXR/21].

Item 7.1 (Relations with international non-governmental organizations under present and future Directives) [document 5C/OXR/10].

[6] In presenting his draft resolution, Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) requested that the last part of the second paragraph, from the words: "and to report. . ." be deleted. *Agreed.*

The draft resolution, accordingly amended, was seconded by Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) and *adopted* by 8 votes to 1.[2]

Item 7.2 (International non-governmental organizations with which Unesco has made consultative arrangements)

[7] Presenting item 7.2 of the agenda (document 5C/OXR/21, page 2), Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) said that the

1 In final form: Resol. 33.6.
2. In final form: Resol. 33.12 and 33.13.

Sub-Committee was asking the Commission to take two decisions:

(1) That certain organizations be no longer admitted to consultative arrangements—and here it should be noted that the World Council of Churches had spontaneously requested that it should no longer be included among such organizations, since it would in future maintain relations with Unesco through the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

(2) A draft resolution was submitted to the Commission, authorizing the Executive Board to take decisions within the framework of the previous Directives on the applications for consultative arrangements, which had been submitted to the Organization prior to the opening date of the Fifth Session of the General Conference, and which were now in suspense.

[8] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed an amendment to the last paragraph of the draft resolution (page 4), to permit the Executive Board to take its decisions under the new criteria adopted by the Conference.

[9] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) supported this suggestion, and proposed that the words "previous Directives" in the second line of this paragraph be changed to: "Directives adopted by the Fifth General Conference".

This proposal, seconded by Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) was *adopted* by 12 votes to none.[1]

Item 7.2 was *adopted* as amended.

Item 7.3 (Formal agreements concluded with certain international non-governmental organizations) [document 5C/OXR/12].

[10] Presenting item 7.3 of the agenda (document 5C/OXR/21, page 4) Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) explained that a draft resolution was being submitted to the Commission, together with a recommendation for a renewal or continuation, as the case might be, of the formal agreements concluded with certain organizations.

The draft resolution on page 4, instructing the Director-General to review the form and context of the formal agreements, was *adopted* by 10 votes to 2.[1]

[11] Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) explained that the World Federation of United Nations Associations and the International Studies Conference had been excluded from the list on page 5, solely because they did not conform to the previous criteria for formal agreements. Now that these had been changed, the Commission could decide whether these organizations should be re-included.

[12] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) recommended that the formal agreements should be renewed with the two organizations omitted by the Sub-Committee. He recalled that the criteria had been changed since the unfavourable decision had been taken against them, and that it would be difficult, under the new criteria, to object further to the renewal of contracts with two organizations which had not deserved any criticism, and which had fulfilled all the stipulations contained in their agreements with Unesco. If the Commission were to ask the Director-General not to renew the formal agreements with the International Studies Conference and the WFUNA, such a gesture would be interpreted as a motion of censure. In fact, however, both those organizations were fulfilling all the conditions required, and the French delegation therefore formally proposed that the Commission should ask the Director-General to renew the agreements with them.

[13] In reply to an enquiry from Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America), Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) explained that no problem existed concerning organizations already having agreements with Unesco, even though the criteria for agreements had been changed. It had been felt advisable to limit the number of organizations with which Unesco had formal agreements, and for this reason strict rules had been established.

[14] Dr. WALKER (Australia) thought it was undesirable to establish a separate category of formal agreements, which made the structure of Unesco's external relations too complicated.

Messrs. MURTINHO (Brazil), VEDOVATO (Italy) and ZÉREGA FOMBONA (Venezuela) seconded the French proposal.

[15] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom), opposing the French motion, thought that the changes made in the conditions under which agreements could be concluded were not so substantial as to warrant the inclusion of the two organizations under discussion. He pointed out that the five included in the list were professional, whereas the two excluded were not.

[16] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to all formal agreements.

[17] The inclusion of the following organizations

1 In final form: Resol. 33.21.
2. In final form: Resol. 33.31.

as eligible for formal agreements was *agreed* without further discussion: International Council of Museums, International Council of Scientific Unions, International Theatre Institute.

[18] As regards the Council for the Co-Ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences, Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) felt there was a special reason for not having an agreement, as the Council was as closely related to WHO as to Unesco, the former assisting in the financing of the Council.

Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) agreed with Mr. Mulliken, but Professor SOMMERFELT (Chairman of the Sub-Committee) pointed out there had been a substantial majority in the Sub-Committee in favour of including the Council.

[19] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) was not in favour of excluding the Council from the benefit of formal agreements merely because it collaborated mainly with WHO, since its interests clearly extended to the fields of both Unesco and WHO. He formally seconded the proposal to include the Council in the list of organizations entitled to formal agreements.

Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) did not feel that co-operation with WHO should exclude the Council from a formal agreement with Unesco.

[20] It was *agreed* to include the Council for the Co-Ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences in the list of organizations eligible for formal agreements.

The inclusion of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies was *agreed* without comment.

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONFERENCE.

[21] Mr. MONTEL (France) completing the statement made by Mr. de Lacharrière, pointed out that, even if this organization had not in the past fulfilled the conditions required for the conclusion of a formal agreement, it did so now. Moreover, it had met all its obligations and was the only organization of its kind. Whatever form the exclusion might take, it would inevitably amount to unreserved censure.

[22] Sir George THOMSON (United Kingdom) announced that Sir Charles Webster, who held an official position in the International Studies Conference, no longer found that organization suitable for inclusion in the list; the United Kingdom delegation would therefore vote against it.

[23] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) felt that the achievements of this organization did not justify its having a special status in relation to Unesco.

It was *decided*, by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions, to include the International Studies Conference in the list of eligible organizations.

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS.

[24] Mr. ENNALS (Secretary, WFUNA) stated that the Federation had understood its exclusion from those eligible for formal agreements, when the criteria demanded professional status. This requirement was now annulled, and the Federation hoped for re-inclusion, which it felt it deserved through its world-wide representation and its past collaboration with every department of Unesco.

No decision was taken for the time being.

Item 7.4 (Contracts with international non-governmental organizations and grants-in-aid made since the Fourth Session) [document 5C/OXR/13].

Item 7.5 (Sums paid to international non-governmental organizations under grants-in-aid or contracts) [document 5C/OXR/14].

Items 7.4 and 7.5 of the agenda [document 5C/OXR/21, pages 5 and 6] were *approved* without comment.

Recommendations submitted to the General Conference by the Second Meeting of Representatives of National Commissions [docu- 5C/OXR/2].

Resolution C.

[25] The SECRETARY read the statement of the Programme and Budget Commission on the budgetary implications of the authorizations to the Director-General contained in paragraph 4.

According to this statement, no funds were available in 1951 to cover the cost of members of the Secretariat, serving in a temporary capacity, on the staff of a National Commission of a Member State, as proposed in paragraph *(a)*. If the Official and External Relations Commission considered that special funds should be provided, the possibility of their inclusion would be studied by the Budget Committee.

Considerable funds were provided for the travel of officials envisaged under *(b)*, and this type of work might be undertaken by the special field staff of the External Relations Service.

The budgetary provisions under (c) were on a level with those for 1949 and 1950.

Provision had been made at the request of the Director-General for payment of half the round trip fare envisaged under *(d)* for two representatives of National Commissions from Member States in the region, and for inviting observers at their own expense from other States in the region.

Paragraph *(e)* had no budgetary implications, and *(f)* did not affect the 1951 budget. The Director-General would prepare estimates for 1952, based on the recommendations of the Commission under paragraph *(f)*.

[26] The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as the Programme and Budget Commission had raised objections only under *(a)*, this paragraph might be redrafted to exclude budgetary implications.

[27] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) agreed that paragraph *(a)* was not covered by any special financial provision. Moreover, it was merely an authorization, not an injunction. The Director-General might quite possibly receive such a request during the year, and be in a position to meet it with the aid of existing personnel.

[28] Sir George THOMPSON (United Kingdom) proposed amending this paragraph to read: "to send, at the request of a Member State and at its expense, a member of the Secretariat. . .".

This proposal, seconded by Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) and Professor DÜRING (Sweden), was *adopted* by 10 votes to 8.

[29] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed the insertion of the words "beginning in 1951" after the word "decides" in paragraph *(f)*. *Agreed.*

Resolution C was *adopted* unanimously.[1]

Resolution A.

[30] Mr. ENNALS (Secretary, WFUNA) drew attention to the second paragraph of resolution A and to the question of co-operation between international non-governmental organizations and National Commissions. It had been recommended that National Commissions should assist non-governmental organizations in their work, but no reference was made to the national bodies of these international non-governmental organizations. Mr. Ennals recalled that, at the close of the Second Meeting of Representatives of National Commissions, Professor Düring had suggested that Unesco should inform these Commissions what national bodies in each country were affiliated to international non-governmental organizations. This would make closer association possible, and help to put into practice the terms of resolution A2.

Report of the Committee appointed for the Study of the Reports of Member States [document 5C/OXR/22].

[31] Mr. WARD (Chairman of the Special Committee) drew attention to two typographical errors on pages 1 and 4 of the English text of the Report, and explained the layout of the Report. He moved its adoption as a whole, including the recommendations and the resolutions.

The draft resolutions on pages 6 and 7 were *adopted* by 19 votes to none.[1]

Recommendations 1 to 14 (pages 3-6).

[32] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) asked whether the minutes of the Special Committee gave the Director-General adequate guidance in issuing a factual analysis on the reports, as proposed in recommendation 11.

[33] Mr. DARD (External Relations Service) stated that the Director-General had read the report of the Special Committee with the greatest interest, and had asked him to convey his thanks to the Committee for its careful study and for the excellent suggestions contained in it. The Director-General had wondered, however, whether it was not rather for the Executive Board to analyse and comment on the reports of Member States as suggested in recommendation 11. If the Commission decided to entrust that task to the Director-General, he would willingly assume it, but he would have preferred it to be entrusted to the Executive Board.

[34] Mr. WARD (Chairman of the Special Committee) explained that the Committee had found it advisable to leave the methods of factual analysis to the Director-General, at least for the time-being. The methods envisaged were similar to, but more elaborate than, those outlined in Part I of the report.

[35] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) queried the feasibility of issuing the reports in one volume, as proposed in recommendation 9.

Mr. DARD (External Relations Service) stated that there had been lengthy discussions on this matter in the Committee. In order to avoid the Reports arriving at such different times, the Committee had proposed that they should be sent

1. In final form: Resol. 30.13.

1. In final form: Resol. 30.21.

in by a certain date towards the end of February. In that way, by May, the General Conference would be in possession of all the Reports collected in a single volume, and would thus be able to examine them as a whole. Mr. Dard added that the Reports would not be printed until after the General Conference, and that this initial edition would merely be duplicated.

Recommendations 1 - 14 were *approved* for inclusion in the Commission's report to the General Conference.[1]

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies [document 5C/OXR/4 - Corr. 1].

[36] The SECRETARY explained that the resolution had been referred to the Programme and Budget and the Administrative Commissions, which had raised no objections.

[37] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed amending the second paragraph on page 2, beginning "Expresses its conviction", to read: "Directs the Executive Board and the Director-General to continue to pay the closest attention. . .". This gave more force to the proposal that they should keep in line with the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

This proposal, seconded by Dr. ZEISSL (Austria), Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) and Mr. DÜRING (Sweden), was *adopted* by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The resolution contained in document 5C/OXR/4 - Corr. 1 was *adopted*.[1]

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on Educational Problems in Non-Self-Governing Territories [document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1].

[38] The SECRETARY pointed out that an amendment [document 5C/111] to the resolution contained in document 5C/OXR/5 - Add. 1 had been proposed by the Egyptian delegation, which had not yet been adopted.

[39] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) pointed out that this question was directly related to Unesco's programme. It concerned studies which the United Nations had asked Unesco to undertake. He recommended that the text, together with the Egyptian amendment, should be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission. *Agreed.*

Cultural Agreements and Conventions now in force and Proposals to facilitate the Conclusion of Bilateral or Multilateral Cultural Conventions [document 5C/OXR/17 and Addendum].

[40] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Programme and Budget Commission had found there were no budgetary implications in this proposal, as no further posts were proposed for the time-being. An amendment to the report had been proposed by the Belgian delegation [document 5C/OXR/17 - Addendum].

[41] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) stated that, in implementation of the resolutions adopted at the Fourth Session of the General Conference, the agreements and conventions already collected were in process of being published, and that such publication would be paid for out of the 1950 budget. No further publication was contemplated for 1951. It was unlikely that an additional publication would be required until two or three years had elapsed.

[42] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) pointed out the serious budgetary implications of publishing the texts, as proposed in the Belgian amendment. He felt that Member States would not be sufficiently interested in this project for a big financial outlay to be justified.

[43] Mr. GARCIN (External Relations Service) stated that the number of cultural agreements concluded amounted to some 300, of which 200 were at present in force. About five or six new agreements might be concluded each year. It was therefore not a question of issuing a large annual publication, but only of periodically adding a brochure of 10 to 15 pages to the publication now about to appear. He wished to reassure Mr. Cowell by stating that no great expenditure would be involved.

In reply to a further question from Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), Mr. GARCIN added that the publication now under way was being paid for out of the funds allocated by Member States for the publication of such information.

[44] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) enquired whether it was not agreed that Member States of the United Nations should deposit with that body all agreements into which they entered.

[45] Mr. GARCIN (External Relations Service) agreed that this was so. In principle, all Member States should deposit with the United Nations

1. In final form: Section V, pages 119 and 120.
2. In final form: Resol. 9.911 and 9.912.

(as formerly with the League of Nations) all treaties concluded by them. In fact, however, almost half the cultural agreements in force were not deposited with the United Nations, which was why Unesco had wanted to register and make its own collection of them. This practice was incidentally not peculiar to Unesco, but was followed by the other Specialized Agencies. There were very large gaps in the United Nations collection, which it was essential to fill in this way.

[46] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) thought that it was rather a question of communicating texts for purposes of information than of depositing them in the legal sense of the term.

[47] Mr. GARCIN (External Relations Service) agreed that a "dépôt légal" must be based on a convention. The Belgian delegation had used the term "to deposit" only to indicate that the communication was to some extent an official one.

Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) confirmed this interpretation of the Belgian draft resolution. What was contemplated was a communication made through a relevant Ministry.

[48] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed that the paragraph be divided into two, the first part dealing with the study of the conventions and the second with the publication of their texts. For himself, he could agree only to the first part.

The proposed division was *agreed.*

The draft resolution of the Belgian delegation [document 5C/OXR/17 - Add.] was *adopted* by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.[1]

Draft Resolution concerning the Junior Red Cross [document 5C/44].

[49] Mr. HOWELL (United States of America), declaring his sincere appreciation of the fine work of the Junior Red Cross, at the same time felt that other organizations were equally deserving; it was therefore embarrassing to single out one organization before all others. He suggested that the Commission take note of this resolution, but without taking action on it, so that the public might be aware of the satisfaction felt at the efforts of the Junior Red Cross.

[50] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) supporting the Italian motion, stressed that, in his country at least, the Junior Red Cross was the most efficient organization dealing with the promotion of international understanding. Referring to Mr. Howell's remarks, he pointed out that the Junior Red Cross was much more strongly influenced by educators than were other organizations.

[51] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) felt that, as a matter of principle, the General Conference should not have to take steps to express its satisfaction with the many organizations collaborating with Unesco.

[52] Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) agreed with Mr. Howell's remarks, as did Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium), who pointed out that an important question of principle was involved. Unesco should not be called upon to draw up a list of prize-winners among the various non-governmental organizations. If it set out to do that, it would soon be submerged in similar requests. Mr. de Visscher recognized that the Junior Red Cross had considerable accomplishments to its credit in the field of education, but the same could be said of many other organizations.

While agreeing with the Italian delegation as to the great educational value of the Junior Red Cross, Mr. MONTEL (France) also shared Mr. de Visscher's view that a question of principle was involved; accordingly, he endorsed Mr. Howard's remarks.

[53] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) having similarly expressed his support for Mr. Howell's views, Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) moved an amendment to the effect that the Commission, while recognizing the high value of the educational work of the Junior Red Cross, was not in a position to adopt the resolution, as it wished to avoid any discrimination between the various organizations co-operating with Unesco.

[54] It was decided to record the Commission's appreciation of the work done by the Junior Red Cross in the report submitted to the General Conference, but not to adopt the Italian motion.

Report of the Sub-Committee for Relations with International Non-Governmental Organizations to the Official and External Relations Commission (*continued*) [document 5/OXR/21].

Annex I

Sub-Section II.E (CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURE).

[55] The SECRETARY announced that no decision had yet been taken by the Budget Committee on clause (2) (page 12).

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) presumed it was the sense of the Commission that any subventions pending should be handled under the old directives, but if the question of any new subventions arose they would be handled under the new directives.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

1 In final form: Resol. 34.21 and 34.22.

NINTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. Htin Aung (Burma)

Report of the Official and External Relations Commission to the General Conference [document 5C/OXR/23].

[1] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) introduced the Report of the Commission to the General Conference, indicating its main features.

The SECRETARY announced that since the report had been drafted, a letter had been transmitted to the Chairman of the Commission from the Chairman of the Budget Committee on the subject of paragraph E (2) on page 12 of Annex II of the Report. The letter was as follows:

Your letter of 7 June has been considered by the Budget Committee. The Committee has concluded that the paragraph to which you refer should read as follows:

(2) The General Conference shall give special attention to the total sum to be paid from the Budget of Unesco in the form of subventions to the international non-governmental organizations or preparatory committees.

The Budget Committee is of the opinion that there need not be a special annex to the Budget Document for three reasons:

(*a*) The Budget is a project budget by previous decisions of the General Conference. Grants-in-aid therefore are voted in each individual project and are not therefore approval in total.

(*b*) As a corollary to the first, the Committee agrees that more information on grants-in-aid is desirable in the Budget presentation. Accordingly, the Budget Committee has requested additional information to be included in the Budget for 1952, on a project basis.

(*c*) Until such time as the grants-in-aid increase substantially in number, the Budget Committee believes that there is no need for an over-all table in the Budget. Over-all tables in the Budget generally have been reserved for those activities which, because of their complexity and number, cannot be considered except in total. This is not yet true of subventions, however.

The Budget Committee, in its final report, will include a statement, with the agreement of the Official and External Relations Commission, that, should subventions increase in number substantially, an over-all table should be included with all information necessary to ensure a clear presentation of the Budget.

[2] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) drew attention to the Draft Resolution on page 13 of the Report, laying down that the new Directives would come into effect on 1 January 1951. His delegation had assumed that the new Directives would become effective upon adoption by the General Conference. On a previous occasion, the delegate of Switzerland had asked how the new Directives would affect existing grants-in-aid or subventions, and the Director-General's representative had replied that the Directives would become effective at the beginning of the next calendar year: in the subsequent discussion, it had been agreed that the new Directives would not affect existing or pending subventions, but the United States delegation had assumed that it would be appropriate for the new Directives to cover new applications for subventions and for consultative arrangements, that is to say, subventions which had not yet been considered by the Executive Board; those which had come before the Board would be covered by the old Directives.

Mr. Mulliken therefore moved the deletion of the last phrase of the resolution: "to become effective as of 1 January 1951", which would mean that the new Directives would become effective upon adoption by the General Conference.

[3] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the Commission could reasonably approve the United States motion, but wondered whether the Director-General would like time to examine the various clauses to see whether any embarrassment would be caused by making the new Directives effective immediately.

[4] Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service) thought there would be no special difficulty in making the Directives apply from the close of the Conference; however, if that were decided, the paragraph following the resolution would also have to be modified.

[5] Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed that the paragraph be changed to read as follows:

In view of the fact that the new Directives will come into effect at the close of the Fifth Session of the General Conference, it is the opinion of the Commission that the Executive Board, when granting sub-

ventions for which applications are already pending with the Board, should take action on the basis of the criteria set forth in the previous previous Directives.

The two amendments moved by Mr. Mulliken were *adopted.*

[6] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) drew attention to paragraph B.5 on page 5 of the Report, and observed that it might be interpreted to mean that Reports should be submitted both by Member States and by National Commissions, whereas it had already been agreed that Member States should include in their Reports a section on the activities of their National Commissions.

[7] On the suggestion of Mr. de BLONAY (Head, External Relations Service), it was *agreed* to substitute the word "information" for "reports" in paragraph B.5.

[8] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) pointed out that the French text of paragraph B.2 might cause confusion and should be revised. His observation was *noted.*

[9] Referring to the Resolution at the top of page 16 of the report, Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) moved the addition of the words "adopted by the Fifth Session of the General Conference" after "Directives". *Agreed.*

[10] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) moved the insertion of the words "if possible" in the sixth line of paragraph III on page 9 of the report between "They shall" and "be issued in one volume". *Agreed.*

[11] Assuming that the whole report would be adopted, Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) announced that, if the matter were put to the vote, his Government would feel compelled to abstain. The United States delegation had been glad to participate in the work of the Commission and of its Sub-Committees, and had appreciated the patience with which those bodies had listened to the United States point of view; but his delegation was disappointed with the results achieved as far as the new Directives were concerned.

It considered that closer relations should have been established with international non-governmental organizations, especially with regard to oral and written communications. It was also concerned about the clause that non-governmental organizations, in order to be eligible for consultative status, had to be "primarily" concerned with matters within the competence of Unesco; it feared the exclusion of certain organizations, such as Youth and Church groups, that were not primarily concerned with Unesco's work.

The United States delegation was also disturbed by the fact that the conditions for the granting of subventions, as set forth in the new Directives, did not protect the expenditure of Unesco's funds sufficiently explicitly.

The Report of the Commission was *adopted* by 17 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Letter from the World Federation of Trade Unions and the "Fédération internationale syndicale de l'Enseignement".

[12] The SECRETARY read out a letter from the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Fédération internationale syndicale de l'Enseignement, which had been forwarded to the Commission by the General Committee of the Conference and ran as follows:

As representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Fédération internationale syndicale de l'Enseignement at the Fifth General Conference of Unesco in Florence, we have the honour to call the attention of the Conference to the following considerations:

The Fourth Session of the General Conference of Unesco, held in Paris in 1949, adopted resolutions 33.5, 33.51, 33.52, 33.521, 33.522 and 33.523, as a complement to Article VII of Unesco's Constitution regarding liaison between Unesco and workers' organizations.

The aim of these resolutions is to ensure that the masses shall share in the benefits of culture and in an understanding of scientific progress. In the belief that the most fundamental way of achieving this object is to have worker's representatives on the National Commissions, the Federations request the Member States to associate workers' organizations in the work of the National Commissions and to consider the possibility of including representatives from these organizations in their delegations to the General Conference.

We must, however, point out that workers' organizations are not now represented on the National Commissions nor in the delegations, except in the case of two or three States which, in forming their National Commissions and delegations, have taken into account the invitation contained in the resolution quoted above.

We request the General Conference to remind Member States to act in accordance with the resolution adopted at the Fourth Session of Unesco's General Conference, so that workers' organizations shall in future be represented in Unesco in accordance with their importance from a national and a world point of view.

[13] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) observed that this letter brought up two very different questions at one and the same time: that of workers' representation on the National Commissions, and that of their representation on delegations. While he entirely agreed with the signatories of the letter on the importance of workers sharing

in the activity of the National Commissions—they had long done so in the case of the French National Commission—he could not share their point of view as regards the composition of delegations. The representative of a State was the representative, not of any given social stratum, but of the government, and thus of the nation as a whole.

[14] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported by Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium), endorsed Mr. de Lacharrière's words. He suggested that the Commission should merely take note of the letter.

[15] Stating that trade unions were represented on the Austrian National Commission, Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) pointed out that small countries which could not send large delegations to the General Conference would be in a difficult position if they had to include workers in their delegations as well as the necessary experts.

The Commission *took note* of the letter.

Statement by the representative of the League of Red Cross Societies.

[16] Dr. MINNUCCI (Head of the Italian Junior Red Cross) stated that the League of Red Cross Societies, a world federation of the sixty-seven national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies now in existence, uniting more than a hundred million men, women and children in the same humanitarian ideal, had been happy to take part as an observer in the work of Unesco's Fifth Annual Session. The League had already taken part in the work of successive annual sessions of Unesco's General Conference, and it has also been happy to be a member of the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction. During the past year, representatives of the League had also shared in the work of the Conference of Directors of Children's Communities, of working parties on exchange of persons problems, and of the meeting of representatives of non-governmental student and youth organizations, as well as in the work of other organizations supported by Unesco.

This showed that Unesco could rely upon the cordial co-operation of the League of Red Cross Societies in every field that touched Red Cross interests or where Red Cross activities might be called for. This co-operation, based on the complete independence and freedom of action of the two Organizations, would be continued at all time and in all places, whenever and wherever there was human suffering to be eased and where the level of man's physical, moral or intellectual life could accordingly be raised; it would be continued, above all, through the activities of the Junior Red Cross, a movement which—regardless of politics, religion or race—today extended to sixty countries and had forty million members, in a cause which was that of Unesco, namely international understanding.

Dr. Minnucci added that he was particularly happy to give this assurance, not only as delegate of the League of Red Cross Societies, but also as Head of the Italian Junior Red Cross, of the nation which had had the great privilege of extending its hospitality to this important session of Unesco's General Conference.

If the League's co-operation with Unesco was thus an accomplished fact, the League, for its part, was grateful for Unesco's help in drawing up an educational programme for the Palestine refugees. Dr. Minnucci recalled that the League, together with the International Red Cross Committee and the Quakers, had been entrusted by the United Nations with the distribution of relief to those refugees. The League had had to deal with some 330,000 refugees living on Jordanian, Lebanese or Syrian territory. Its activities, which had lasted sixteen months, had come to an end on 30 April 1950, when a new United Nations organization took over the work. In the name of the League, Dr. Minnucci wanted to take this opportunity of expressing the hope that Unesco would be able to continue bringing to these unfortunate refugees the educational aid that had helped them so much in the past.

The Red Cross, the national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in every country, as well as their world federation, had all shown by practical action, like that on behalf of the Palestine refugees, that they were always prepared, wherever it was a question of relieving human suffering and improving men's living conditions. But they had also shown by their practical work that they regarded it as one of their essential tasks to make an effective contribution to peace and international understanding, within the spheres of Red Cross activity.

In this spirit, and in the name of the League of Red Cross Societies, Dr. Minnucci was very pleased to note the work so successfully accomplished by the present Conference, and he hoped that Unesco's mission throughout the world would go from strength to strength.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. Minnucci for this statement.

[17] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) expressed the warm appreciation of the people of the Near East for the work done in that region by the Junior Red Cross.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

FIRST MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Election of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

At the suggestion of the Nominations Committee, *Professor Alex Photiades* (Greece) *was elected Vice-Chairman* and *Mr. W.G.St.C. Smith* (Australia) *was appointed Rapporteur.*

Adoption of Agenda [document 5C/ADM/1].

[1] The CHAIRMAN indicated that three items had been added to the Agenda:

(1) Under 4.8, the consideration of the rhythm of expenditure in 1950;

(2) Reimbursement of state income-tax paid by staff members [document 5C/ADM/16];

(3) Effects of devaluation on the 1950 Budget [document 5C/ADM/17].

With these additions, the provisional agenda [document 5C/ADM/1] was *adopted.*

Presentation by the Executive Board of the Report of the Auditors on the last six months of 1949 [documents 5C/ADM/2 and 5C/ADM/2 (I)-Addendum].

[2] Dr. WALKER (Executive Board) stated that the first and principal observation of the Board on the Auditors' Report for 1949 was that the finances of the Organization had continued to be conducted in a satisfactory manner by the Secretariat.

With regard to the Auditors' view, expressed on page 3 of their report, that the Board's proposals in relation to the cash deficiency due to the non-payment of certain contributions were inadequate, Dr. Walker explained that the Auditors had been working on figures which did not include the anticipated collection of some arrears or the savings which would be effected on the liquidation of obligations for 1948 and 1949. The total of these assets reduced the estimated deficit to about $500,000, as shown in the Annex to document 5C/ADM/2 (1).

The only other comment the Board had thought necessary to make on the Report was that the sum of $160,120 remaining under the heading of Exchange of Information could not have been transferred out of Part III of the Budget, as suggested by the Auditors, because the 1949 Appropriation Resolution provided that "no transfer may be made to decrease the total voted for Part III of the Budget". Dr. Walker stressed that the activities to which that sum was applied were closely related to Programme activities.

[3] In reply to Dr. MASON (New Zealand), Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) said that, since the time when the Board had considered the deficit, approximately $152,000 of arrears had been received.

The Commission *approved* the Auditors' Report.

Member States whose contributions are in arrears [documents 5C/ADM/5, 5C/ADM/5 (*b*)-Addendum I, Corrigenda I, II, III and IV].

[4] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Corrigenda indicated the status of contributions of Member States as of Saturday, 27 May 1950. The purpose of part *(a)* of document 5C/ADM/5 was to carry out the instructions of the Fourth Session of the General Conference in regard to arrears of contributions.

[5] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) declared that the problem of arrears was plaguing many international Agencies, and it was time that

governments which had agreed to pay certain sums should do so. The Director-General should be encouraged to take more aggressive steps in the matter.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that a special communication sent to all the delinquent Member States on 15 April 1950 had been followed by the payment of nearly $600,000.

[6] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) believed the question of arrears went deeper than a mere exchange of communications. He appreciated the efforts made by the Director-General but, in final analysis, a failure to pay was often an indication of a lack of interest. He agreed with a current opinion that Unesco was difficult to understand and to publicize, but that was not an excuse for the neglect of financial obligations and he thought the Conference should put clearly on record its opinion of such neglect. In his opinion, the Executive Board should study the matter further and examine the possibility of amending sub-paragraph 8 *(c)* of Article IV of the Constitution. Political expediency should not be allowed to cloud the delegates' judgment in the matter.

[7] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) sympathized with the views expressed by the United States and Canadian delegates, but he pointed out that the solution of the problem would affect all the Member States. He was very favourably impressed by the fact that the Director-General's efforts had been followed by results, and Sir Henry would regret any premature action. Since the problem was not peculiar to Unesco, he did not think it should embark on action which might appear unduly harsh in comparison with that of the other Specialized Agencies; so he advocated that the Director-General should be asked to contact them to explore the possibility of some co-ordinated action regarding arrears of contributions.

Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) took up the same position as Sir Henry and advocated sending a telegram to the defaulting States requesting an explanation.

[8] Dr. WEN (China) agreed with the prudent and very wise statements of the previous speakers. He was very conscious of his country's failure to meet its obligations and wished to assure the Commission that it was due not to a lack of willingness but to circumstances beyond the control of his Government. He could not promise on its behalf the payment of China's contribution on the present scale and suggested that his country should be permitted to pay a total of $10,000 a year until such time when it could pay its arrears in full.

[9] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) was opposed to any scheme which would make the paying Member States shoulder the defaulting ones' share, particularly in the case of those countries which were in arrears since 1947 without being able to produce a satisfactory explanation. Accordingly, he was in favour of resolution 4 *(b)* [document 5C/ADM/5].

[10] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) moved that the Director-General and the Executive Board be asked to make enquiries from other international Agencies with a view to co-ordinated action being taken on behalf of all of them to deal with defaulting countries and to press this action vigorously.

[11] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) held that the problem of arrears was too urgent for that type of procedure. In his opinion, the Conference should ask the Director-General and the Executive Board for immediate efforts to collect the outstanding contributions.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) was prepared to accept that addition to his proposal.

[12] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) emphasized the difference between those Member States which were materially unable to pay and those unwilling to do so. Although he was prepared to accept the United Kingdom's proposal, he still thought that the question must be examined in greater detail by the Executive Board. It was possible that China's proposal was the realistic way of dealing with the issue of real inability to pay.

[13] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stressed that the Director-General welcomed any assistance which the Conference might be willing to give him in the matter of arrears, but he doubted very much whether any concrete results would result from a joint action with the other Agencies whose contacts with their Member States differed very greatly. Sometimes the question of collection of contributions was related to that of currency. In his opinion, it might be wiser for the Commission to indicate that the responsibility for the collection of contributions lay with the Director-General with the assistance of the Executive Board, so as to make a clearer separation between the immediate action advocated and that to be undertaken after the end of the General Conference.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) was quite happy to accept a revised wording of his proposal.

[14] Dr. WALKER (Executive Board) was sure that the Board would prefer the responsibility to lie with the Director-General; he advocated the

elimination of the words "Executive Board" at the beginning of the United Kingdom proposal, and the addition of a clause to the effect that the Director-General was requested to report on the matter to the Executive Board in the course of the year.

The Commission *agreed* with the principles enunciated in the resolution and *decided* to refer it to the Drafting Committee.

[15] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) thought it would be useful to know the degree of interest and collaboration of Unesco's defaulting Member States with other Specialized Agencies. A study of the list of defaulting States showed that these were in most cases identical with those making no effort to take part in Unesco's work or to attend meetings. The enquiry by the Director-General in co-operation with other Specialized Agencies, suggested by Sir Henry French, would show whether the position was the same in the case of the other Agencies, and how far defaulting States took an interest in their work.

[16] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the "Recommendation regarding consequential sanctions that might be applied by the General Conference to Member States whose contributions are in arrears" [document 5C/ADM/5 *(b)* - Addendum I].

[17] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) felt that the one-year test was rather premature, but he was ready to accept the Board's proposal which appeared in the last paragraph of document 5C/ADM/5 *(b)* - Addendum I.

[18] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought the Board's proposal was too precipitate; in his opinion, two years was a more reasonable provision.

[19] Dr. WALKER (Australia), representative of the Executive Board, explained that the Board had changed its view on the matter during the meetings held just before the Conference. It had come to the conclusion that, after a Member State was in arrears for one full year, certain penalties should be applied; but it was for the General Conference to determine what those penalties were to be. He wished to make it clear that the Board was not recommending depriving a State of its vote after only one year's delinquency.

[20] Mr. SMITH (Australia) disagreed with Mr. Pollock's views: the General Conference should always be able to waive any sanctions if it wished to do so, and the delinquency period should be contingent on the character of the sanction whose application to a Member State should not hamper or interfere with the Organization's work—as would be the case, for instance, if some activities of a Field Sciences Co-operation Office were curtailed, as the result of a sanction.

[21] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) supported the proposed resolution, but hoped that the text would be submitted to the Commission in writing.

Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) saw no necessity for written submission; the text had been referred to the Drafting Committee and all the Commission had to do was to reach a decision on its substance.

[22] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to make it quite clear that, under the present constitutional provisions, a country would have forfeited its right to vote at Florence only if it was in arrears in its full contributions for 1948 and 1949. Under the new resolution, the difference would be that certain sanctions, decided by the Conference, would have been applicable to such a country as from 31 December 1949.

[23] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) moved that the Commission should accept the Executive Board's recommendation which, he noted, did not suggest what the sanctions should be. In his opinion the scheme should start at a low level and progressively become stronger as time passed. He formally proposed that the Commission accept the Board's recommendation as to when the sanctions became operative, and set up a sub-committee to prepare proposals concerning the nature of the sanctions.

[24] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) thought it would be well to deal with one question at a time and to give separate consideration to *(a)* the type of sanctions to be applied to defaulting States and *(b)* when such sanctions would become operative.

Further, he would be glad to know whether the reservations made by Mr. Roseman had any connexion with another proposal by the United States delegation for making the General Conference's sessions biennial.

[25] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) thought that Sir Henry French's suggestion was very valuable, and that its adoption would speed up the discussion. However, the proposed resolution presented by the Executive Board struck him as very broad, seeing that "sanctions" were used to cover both deprivation of the right to vote and other measures which did not stem from Unesco's Constitution. He would therefore suggest that Article IV C. 8*b* of the Constitution be amended as follows:

A Member State which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Conference if the amount

of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for *the last financial year.*

Thus a State which had paid nothing in respect of 1949 could not take part in the General Conference of 1950. That did not seem to be an overheavy sanction, and it could be applied even if the General Conference's sessions were to be made biennial.

Finally, as regards the present Session of the General Conference, had some States made a token payment for 1948 only in order to have the right to vote?

[26] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL confirmed that, at present, a token payment on account of an unpaid 1948 contribution would secure the country's right to vote at the Florence Session of the General Conference.

[27] Dr. WALKER (Australia), representative of the Executive Board, stressed that the Board suggested that, if a State had *any* outstanding amount for the preceding two years, certain sanctions, to be decided by the Conference, would be applicable to it automatically.

The CHAIRMAN held that the question was so complex that it was better to refer it to the Sub-Committee.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) agreed with the Chairman and withdrew his resolution.

[28] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), supported by Dr. WEN Yuan-Ning (China), emphasized that two entirely separate issues should be considered: (1) arrears when the Member State was obviously unable to pay, and (2) those due to unwillingness only. In his opinion the first case could not be settled by the General Conference without further preliminary study of the question; in the second, sanctions should be automatic.

[29] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) wondered who could decide between inability and unwillingness. In his opinion, the principle of sanctions should be clear, the sanctions should be adequate and, in order to avoid discrimination, they should be universally applied.

[30] It was *decided* to set up a Sub-Committee composed of the delegates of Australia, Canada, Denmark, the United States of America, France, Lebanon, the Philippines, the United Kingdom and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Sub-Committee should also examine resolutions 20.2551 ("that no surplus shall be declared when in fact the book surplus has not been realized in cash") and 20.2552 (Application of Regulation 25 under those circumstances).

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Member States whose contributions are in arrears (*continued*).

Distribution of book surpluses which have not been received in cash and application of Financial Regulations 25 and 26 in these circumstances [document 5C/AM/5, part (c)].

[1] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the problem involved was twofold (surpluses and deficits); although both aspects were closely related, he felt they were better dealt with separately.

The question of a book surplus revolved around Financial Regulations 25 and 26. The book surplus was the difference between the anticipated income of the Organization (according to the scale of contributions and the total budget voted by the General Conference) and the actual obligations incurred during the financial year. The problem facing the Organization arose from the existence of arrears of contributions from certain Member States. On the basis of Financial Regulations 25 and 26, the Organization had declared a surplus for the years 1947, 1948 and 1949; but this was only a *book* surplus and did not exist in actual fact.

[2] There were two principles to be decided by the General Conference:

(1) That in future no book surplus should be declared before a real surplus existed for any given year (the Director-General, the Auditors and the Executive Board were agreed on this point);

(2) That no surplus should be declared for any year if a net (accumulated) deficit still existed in the Organization (the Executive Board did not agree with the Director-General and the Auditors on this point, and was recommending the surrender of the surplus for 1947).

[3] On the question of deficits, the Deputy Director-General felt it would be clearer to distinguish between the existing deficits for 1947, 1948 and 1949, the probable deficit for 1950, and the possibility of a deficit in 1951. Owing to devaluation and other circumstances favourable to the Organization, the total deficit for 1947, 1948 and 1949 was only in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars, and this could be carried in the Working Capital Fund on the assumption that Member States would bring their contributions up to date and that this deficit would not increase in future years. However, the position with regard to 1950 and 1951 could not be foretold and would depend entirely on the extent to which contributions and arrears were paid.

[4] The Deputy Director-General emphasized the necessity for a decision by the General Conference as to whether the Director-General was to assume that all arrears and future contributions would be paid or, if not, whether the resulting deficit was to be made up from another source. The Director-General did not believe the General Conference should reduce the budget for 1950 below the level voted at the Fourth Session, simply because some of the anticipated contributions might not be paid. When the General Conference in Paris, being in possession of the full facts regarding arrears, voted a budget figure together with a scale of contributions for the year 1950, the Director-General could only carry out his mandate to implement the programme to the full extent of the budget. A decision of the General Conference now to reduce the figure voted for 1950 would result in checking the development and growth of the Organization.

[5] With regard to 1951, the Director-General joined with the Executive Board in suggesting two possible courses of action:

(1) A supplementary assessment on Member States to ensure the effective collection of the whole budget;

(2) The assessment of a deposit from all Member States to the Working Capital Fund to enable the Director-General to draw on this Fund to make up the total budget figure. This extra deposit could be reimbursed to all Member States as soon as a net surplus could be declared.

[6] The suggestion had been made that the General Conference might vote a programme and a budget, and then request the Director-General to adjust expenditure in order to remain within the total income actually received. The Director-General felt however that, if the General Conference decided that certain exceptional circumstances justified non-payment of contributions, it should also provide special funds to replace the resulting deficit in the budget voted. Any attempt by the Director-General to adjust the budget voted to the actual contributions received would result in a series of complications. The following facts had to be taken into consideration:

(1) A large proportion of the Programme resolutions were continuing activities representing a normal development of projects begun in 1947, 1948 or 1949; such projects could not be arrested temporarily and restarted when funds became available;

(2) The planning of the actual programme was done on an extremely long-term basis and it was quite impossible to plan in a realistic manner if future contributions were not to be depended upon;

(3) A substantial part of the budget was devoted to personnel costs; it had been suggested that such costs were too high and should be reduced, but the very nature of the Organization required a large staff and these costs could neither be reduced nor temporarily arrested;

(4) Ten per cent to 15 per cent of the total budget being devoted to interests outside Unesco, i.e., contratcts with other Organizations, participation in Seminars and assistance to Member States, the Director-General was required to make commitments on behalf of the Organization quite a long time in advance of the time at which action would be taken; it was essential that the Director-General should know to what extent he could make such commitments;

(5) Temporary reductions could not be made in the central administrative costs of the Organization: the activities of the Bureaux of the Comptroller, of Administrative Management and Budget, of Conference Planning and General Services, for instance, could not be closed down temporarily.

[7] In view of those facts, any reductions in expenditure the Director-General might be obliged to make owing to the non-payment of contributions would fall entirely on certain sections of the programme. This, of course, was most undesirable.

The Director-General therefore sought the decision of the General Conference regarding not only

the size of the Programme and the budget for 1950 and 1951, but also regarding the means whereby collection of the total budget figure was to be assured.

[8] The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared to be two main problems:

(*a*) The immediate problem of the arrears for 1947, 1948 and 1949—bearing in mind the recommendation of the Director-General and the Auditors, and that of the Executive Board;

(*b*) The problem of how probable future deficits should be met.

He proposed that the Commission should adjourn while the sub-committee established at the morning meeting met to consider those problems.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Tuesday, 30 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Scale of Contributions of Member States for 1951 [document 5C/ADM/3].

[1] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) introduced document 5C/ADM/3 and drew attention to its third paragraph and to the formula in page 2, according to which the contributions of the Member States were computed. A document was in course of preparation, giving an illustration of how the formula would affect the contributions after the new Members had been assessed.

[2] Mr. SMITH (Australia) stated that his delegation was in agreement with the proposed formula. He asked, however, on what basis special percentages had been granted to certain States.

[3] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that the contribution of Austria had been reduced from 0.26 per cent to 0.12 per cent, and that of Hungary from 0.28 per cent to 0.15 per cent, at the special request of those two countries.

[4] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) asked whether those reductions meant that Austria's and Hungary's ability to pay was less than anticipated.

[5] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) pointed out that this question had been studied during the Second Session of the General Conference; it would be well to ascertain the origin of these differences in treatment and correct the position.

It was *agreed* to postpone the discussion of this item until the information requested by the Commission was available.

Currency of Contributions by Member States [document 5C/ADM/4].

[6] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that, up to the Fourth Session of the General Conference, each country had paid its entire contribution in a given currency. The question had now arisen whether certain countries should pay in hard currency and the others continue to pay in a soft one. The document contained two suggestions:

(1) That the present practice be continued, or

(2) That every Member State be asked to pay part of its contribution in hard currency.

The computation of the Organization's hard currency requirements could be found on page 2 of document 5C/ADM/4; the total figure was 47,6 per cent (including a safety margin of 5 per cent and 5.6 per cent for the Book Coupon Scheme), leaving 52.4 per cent for soft currency. The States whose contribution still remained to be assessed were Yugoslavia, Costa Rica, Korea, Hashemite Jordan and Indonesia.

[7] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) wanted to emphasize that Unesco was not the only organization receiving contributions partly in hard and partly in soft currency, as a result of its headquarters being in a so-called soft currency country. The position was similar in the case of OEEC (whose headquarters were also in France), the currency in which contributions were paid varying with the country making the payment. Nor apparently was soft-currency expenditure evenly spread over all member countries of the United Nations; thus

the International Civil Aviation Organization had decided to accept payments in soft currency only in the case of countries in which there was a regional office in existence; the World Health Organization's attitude was similar. As Unesco's Headquarters were in France, payments should, in principle, be effected in the currency of the country, and the hard currency requirements could be secured from certain countries with hard currency available, It would be dangerous if questions of foreign exchange transfers imposed still further delay on the payment of contributions; this could not fail to aggravate the Organization's difficulties. In practice it might be arguable that payment of their contributions partly in hard and partly in soft currency would be advantageous to States at present discharging their liabilities in hard currency only. The discussion would be greatly assisted by an exact and detailed statement of the Organization's hard currency needs which, according to document 5C/ADM/4, amounted in all to 37 per cent of the total payable. It should be possible to reduce the Organization's hard currency expenditure still further, more particularly under the head of travel.

[8] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) subscribed to the remarks of the delegate of France. As the location of the Organization's headquarters had been mentioned, it should be noted that, although calculated nominally in dollars, the payments of the staff were made in French francs, save in the case of the Unesco New York Office. The speaker thought, with Mr. Guignolet, that all travelling expenses could easily be discharged in French francs. The Executive Board had expressed no opinion on this matter, and personally he felt it would be wiser not to alter the procedure so far followed.

[9] Mr. SMITH (Australia) agreed with the previous speakers. In his opinion, the capacity of certain Member States to find hard currencies should be carefully examined. He recalled that one of the arguments for a high budget figure had been the needs of the Book Coupon Scheme; if part of all the contributions were paid in dollars, the main advantages of the Scheme would disappear. He stated that the Australian delegation was opposed to a compulsory dollar levy.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) held the same views as Mr. Smith.

[10] Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) declared that his country could pay in French francs or pounds sterling only; no payment could be made in U. S. dollars.

[11] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) favoured maintenance of the *status quo*. He shared Mr. Guignolet's view and supported his request for fuller details on the Organization's hard currency requirements. In addition, he would like to know to what extent the needs of the Field Science Cooperation Offices would be covered by the $450,000 which it was proposed to allocate to the various "Unesco Coupon Schemes" in 1951; if the Organization were forced to economize dollars, this particular item should be the last to be affected, on account of the high propaganda value of such coupons in all countries.

Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) declared that his country could not pay in dollars.

[12] Mr. KUSEJ (Yugoslavia) favoured the continuance of the method so far followed for determining the currency in which each country's contribution was to be paid. The method had the advantage of flexibility and of making it easier for the smaller soft currency countries to pay their contributions.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq), Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) and Mr. KIRPAL (India) were strongly in favour of retaining the present practice.

[13] Notwithstanding the general trend of the remarks which had been made, Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wished to stress that alternative (2) was not unreasonable on grounds of equity. Canada has always paid in dollars and would continue to do so if the Conference did not decide otherwise, and he thought it equitable that all Member States should be asked to share the obligation to supply the Organization with hard currency.

[14] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) indicated the expense items which required hard currency payments: goods and services in North America, the non-sterling part of the Pacific area, China, Switzerland and Germany; dollar travellers' cheques for the Field Natural Sciences Cooperation Offices; certain grants and subventions to international organizations; some dollar salary allotments; dollar travellers' cheques for certain missions; the staff Provident Fund and Pensions Scheme and, finally, the Book Coupon Scheme. Consultants in Paris, no matter where they came from, were paid in French francs. Children's allowances were paid in French francs or local currency, as well as the fees of experts. He pointed out that Unesco's percentage of soft currency expenditure was higher than that of any other Agency, and that all the Agencies agreed that all Member States should share in the advantage of using soft currencies (whenever it was possible to do so) as well as in the burden of providing the indispensable hard currencies. He stressed that the Book Coupon Scheme not only made possible the purchase of books printed in hard currency countries by persons residing in soft currency ones, but also greatly speeded up

such transactions by by-passing the various exchange control authorities. He assured the Commission that the hard currency expenditure of the Organization had been reduced to an absolute minimum.

Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) reserved the right to revert at a later stage to the data supplied by the Secretariat.

[15] Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) said that Venezuela paid her contribution in hard currency and would continue to do so; nevertheless he was anxious to make it easier for Member States to pay their contributions and would therefore vote for the maintenance of the present system.

[16] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) had no criticism to make on the score of dollar expenditure. A hard core of dollar payments would always subsist and, in his opinion, it could be met by those for whom dollars were readily available.

[17] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought the matter was one of moral principle: all the Member States regarded themselves as equal partners with a right to equal treatment and to the duties which it involved. He stated that he would regret any decision based on temporary expediency.

[18] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) said that, with reference to his earlier remarks, payments to the International Civil Aviation Organization, whose headquarters were in Montreal, were effected in Canadian dollars.

The speaker again pressed for documented information, with figures, giving more details of the Organization's dollar needs and more particularly of the percentage of salaries paid in dollars. Could fuller information also be supplied on book coupons? It had been suggested that costs under this head could be covered in Swiss francs up to the equivalent of $50,000, which would make it possible to reduce the percentage of dollars allocated by Unesco in respect of these coupons. The Member States of the OEEC discharged their obligations in their several currencies, i.e., in seven different European currencies. Since the delegates of the United States of America, Venezuela and Canada had made it known that they had no intention of seeking authority to pay their contribution in any currency other than dollars, it would be possible to revise the table of countries required to make payment in dollars, since Unesco's needs could in all probability be covered by the countries that voluntarily paid in dollars. It should be noted that the authority granted to Uruguay to pay in pesos had made it possible to recover arrears of contribution.

In conclusion, would the Secretariat give the Commission detailed figures of contributions, from which the percentage paid in dollars could be ascertained, and a similar statement of the Organizations's dollar needs? Lastly, it would be advisable to ascertain which countries were prepared to discharge their liabilities in dollars voluntarily; their contributions might in fact meet all the Organization's needs.

[19] Mr. SMITH (Australia) wished to make it clear that he had not overlooked the other advantages of the Book Coupon Scheme, the usefulness of which he did not contest. He personally did not think it equitable that soft currency countries should be asked for the same proportion of their contributions in dollars as those countries for which dollars were readily available. He hoped assessments were not based on the date of joining the Organization, but only on geographical considerations. He was convinced that dollars economies could be effected on such items as the proportion of salaries paid in dollars.

[20] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) drew attention to the second paragraph on page 2 of document 4C/ADM/4: it was not the Director-General's proposal that all countries should share equally in the dollar requirements of the Organization, but that of the United Nations Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions.

[21] Mr. LOURENÇO FILHO (Brazil) recalled that the previous year his country had suggested a criterion better adapted to the actual situation. The list of countries required to make payments in dollars included not less than 16 Latin American countries of which one only, Venezuela, had indicated its willingness to continue to pay in that currency. It should not be forgotten that the list had been drawn up when the Organization was in its infancy, in 1945; at that time the arrangement was reasonable enough; but owing to changes in the financial position of the Latin American countries, this was no longer the case. Only by a great effort had the Brazilian Government been able to pay its own contributions to the Budget and the Working Capital Fund. To secure the necessary dollars in the future great sacrifices would be necessary which would endanger the progress of the country. Thus it would be no more than fair to re-examine the whole question in the light of present-day circumstances.

[22] Dr. MASON (New Zealand) was opposed to any change in the present method of payment and wished to recommend a continuation of the Organizations's efforts to keep down dollar expenditure. He stressed that any change might force some countries to reduce their contributions or even to cease taking part in Unesco's work altogether.

[23] Mrs. GARDE-WIDEMAR (Sweden) recalled that her country had asked to be allowed to pay in soft currency and was in favour of retaining the *status quo* .

[24] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) asked the French delegate not to press his proposal in which Canada was singled out. He was against any priorities in the matter of contributions; any hardship case in list (*c*) should be considered on its merits.

[25] Mr. LOURENÇO FILHO (Brazil) thought it would be well to afford the delegations concerned an opportunity of explaining their point of view, and accordingly formally requested further discussion of this item.

[26] Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) emphasized that his country was small and has suffered great economic set-backs in the last two years. Its commercial deficit for 1949 was $73,000,000. It had asked to pay in pesos, not because of any unwillingness but for concrete material reasons. In conclusion, he wished to support the Brazilian proposal for a revision of the original lists, on page 4 of document 5C/ADM/4.

Mr. GONZÁLEZ RISOS (Argentine) also supported the proposal.

[27] Mr. LOURENÇO FILHO (Brazil) understood that the United States of America were prepared to pay their contribution wholly in dollars and that that contribution represented approximately one-third of the Organization's total budget. Would the Secretariat give information as to the percentage represented by the remaining contributions payable in dollars, after deduction of the United States contribution?

[28] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that the Organization's dollar requirements exceeded the United States contribution by 10.6 per cent.

Alternative (1) [document 5C/ADM/4, page 3] was *rejected* by 22 votes to 7.

Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) enquired what was the source of the proposals submitted.

[29] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) pointed out that alternative (2) was not really a proposal, but simply a statement of fact which required no action on the part of the Commission unless one or more countries asked to be moved from one list to another—a question the Commission obviously could not deal with at that moment for lack of precise information on the matter.

[30] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) stressed that Financial Regulation No. 11 made it necessary for the Commission to make a recommendation on the question to the General Conference. A recommendation was also needed concerning the new Member States which did not appear in the lists on page 4 of document 5C/ADM/4.

[31] Mr. LOURENÇO FILHO (Brazil), supported by Mr. PIÑEROS CORPAS (Colombia), moved that the committee proposed by Sir Henry French be also instructed to examine the possibility of spreading the 10 to 11 per cent of dollar requirements to be found in addition to the United States contribution over all Member States. *Adopted.*

In reply to Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay), Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that the composition of the lists had been decided by the General Conference, in accordance with Financial Regulation No. 11.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) agreed with M. Lourenço Filho. If a country wished to be transferred from one group to another, its delegation should send a written request to that effect to the Secretary of the Commission.

Mrs. GARDE-WIDEMAR (Sweden) asked for vote to be taken on alternative (2) [document 5C/ADM/4, page 4].

Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) asked that it be agreed that, unless a Member State expressed, in writing, a wish to alter its category, it automatically remained in its present category.

Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) trusted that the list of States required to pay in dollars would be revised so as to permit of certain of those States transferring to another category.

[32] In reply to Mr. GUIGNOLET (France), Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) stated that the 1949 dollar expenditure had been $2,844,000 (plus 5 per cent for future requirements), to which $450,000 must be added for the Book Coupon Scheme, making a total of $3,436,200.

[33] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) wondered whether the delegates who were proposing the setting up of the committee realized the magnitude of the task they were assigning to it. He urged the Commission to consider the proposal that the Executive Board should examine, in the course of the coming year, on their individual merits, any applications for transfers from one group to another, and act on those applications if it found it possible to do so. In his opinion, the Commission could not deal with the question except perhaps in a few cases of real hardship.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) was in complete sympathy with Mr. Pollock's remarks, but still thought the committee could explore the different aspects of the question and report to the Commission.

Mr. SMITH (Australia), speaking as Rapporteur, asked if the committee to be set up would also

be asked to deal with any applications for transfer.

The CHAIRMAN answered in the affirmative.

[34] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) stated that the actual expenditure in 1949 had been $7,630,000. The size of the 1951 Budget was still unknown, but it was assumed that the dollar requirements (excluding 5 per cent for the safety margin and 5.6 per cent for the Book Coupon Scheme) would equal the 1949, figure, i.e., about 37 per cent.

[35] It was *decided* by 25 votes to 4 to set up the proposed committee.

It was also *decided* that the committee's terms of reference would be to take into consideration the four categories of Member States, examine any applications for transfer from one category to another and suggest a course of action to the Commission according to the number of such applications received.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked that the committee should have authority to make recommendations in connexion with the five new Member States which were not listed on page 4 of document 5C/ADM/4. *Agreed.*

At the request of Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay), it was *agreed* that any transfer applications should be handed to the Secretary by the end of the next day.

It was *agreed* that the Committee should be composed of the delegates of Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, the United States of America, Indonesia, the United Kingdom and Sweden.

Administration of the Revolving Fund (document 5C/ADM/7].

[36] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) introduced document 5C/ADM/7 and indicated that the Director-General recommended that the Working Capital Fund should be maintained at $3,000,000. The uses to which the Fund might be put during 1951, according to the decision of the Fourth Session of the General Conference, were listed on page 2 of document 5C/ADM/7.

[37] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) recalled the discussions which had taken place at the Paris Conference concerning the appropriateness of using the Working Capital Fund for the purposes listed on page 2. He asked if there was any possibility of financing the Staff Housing and Welfare Fund by a credit union or a staff loan.

[38] Mr. SMITH (Australia) thought an exploration of the question had been made and said he would welcome a statement on its results. In his opinion, the amount set aside for advances was too large and the time-limit for their repayment was too long; one year ought to be enough. Advances for the purchase of motor-cars should be limited to the higher grades for whom cars were really a necessity.

[39] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) stated that, after very careful study, the idea of forming a credit union had been postponed because the Staff Association was comparatively new and had not had the opportunity to build up a sufficient capital. The majority of the loans extended to members of the staff were intended to overcome the great housing difficulty in Paris and were usually for periods which seldom exceeded twelve months. The $150,000 earmarked for that purpose did not mean that the entire sum was constantly being used. Cars were frequently required by the lower grade personnel, because they could find adequate accomodation for themselves and their families, at a reasonable cost, only outside Paris.

[40] Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) agreed with Mr. Roseman as to the desirability of liquidating the Staff Housing and Welfare Fund. This would mean not merely a direct economy of $150,000 but also the saving of all the administrative expenses incidental to these activities. It should be recalled that Embassy staffs were in a very similar position, but Embassies had never considered a policy of loans for the housing of their staffs or for staff purchases of motor cars. These activities fell squarely within the province of the Staff Association or the Staff Co-operative.

[41] Mr. SMITH (Australia) appreciated the difficulties of the Staff Association, but he regretted that it was not possible to find money for its Welfare from some other source than the Working Capital Fund. He noted that both the sum involved and the time-limit for repayment of advances could be reduced since they did not seem to be required.

[42] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) stated that the Director-General urged that the figure of $150,000 should be retained in order to enable him to deal with the difficult problem of housing the harassed staff.

Mr. SMITH (Australia) did not press his proposal for a reduction of the sum but asked for the repayment period to be limited to twelve months.

Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) pointed out that the limitation would preclude the setting up of the housing-scheme.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) opposed any consideration of a housing-scheme and declared that his delegation was quite willing

to accept any recommendation which would bring the present situation to an end as soon as possible.

[43] It was *agreed* that the Working Capital Fund should be maintained at $3,000,000.

The Commission *approved* the figure of $150,000 for the Staff Housing and Welfare Fund and *recommended* that the time-limit for the repayment of loans should be "normally reduced to twelve months".

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Scale of Contributions of Member States for 1951 (*continued*) [documents 5C/ADM/3 and Addendum I].

[1] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that Addendum I to document 5C/ADM/3 was an illustration of the application of the formula contained in document 5C/ADM/3 on the basis of the present membership, and of the way the 2.87 per cent brought in by the new Member States would reduce the 1951 assessments.

[2] Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) wished to know the actual sum his country would have to pay and asked for a table of last year's percentage assessment in order to be able to make a comparison.

[3] Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) pointed out that actual figures would only be known after the Budget had been established by the Programme and Budget Commission. Corrigendum III to document 5C/ADM/5 contained the table of last year's assessment. In reply to Mr. Smith's previous question concerning the special percentages granted to Austria and Hungary, Mr. Harper-Smith could only confirm that they had been approved by the Second Session of the General Conference at those countries' request.

[4] Mr. SMITH (Australia) thought the Secretariat might be able to obtain some additional information on the matter from the United Nations Statistical Office.

[5] Dr. OPRECHT (Switzerland) thought the proposed assessment of his country for 1951 too high. The United States had asked that their own contribution should not exceed one third of the Organization's total budget; this was perfectly proper, but in proportion to population the country most heavily assessed at the moment was Switzerland.

[6] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stressed that the figures contained in document 5C/ADM/3, Addendum I, were received from the United Nations and that, under existing regulations, it was Unesco's duty to operate on them. It would be very difficult to alter the figure for Switzerland's contribution pending a decision of the United Nations.

[7] Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) reminded the meeting that the scale of contributions was not calculated on a population basis but on the over-all ability to pay of the country concerned. A statement by the Secretariat on the methods used by the United Nations to arrive at this scale would assist the discussion.

Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) indicated his readiness to give this information as soon as he had the necessary data.

[8] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) recalled the Beirut Conference decision that, in normal times, no State's contribution should exceed one-third of the total Budget. It had been assumed at the time that a reduction of the United States' assessment should take place over a three-year period. Because of devaluation, the results of which no one could forecast, the United States delegation had not pressed at the Paris Conference for the full reduction to which it was entitled and 1951 should be the year when the Beirut decision took full effect. In view of the marked improvement in world conditions, of the additional 2.45 per cent of the Budget provisal by the new Member States and of the readjustment of the

contributions of Indonesia, Korea, and Hashemite Jordan, the total additional income in 1951 was nearly 3 per cent; it would only be logical for the United States to get the benefit of that increase. Actually his country was asking for a reduction which would make its contribution equal to 35 per cent of the Budget. The United States Government distinguished between this maximum one-third contribution to Unesco's programme and its contribution to far larger programmes of which the United States felt it should bear a much larger share. Many countries were pressing for an increase of the United States' contributions to the budgets of various Specialized Agencies; the United States were willing to do so, but asked for at least a token recognition of its right to have its contribution reduced in this particular case. In conclusion, Mr. Roseman asked the Commission to consider the problem in this broad aspect and to bear in mind that the reduction he was asking for would in no way affect the Member States' present contributions.

[9] The CHAIRMAN stressed that, that, in spite of the improvement in world conditions, Unesco was still faced by many difficulties. In his opinion, it was perhaps a little early to reduce any contribution, however equitable it might be to do so.

[10] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) observed that there were certain discrepancies between document 5C/ADM/3 and Addenda and the Fourth General Conference document giving the scale of contributions of Member States as established in 1949. He would therefore be glad of an opportunity of consulting the latter document.

Secondly, would Mr. Roseman say if he (the speaker) was correct in assuming that the United States were prepared to agree to an increase in their contribution to the International Labour Organization, at that body's next Session, if the General Conference of Unesco agreed to a reduction of their contribution to Unesco?

[11] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said the reply was a categorical yes. He added that the instructions of the United States delegation to the ILO General Conference, which was opening next week, were not yet complete in regard to contributions pending the results of the present meeting.

Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) pointed out that the scale of contributions contained in document 5C/ADM/5 - Corrigendum III had been adopted by the 1949 General Conference.

[12] Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) thought it should be remembered that the United States had assisted the birth of the Organization by contributing very largely, voluntarily and even courageously to its expenses, making themselves responsible for up to 48 per cent of the total budget. Once the Organization was well launched, this percentage had grown less, but it was still above what had been laid down (one-third of the Budget). He accordingly felt that it was impossible to do otherwise than agree to the reduction requested by the United States delegate, without conditions or bargaining, and make good the resulting deficit by a readjustment of the Budget. The United States delegate had indicated that the deficit in question would in fact be covered by the contributions of new Member States, without any increased contribution from the remaining countries being required. The speaker accordingly moved the immediate adoption of the reduction in the scale of contribution for the United States, and regretted that this gesture should not have been spontaneous.

[13] Mr. de CLEMENTI (Italy) entirely shared the views of the delegates of Egypt. The United States request was both logical and ethical, and he proposed that it be agreed without discussion and without a vote, as the views of delegates on the matter appeared to be unanimous.

[14] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) supported the United States request, which should be unconditionally accepted by the Commission in view of the United States' very large contribution to the cost of running the Specialized Agencies.

[15] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that he had instructions from his government to point out that, when the United Nations scale was established, the Canadian contribution was set considerably above the figure which would have been the result of an objective consideration of the different countries' position: Canada had a record for the payment of contributions which was second only to that of the United States. He sympathized with the desire of the United States to have its contribution reduced and recalled that the limit of one-third had been laid down at Beirut on a joint Canadian-American proposal seconded by Chile; but the rate at which the United States' contribution was reduced, as world conditions improved, must be related to other countries' capacity to bear that reduction. Other Member States which had been over-assessed felt that they also had the right to a reduction; furthermore, the reduction of the United States' contribution only (to 35 per cent of the Budget) would not take in consideration the position of other Member States in relation to the *per capita* principle which underlay the United Nations'

scale. Mr. Pollock stressed that Canada's contribution *per capita* would be higher than the United States' one if the full reduction were approved; he therefore proposed that the Commission grant the United States' request to the extent that it did not reduce the United States' contribution *per capita* below that of any other Member State.

Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) stated that his delegation supported the United States' request.

[16] Mr. SMITH (Australia) agreed with the principle of that request but he did not feel that the time was ripe for such a large reduction which would absorb the contributions of all the new Member States. He asked the Commission to remember that devaluation had increased many Member States' contributions by 30 per cent in terms of their own currency.

[17] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) pointed out that the Commission was faced simultaneously with a legal and a practical question.

There was a United Nations Committee with the task of examining the scale of contributions for 1951; its works was not yet concluded and hence, as Unesco was obliged to take account of that Committee's conclusions, no immediate decision could be taken; it was quite possible that the Committee in question might make allowances for population.

As regards the practical question, the delegate of the United States had indicated that his country's contribution was too high and out of proportion to that country's assessment for contributions to the other Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. If the Commission agreed to reduce the United States share to 35 per cent, Member States would benefit by an increased contribution by the United States to the other Specialized Agencies and this might well largely compensate for the reduction of the United States contribution to Unesco.

Mr. Guignolet was prepared to support the United States proposal unreservedly, it being of course understood that the position of all Member States would be re-examined in the light of the decisions of the special United Nations Committee.

[18] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) did not contest the reasonableness of the United States request and agreed that everyone was greatly indebted to the United States for their generosity. He would regret if the United States benefited by all the new subscriptions and if their proposal gave rise to similar requests from other Member States, but would nevertheless vote for the acceptance of the request.

[19] Mr. WEN (China) held that the United States request was fair, just and reasonable and wished to support it (1) on grounds of principle; (2) because over-generous contributions made suspicious people draw all kinds of unfair inferences and (3) in view of the assurance that, if the United States contribution to Unesco was scaled down, they would increase their contributions to other Specialized Agencies.

Dr. CASO (Mexico) said he would vote for the motion presented by the United States delegate, as he thought that request was equitable and reasonable.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) supported the principle of the United States request, but felt that it should be postponed a little.

Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) strongly supported the United States request.

Dr. OPRECHT (Switzerland) wished to support both the proposal by the United States, which was equitable from the ethical point of view, and the Canadian amendment to it.

[20] Mr. DESPOT (Belgium) supported the United States proposal, but said he must make certain reservations as regards the argument advanced by the Chinese delegate: it appeared undesirable to stress the political aspect of such a gesture, as this might be taken to imply that the United States generous support of Unesco since its inception was afforded with political ends in view.

[21] Mr. TECER (Turkey) also supported the United States proposal in principle; nevertheless it must not be forgotten that the Fifth Session of the General Conference was a turning-point in the Organization's life and that the adoption of the American proposal would have repercussions on the stability of Unesco's budget: it might be necessary to consider the reduction of certain activities in order to restore the balance. He therefore submitted that the question should be examined in close co-operation with the Programme and Budget Commission before any final decision was taken.

[22] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) proposed that the United States be granted the reduction, up to a maximum of 2.82 per cent of the 1950 scale, which would be granted without placing other Member States in the position that their contribution on a *per capita* basis exceeded that of the United States. He stressed that the resolution sponsored by the United States and Canada, and adopted by the United Nations, included the principle he had enunciated.

[23] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) was deeply grateful for the expressions of recogni-

tion of the United States' share in the common task. He wished to appeal to the delegate of Canada to separate the question of *per capita* contributions from that of a ceiling for the United States' contribution for 1951, and to leave the former to the consideration of a working party.

[24] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) was prepared to agree, provided the working party met first. He suggested that the Commission might be asked to say if it wished to treat both matters on an equal basis: if not, there would be no problem left.

Dr. OPRECHT (Switzerland) supported the proposal.

[25] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) pointed out that, according to the scale submitted to the Commission, the total contributions receivable from new Member States represented 2.87 per cent of the whole Budget, to be deducted proportionately from the contributions of all Member States. However, as the United States were asking for a reduction in their own contribution equal to 2.82 per cent of the total, there remained no more than 0.05 per cent for the relief of the remaining Member States. In these circumstances the speaker moved that a vote be taken on the reduction to 35 per cent requested by the United States, and that the Working Party be made responsible for the allocation of the 0.05 per cent remaining in hand.

[26] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States) stated that his delegation would vote against the Canadian proposal because it was not supported by relevant figures.

Mr. SMITH (Australia) agreed with Mr. Roseman's view on the Canadian proposal.

[27] Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) reminded the meeting that the establishment of the scale of contributions was the prerogative of the United Nations alone and that Unesco was obliged to conform to that scale. It therefore followed that the Commission had no jurisdiction and could not examine the proposed amendment.

[28] Mr. de CLEMENTI (Italy) remarked that he had already indicated his support of the request submitted by the United States delegation. As regards the Canadian delegate's amendment, he wished to make certain reservations, since if it were accepted without all its repercussions having previously been examined, certain States might be relieved at the expense of others which might not be able to stand an increase in their commitments; there were two quite separate questions at issue here. The United States wished to conform to the ceiling established for them at Beirut, and he (the speaker) supported Mr. Guignolet's proposal that a vote be taken on this point; the circumstances in which revised assessments might be decided should be considered separately.

[29] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) requested that Rule 76 of the Rules of Procedure (moving the closure) be applied.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) would regret the closure on an important matter on which his government had firm convictions; he did not believe that the Commission was unwilling to examine the problem because it was too complex.

The Commission decided on the closure of the debate by 22 votes to 4.

The proposal made by the delegate of Canada was *defeated* by a large majority.

The reduction of the United States assessment for 1951 to 35 per cent was *approved unanimously*.

[30] Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) remarked that his delegation was not yet in a position to vote on the entire scale because his government was interested in the actual figure for its contribution and considered the percentage figure relatively unimportant. If the contribution should turn out to be larger than the year before, his country would be placed in a difficult position. Accordingly he asked that final action on the scale should be postponed.

[31] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Conference voted a scale of contributions independently from the Budget; it was therefore impossible at present to quote any precise figures. A reduction of the United States' contribution to 35 per cent would not increase the percentage of the Philippines, and the assessments of the new Member States would probably reduce it a little.

The Deputy Director-General pointed out that paragraph 3, on page 3 of document 5C/ADM/3, would now have to be altered in view of the Commission's decision concerning the United States' contribution.

[32] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) moved the acceptance of the first version of paragraph 4 on page 3 (percentages of Austria and Hungary). *Adopted.*

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) seconded by Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) suggested the insertion, in paragraph 5 after "during 1950", of the words "and the decisions embodied in paragraphs 3 and 4 above".

Part II (Contribution of Ceylon to the Budget of 1949) was *adopted* without discussion.

Document 5C/ADM/3, including the resolution as amended above, was *approved.*

Consideration of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the Programmes and Budgets of the Specialized Agencies [document 5C/OXR/4].

[33] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL introduced document 5C/OXR/4, some parts of which dealt with Unesco's relations with the other Agencies. He pointed out that Annex II contained a series of resolutions relative to the Budgets for 1950 which could be divided in two groups: (*a*) those of a Programme and Budget character and (*b*) those of an Administrative nature. He suggested that paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Annex should be considered by the Programme and Budget Commission, and the remainder beginning with paragraph 3 (including nearly all of heading C) by the Administrative Commission. He suggested further that the Committee which was considering surpluses and deficits should examine the whole document and report on it before the Commission discussed it.

Agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Wednesday, 31 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. Tara Chand (India)

First Report of Committee No. 1 [document 5C/ADM/18].

Mr. SMITH, Rapporteur, introduced the report of the Committee on Member States' contributions and on possible amendments of the Financial Regulations.

Although the Committee had not gone into the question of disposal of surpluses and amendment of financial regulations, paragraph 1 indicated that the Committee did not foresee the possibility of any budgetary surplus being surrendered to reduce the contributions of Member States to the budget of 1951.

In paragraph 2, the Committee expected that the Administrative Commission would wish to point out clearly that the serious financial situation of Unesco was due to the failure of certain countries to pay their contributions.

In paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 the Committee had stated that in its opinion expenditures for each of the years 1950 and 1951 should be kept within the income reasonably expected to be received in respect of that year.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 referred more particularly to the level of expenditure for 1950, which should be kept within the estimated maximum income of the Organization. The Committee felt it was the duty of the General Conference to advise the Director-General of the amount of income reasonably to be anticipated; but the Director-General should be left free to modify the figure in the light of the information at his disposal after the session of the Conference. As the Director-General, after discussion with the Executive Board, had already made modifications to the programme for 1950 to effect certain economies, the Committee felt it desirable that any further necessary economies be left to his discretion.

Paragraph 5, however, underlined that the General Conference should assume responsibility for deciding where economies were to be made, and therefore recommended to the Programme and Budget Commission that it divide the Programme activites for 1951 into two sections: firstly, priority activities the cost of which should not exceed available funds; secondly, activities of lesser urgency, to be undertaken if extra funds became available.

The Committee felt that the scale of contributions of Member States would be an influencing factor in the decisions to be taken by the General Conference concerning the activities of the Organization and so had included paragraph 6 in its report. In view of later discussions of the full Commission, this paragraph was no longer applicable.

Dr. MASON (New Zealand) said his delegation was satisfied with the report, particularly with the paragraph requiring the Organization to limit

its activities to those which would have budgetary cover. He enquired how the figure of $7,500,000 was arrived at, in view of the fact that the budget was about $8,000,000 and the contributions received amounted to about 10 per cent of this figure.

Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) explained that the present deficit of the Organization (approximately $500,000) had been deducted from the total of $8,000,000.

Mr. SMITH (Rapporteur) added that the estimate of $7,500,000 was "the income which the General Conference reasonably anticipates to be available in respect of that year (1950)", as indicated in paragraph 3 and not necessarily received within the year 1950.

The Rapporteur pointed out that paragraph 6 was longer applicable and proposed its deletion. *Agreed.*

The report [document 5C/ADM/18] was *adopted unanimously*, subject to deletion of paragraph 6

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Thursday, 1 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Draft resolution on the scale of contributions for 1951 [document 5C/ADM/3, Corrigendum I].

[1] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that document 5C/ADM/3, Addendum II illustrated the formula for the scale of contributions as they would be fixed if the contribution of the United States of America were fixed at 35 per cent.

The resolution contained in document 5C/ADM/3 (Corr. I) was *adopted.*

It was *agreed* that the resolution contained in document 5C/ADM/19 be transmitted to the Plenary Meeting.

Annual Report of the Director-General on action taken in application of the Staff Regulations [document 5C/ADM/8].

[2] Mr. PYM (Head, Bureau of Personnel) informed the Commission that the UN Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions had not yet completed its study for a revision of Staff Regulations. Annex I to document 5C/ADM/8 listed revisions of Staff Rules made since the last session of the General Conference.

[3] The CHAIRMAN therefore proposed postponement of revision of rules. The question of the Appeals Board [document 5C/ADM/11] would be considered at a later meeting of the Commission.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) moved the *adoption* of the report.

The preamble of the report and Section A of Annex I were *adopted.*

Section B.

I. LOANS TO STAFF MEMBERS (2034).

[4] Mr. SMITH (Australia) pointed out that the administration of a working capital fund would automatically amend Regulation 2034, and reimbursement of loans to staff members would normally be limited to a twelve-month period.

[5] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) recalled that at the Fourth Session of the General Conference the French delegation had specially insisted that loans made to staff members should not be for a longer period than the balance of their contracts. He therefore sought an assurance that this requirement, which was not mentioned under Item 2034, had indeed been taken into account by the Secretariat.

[6] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) confirmed that strict financial controls were maintained as regards final payments to terminating staff members.

II. DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE.

[7] Mr. SMITH (Australia) asked the Secretariat

on what basis the dislocation allowance, which his Government felt to be extremely liberal, had been computed. He pointed out that the United Nations Report of the Committee of Experts had recommended the replacement of the expatriation allowance by a repatriation grant.

[8] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) enquired why employees recruited from areas 100 kilometres distant from Paris were eligible for a dislocation allowance, whereas those recruited within a slightly lesser distance received no such allowance.

[9] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) replied by pointing out that the dislocation allowance was designed to take the place of the United Nations expatriation and rental allowances. As a result of the devaluation of the French franc, the Director-General had proposed, and the Fourth Session of the General Conference had agreed to, a reduction of the rental portion of the dislocation allowance.

He explained that the dislocation allowance was granted to staff members living at least 100 kilometres from Paris, because they would have to bear certain supplementary expenses on moving into the capital to take up their duties. The Director-General was now considering limiting the dislocation allowance to persons recruited outside metropolitan France, though this might not seem altogether equitable, as persons normally resident in adjacent countries might actually reside nearer to Paris than those recruited from the South of France.

The Director-General had been in touch with the Experts concerning a proposal to abolish the dislocation allowance, and this item would be discussed at a later meeting of the Commission.

Section C.

I. Salary Allotments (2031).

[10] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) did not find it logical that Unesco staff members should be in a preferential situation as regards convertibility of a portion of their salary into a hard currency, in cases where these staff members were normally resident in soft currency areas. The point was particularly important in view of the requests of certain Member States that they might pay their contributions in other than hard currencies. A saving in hard currency expenditure might be effected through cessation of this system.

[11] Mr. SMITH (Australia) felt that it was excessive to permit 75 per cent of an employee's total emoluments to be converted into the currency of the staff member's home country; he suggested that an amount of 30 per cent would be ample for staff members having no family to maintain in their home country. He enquired what was the total amount of hard currency involved in these salary transfers.

[12] In reply, Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that French nationals could not, according to French law, have hard currency holdings; in order to give equality of treatment throughout the Secretariat, the Administration had agreed to hold back from a French employee's salary, at his request, a maximum of 25 per cent which could be paid to him at the current rate of exchange when required. This was a means to safeguard the savings of these staff members.

Hard currency transfers for other staff members were based on the principle of offering them a safeguard for their savings in currencies not subject to fluctuation and of allowing them to meet commitments in other countries. In many cases, the currency of an employee's home country could not be said to be freely convertible and the Administration has wished to give these employees some means of meeting their commitments.

He agreed that the figure of 75 per cent for the convertible portion of a salary might seem excessive, and the Director-General was considering a possible adjustment of this figure. However, the problem was complicated by many personal factors.

[13] Mr. SMITH (Australia) confirmed his proposal that the figure of 30 per cent should be laid down as a general rule, and that this figure might be increased in cases of need. The drain on dollar resources was too heavy under the present system.

[14] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) informed members of a report just received from the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization in which the Council had tentatively concluded that it would be possible, when the Organization moved to Rome, to allow present staff members normally resident in a hard currency area to receive 25 per cent of their salaries in that hard currency and an additional 30 per cent on special request. For present staff members normally resident in soft currency areas, the portion convertible into dollars or hard currency would be 20 per cent, on establishment of the fact that they had commitments in hard currencies, and a further 30 per cent might be converted into the currency of their

home country. New staff members would be permitted automatically to convert 20 per cent of their salary into the currency of their home country, and a further 30 per cent in cases of necessity.

[15] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) pointed out that France's exchange position had become considerably more stable in recent months: hence economic conditions in France no longer warranted the high percentage for transfers into hard currency authorized by previous Conferences. He therefore supported the Australian delegate in asking that such transfers be restricted to 30 per cent or, in very exceptional cases, 50 per cent.

[16] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) stated that, under the present system, the amount involved in dollar transfers for staff members was approximately $800,000 per annum.

Replying to Mr. Murtinho, he stressed two reasons why the Director-General was considering the problem of convertible portions of salaries: firstly, that the stability of the franc had greatly increased; secondly, that there was greatly increased availability of all types of commodities on the open market and therefore transfers of salary were not so necessary. He pointed out further that the only staff members who were allowed to convert 75 per cent of their salaries into hard currencies, were those resident in hard currency areas.

[17] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) asked the Secretariat to let the Commission have the approximate total of economies that could be effected by reducing the maximum limit of authorized transfers to 30 per cent.

[18] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) pointed out that the Staff Rules fell within the competence of the Director-General and the Staff Regulations were the province of the General Conference.

Residents of hard currency areas should be allowed to draw not more than 25 per cent of their salaries in hard currencies, plus a further 25 per cent in hardship cases upon presentation of suitable justification.

For persons normally resident in soft currency areas, provision should be for the transfer of similar percentages of salaries to those soft currency areas. Only in special cases should any transfer to hard currency areas be permitted, and a plea of provision against future devaluation was not acceptable.

The FAO was not in an identical position with Unesco, as it had been established in the United States of America for several years and its present staff members had probably made commitments there.

The figure of 25 per cent which he proposed resulted from study of the Report of the Committee of Experts, who had come to the conclusion that employees normally spent approximately 75 per cent of their salaries in the country where they worked.

[19] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL queried whether the discussion now centred round Staff Regulations or Rules; the latter were the responsibility of the Director-General who reported on them to the Conference.

He urged that the making of Rules continue to be left to the Director-General, since *he* made them in response to the particular needs he found in the Organization. He would be guided by the findings of the General Conference on hard currency needs.

The investigation of the claims submitted by staff members to receive payments in hard currencies was very difficult; further, it was not the function of the Director-General to determine what portion of his salary a staff member should save and what standard of living he should adopt. He hoped therefore that the precise percentage of convertibility would be left to the Director-General, but that he be invited to take note of the findings of the Commission; it was for the Conference to decide what portion of contributions should be made in hard currencies by Member States.

[20] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) referred to discussions which had taken place in the Classification Committee concerning the currencies in which contributions were to be paid. He agreed with the delegate of Australia that the Regulations had been on the whole on a generous scale, and he welcomed the fact that they were under reconsideration. As the need of the Organization was for dollars, the Commission might ask the Director-General to bear this matter very much in mind when deciding upon modifications of existing scales. He asked how far the adjustments discussed could come into effect in 1951 and thereby bring about savings and make it possible to accede to the requests of various countries for changes in the classification of their contributions. He supported the request of the delegate of Brazil for information on the approximate savings that might be effected through changes in the present system.

[21] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) suggested that an explicit recommendation to the Director-General to study the work done on this point by the United Nations be incorporated in the resolution to be submitted to the Conference.

[22] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) felt that the reduction in the percentages provided for in paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)* was likely to result in an appreciable reduction of the Organization's hard currency expenditure without detriment to the interests of the staff. He therefore felt that it was the duty of the Commission to present a detailed resolution in this connexion and not to leave it to the Director-General to take all the necessary decisions on this point. Might he also be informed whether the figures requested of the Secretariat could be supplied before the end of the Session?

[23] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) wished to warn the Commission that, if they could give no definite estimate of the amount of saving that might be effected through decreasing the convertible portion of salaries, then the Classification Committee would have to make an assumption themselves in the light of the discussions taking place and take this estimated saving into account in making their decisions.

[24] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the attention of the Director-General be drawn to the ratios given in Section C, paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)* and that he be asked to reconsider them and find out what reduction could be made in dollar expenditures.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed to submit shortly approximate figures of estimated savings.

The motion proposed by the Chairman was *adopted.*

[25] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) noted the statement of the Deputy Director-General that the data supplied by the Secretariat would enable the Commission to arrive at practical conclusions before it broke up.

Summing up, the CHAIRMAN stated that the Director-General would be asked to consider the dollar requirements of the Organization, the remarks and suggestions made at the meeting, to take note of the desire of the Commission that the dollar obligations be reduced, and to make suitable recommendations in the light of all these considerations. The Commission would consider and accept, or amend, the recommendations of the Director-General.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT (4363).

[26] Mr. SMITH (Australia) felt that, when plus or minus differentials were established in conformity with United Nations standards and New York salaries, then the cost-of-living adjustment should disappear.

[27] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the establishment of salary differentials for Unesco was based on the principle that there should be one international salary scale for all branches of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies; however, it had not yet been possible to determine completely how salaries should be adjusted to major fluctuations in the cost of living in the various countries.

The CHAIRMAN declared the report *adopted* subject to further discussion on items *(b)* and *(c)* of Section C.

Unesco Salary and Allowance System: A Report by the Director-General [document 5C/ADM/9].

[28] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that this report gave details of action taken in relation to United Nations recommendations on Salaries, Allowances and Leave. The first part reported on discussions between the Director-General and Directors of other Specialized Agencies. The second part related only to installation allowances for Havana, Cuba.

Annex I showed the maximum areas of agreement between the Specialized Agencies; some portions of the Report of the Experts were applicable only to the United Nations and some were not acceptable to all agencies.

The Fifth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly had referred the report back to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a report to the Fifth Session shortly to take place. However, the Secretary-General would proceed with certain of these recommendations, as they fell within his competence: these concerned children's allowances, education grants, installation and travel allowances and leave entitlements. The establishment of salary differentials and local salary scales would also be undertaken. Unesco should therefore determine whether and how to establish salary differentials in its capacity as Headquarters of a United Nations agency not established in New York.

It was proposed to establish local salary scales for persons locally recruited. The term "locally recruited" was understood to mean recruitment for those posts for which it was not generally necessary to seek candidates on a world-wide basis. Normally, posts subject to local recruitment were those between grades 1 and 7.

Keeping in line with the action of the United Nations, the Director-General did not find it necessary for the moment to proceed with any of the recommendations contained in the Experts'

Report other than those concerning differentials and local salary scales.

The main problem for Unesco in this respect was that its staff had had the advantage of United Nations salary scales since the establishment of the Organization and it was difficult to make changes at that stage. Further, the Experts' Report suggested that local salary scales should follow the "best prevailing rates" for similar jobs, and it had not yet been possible to determine exactly what these rates were. It should also be pointed out that local salary scales in Paris were relatively lower than those in New York or Geneva. The Food and Agricultural Organization, when transferred to Rome, would also meet this difficulty.

The United Nations had decided that, in applying the Expert Committee's Report, present staff members would neither suffer any reduction in their actual emoluments nor in the amount they at present anticipated receiving in increments up to the ceiling of their grade.

[29] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom), stressing that the Commission would wish the staff (on whom the success of the work depended) to be treated fairly, stated that he approved the proposals contained in the Report, with one or two exceptions. However, he could see no reason why Unesco should delay putting local salary scales into operation until other Organizations had taken the same action, as suggested in paragraph D.2, sub-paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)*, whose deletion he proposed.

Regarding sub-paragraph *(d)* he felt that six months was an adequate period during which to give notice of the proposed change to staff members, so that they might adjust themselves accordingly.

Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) agreed with the delegate of the United Kingdom; however, he felt that the period of transition might be one year.

[30] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) also agreed with Sir Henry French; he estimated the saving on salaries under the new system would be approximately $400,000 to $500,000 per annum. He did not think it necessary to obtain the prior approval of the Executive Board before putting the change into effect; it could be left to the Director-General to work out relations with the Staff Association in this matter. He drew attention to the types of arguments presented by the Staff Association and asked the members of the Commission to assess their validity.

[31] Mr. SMITH (Australia) also felt it unnecessary to wait until other Organizations had implemented local salary scales, and thought a six month period of warning sufficient. He enquired whether those salary scales, applying to grades 1 to 7, would include all non-geographical posts. He also wished to know whether local staff would be entitled to children's allowances, education grants and to enrolment in the Pension Scheme, and what would be their leave entitlements. As regards the Pension Scheme, he felt there should be a preliminary qualifying period of, say, five years, during which staff members could be enrolled in a Provident Fund; after the five years, when the permanence of their employment was established, they could enrol in the Pension Scheme. Children's allowances and education grants should only be allowed where they could be related to local practice.

[32] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) agreed in principle with the suggestions of the previous speakers; he wished, however, to point out that in France education allowances and family allowances were extremely important items. If Unesco decided to adopt the principle of a local salary scale, it should conform to the principles followed by French labour legislation in this matter.

To avoid any argument about the length of the adjustment period which should be accorded to the staff concerned, he would suggest that the new salary scale be applied as from 1 January 1951.

Lastly, he felt that, for psychological reasons, it would be well to discontinue all recruitment of local staff, save on a temporary basis, until the new scale came into force.

[33] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed with the delegates of the United Kingdom and the United States of America regarding sections *(a)* and *(b)*. As regards section *(d)*, he felt that the period of warning would depend on the nature of the separation benefits which would be granted to staff members recruited from abroad who felt that they could not continue their employment under the new scheme, as they might find themselves in a difficult position due to its too early application.

Reverting to Mr. Roseman's reference to the approval of the Executive Board, Mr. Pollock felt there was a slight misunderstanding here; section *(c)* applied only to details of the scheme, which the Director-General would discuss with the Board; but the general principle of its application would be decided by the Commission. He proposed, therefore, amending this section to read: "The views of the Executive Board shall be taken into consideration on details of the new scale." He proposed one year from the date of the decision of the Commission as a period of notice.

[34] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) asked the

Secretariat for additional data in connexion with Annex V (disparity between the salaries paid in Unesco and those paid in other organizations).

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) enquired whether the ceilings which present staff members could attain would remain the same when the new salary scales were applied, or whether they would be adapted to the new ceilings under the new local salary rate.

[35] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out the seriousness of implementing the new salary scales before this was done by other Organizations; it would certainly mean a saving to Unesco, but to each of the 400 staff members involved, it would mean quite a considerable loss, might affect their morale, and make it difficult for them to meet family and other obligations. There would be a great disparity between the take-home pay of local and international employees. He felt that it was all the more difficult for Unesco to take the lead in applying the new scales as it was the only Specialized Agency which had been working for three years on United Nations scales in an area where local salary rates were so very low.

Replying to the delegate of the United Kingdom, he explained that it was the proposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nation that existing staff members should not be affected by the new scheme, and their emoluments, present and anticipated in increments and in ceiling, should remain the same.

The provision concerning reference to the Executive Board was inserted in the text, as it was felt that the situation might change between the time of the vote of the Commission and the date of implementation of the scheme. However, if the scheme were put into effect immediately, reference to the Executive Board would not be necessary.

[36] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget), replying to the delegate of the United States of America, believed the ultimate saving would be in the region of $300,000 to $350,000 per annum; the exact amount would depend on the transitional provisions made for present staff.

Replying to the delegate of Australia, he confirmed that staff hired in the new local grades 1 to 7 would normally be assigned to non-geographical posts. In certain cases, however, where it was determined that the position was one in which the incumbent would normally progress to international status, the post would be considered as geographical for the purposes of appointment; he pointed out that there were certain non-geographical posts in grades above 7, particularly in the interpreting and translating sections.

The proposals concerning allowances, leave and pension rights were based on the principles set forth in the United Nations Report of the Committee of Experts, which provided for children's allowances and education grants at rates commensurate with local salary scales. Leave provisions for local staff would be in line with those of the international staff, taking into account local practice of the country of employment. As regards Pension Fund rights, Mr. Weitz pointed out that the largest percentage of permanent-type contracts were in the local category, and the Director-General felt that local staff should have Pension Scheme rights, which would also follow local salary rates.

In reply to the delegate of Canada, Mr. Weitz stated that staff members who felt that they could not stay with Unesco once the new scheme was brought into operation, would receive normal legal termination and repatriation pay, with no indemnities.

He referred the delegate of Brazil to document 5C/ADM/9 - Annex V for current rates of pay of other Organizations in Paris. The figures shown were the result of a thorough salary study, but it was difficult to determine a final salary scale without considering the benefits other than salaries received in the local market.

He stated that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had decided that present staff members should continue to enjoy both present and potential earnings on the old scale; any change in this decision would mean a severe financial loss to those persons.

[37] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) declared that his Government was strongly opposed to the policy proposed by the Secretary-General on this point. He did not feel that present staff members should continue *in perpetuo* to receive preferential treatment, but agreed that there should be a cushioning period during which their emoluments would gradually be reduced. He pointed out that other organizations, namely the International Labour Office, the International Civil Air Organization and the International Refugee Organization had already put local rates into effect, and they had proved quite satisfactory. He proposed that the Director-General be asked to promulgate new salary rates by 1 July 1950, based on the study of local pay which had been undertaken, and that the new rates be put into effect on 1st January 1951 for new staff members.

[38] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) felt that he could not withdraw his proposal for the deletion of sections *(a)* and *(b)* of paragraph C.2 of the report and proposed the adjournment of the meeting to give members time further to study the question.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Thursday, 1 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Unesco Salary and Allowance System: a Report by the Director-General (*continued*) [document 5C/ADM/9 and Addenda I and II].

Proposal to introduce local salary scales.

[1] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that certain differences of opinion still existed between delegations and the Secretariat on this point. The Director-General still felt that, on account of the peculiar position of Unesco at this time, it would be unwise for the Organization to take the lead amongst the Specialized Agencies in adopting this principle. However since delegations had expressed the opinion that Unesco should take its own decision without awaiting the advice of the other Specialized Agencies, he asked whether discussion of this matter could be deferred until after the week-end to permit the Secretariat to prepare a suitable plan for introducing the scheme with the least possible delay. The Secretariat would take into account the advice of the Commission with regard to the type of scheme to be adopted and to the time-limit for its application.

[2] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation was prepared to give the Secretariat time to prepare the details of the scheme. He felt very strongly that such a scheme was essential in Unesco and must be introduced immediately. The action of other Specialized Agencies in this regard had no relevant importance. The only important fact was that the lower grade personnel in Unesco had been grossly overpaid for a number of years—in relation to comparative rates of pay in Member States—and that this situation must be remedied at the earliest possible moment. He could not agree that the scheme should be applied gradually or that it should be applied in the beginning only to incoming personnel.

[3] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that staff members who had been with the Organization for some time—up to four years in many cases—had established a certain standard of living commensurate with the income they received from Unesco. If Unesco, having enabled these staff members to adopt a certain living standard, obliged them now to make a sudden adjustment to a much lower level, he felt that hardship would result.

[4] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) supported the remarks of Sir Henry French: he felt that there was no justification for maintaining such abnormally high rates of pay among the lower grade personnel and did not think that hardship would result from the immediate application of the proposed scheme.

[5] The CHAIRMAN then proposed a resolution on the following lines:

That . . .the details of this scheme should be brought to the attention of all staff members affected by 31 July 1950. Those staff members with less than two years' service would start being paid on local salary rates from 1 January 1951 and those staff with more than two years' service from 1 July 1951.

[6] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) supported the remarks of Sir Henry French and felt that, if Unesco decided to wait for WHO or FAO to take the initiative, a vicious circle of inaction would result, each organization waiting for one of the others to make the first move. He urged action at the earliest possible moment in this matter.

[7] Dr. MASON (New Zealand) also strongly supported Sir Henry French. He felt that this was an economy Unesco could not afford not to make, and pointed out that the staff members who had been with the Secretariat for a long period should, through experience, be able to live more cheaply in Paris than newly arriving personnel. However, it was important to remember that some of the personnel affected might resign from the Organization when the new salary scale was introduced and, for this reason, some delay might be advisable. He agreed with the proposal of the Chairman.

[8] Mr. SMITH (Australia) also agreed very firmly with Sir Henry French and other speakers. He suggested that the Director-General place his proposals before the Commission at the earliest possible moment and that the Commission then proceed to take an immediate decision.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) supported the remarks made, and in particular the suggestion of Mr. Smith.

[9] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) noted that the Commission was unanimous on this point but would await the statement of the Director-General before taking a decision. At the same time, his delegation felt that there were several other fields in which economies could also be made, in particular, installation allowances, annual and home leave, and *per diem* payments. He wished therefore to recommend that the Director-General be specifically requested to study these points and indicate what action he was prepared to take to secure greater economy.

[10] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) emphasized the logic of the Canadian delegate's suggestion. It would, however, be well to take due account of the lessons taught by experience, of the risk of fluctuations in the exchange rate and of the special problems at the Organization's headquarters.

[11] The CHAIRMAN asked whether all delegations were agreed that the Director-General should be asked to place his new proposals before the Sub-Committee of the Administrative Commission after the week-end. The Commission would then meet to consider the report of the Sub-Committee and to take a decision in this matter. *Agreed.*

Installation Allowance for Havana, Cuba [document 5C/ADM/9, Part II].

[12] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that this problem arose from the fact that the period for payment of the installation allowance in Paris had been cut from 90 to 45 days. This had resulted in serious hardship to staff members in Havana, and the Director-General had asked the Executive Board to authorize payment of the installation allowance for a period of 90 days in this one instance. This had been done and the General Conference was now asked to confirm the decision.

[13] In reply to Dr. Bender (Netherlands) Mr. WEITZ added that this proposal involved a total increase in expenditure of only $1,000, and that this item could be carried in the existing Budget for 1950 without further provision of funds.

This proposal was *approved.*

Representation Allowance for Department Directors [document 5C/ADM/9-Addendum I].

[14] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that, under authority of Staff Regulation 36, the Executive Board had approved a proposal by the Director-General to abolish the two posts of Assistant Director-General together with the corresponding representation allowance ($2,360 per annum each) and to establish instead five posts at grade 19 for Directors of departments, each with a representation allowance of $1,000 per annum. This involved a slight increase of $280 in the total amount required for representation allowances.

[15] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had a serious question to raise in the matter of representation allowances. He objected to the principle of alloting a fixed sum to cover hospitality requirements over a certain period, and preferred the system whereby vouchers were submitted to claim repayment for each expenditure incurred. He also preferred the proposal contained in the report of the United Nations Expert Committee that the representation allowance should be abolished and the salaries of personnel affected be increased proportionately.

[16] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) agreed that it was the custom in Unesco to pay a representation allowance on a non-voucher basis, but explained that, although the Director-General was studying this matter with the other Specialized Agencies, they had so far been unable to agree on a uniform system. In providing this representation allowance for Directors of departments, the Director-General had substantially reduced the funds available for hospitality in the departments concerned.

[17] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that Mr. Roseman was right in his statement that the

United Nations Expert Committee had proposed the merging of representation allowance with salary and the provision of funds for hospitality purely on a voucher basis. Since agreement would be reached on this matter during the course of the year, he suggested recommending that the General Conference approve the proposal of the Director-General for 1950 only, pending a final decision in this matter in agreement with the United Nations.

[18] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) then proposed the following resolution:

The Director-General is authorized to pay a representation allowance at the rate of $1,000 per annum to Directors of Departments established at grade 19, on the understanding that these arrangements will be reconsidered at the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

This resolution was *adopted*.

Reimbursement of State Income paid by Staff Members [document 5C/ADM/10].

[19] Mr. WEITZ (Head, Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget) explained that the Director-General had found recently that the United Nations had extended its system of income tax reimbursement to include the reimbursement of local and state taxes. The Director-General wished to ensure uniformity with the United Nations on this point and sought the authorization of the General Conference. At the present time the only Unesco staff members involved were United States citizens stationed in the United States and the sum required amounted to only a few hundred dollars.

There was no discussion on this point and the resolution contained in document 5C/ADM/16 was *adopted*.

Report on the Application of the Medical Benefits Scheme [document 5C/ADM/10].

[20] Mr. PYM (Head, Bureau of Personnel) explained that the report covered the period February 1949 to March 1950 and, although the Medical Benefits Scheme was working satisfactorily, it was felt that this period was not long enough to permit a real evaluation of the effectiveness of the scheme. The United Nations was proposing the establishment of a joint Social Security Scheme, and the Director-General therefore proposed the continuation of the present Unesco Medical Benefits Scheme for a further period of one year, at the end of which time a better opinion could be given and the merits of the two schemes compared.

[21] Mr. SMITH (Australia) asked whether the Secretariat considered it necessary to reinsure with Lloyds since the amounts concerned appeared to be extremely small; he thought it would be more economical for the Organization to bear the risk itself.

[22]) Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) replied that this had been done on the specific advice of the Actuary and that, until it could be decided whether or not this was in fact the best policy, it was considered better to abide by the advice of the Actuary.

[23] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) agreed with Mr. Smith that it would be more economical in the long run for Unesco to insure its own risks. He proposed that this matter be given careful attention and that it be referred to specifically in the report to the next General Conference.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Ceiling for 1951 budget.

[1] The CHAIRMAN informed members that the Programme and Budget Commission has asked the advice of the Administrative Commission on this matter.

[2] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that at its

last meeting the General Committee had decided to submit three questions to the Administrative Commission to enable the Programme and Budget Commission to reach a decision on the ceiling for the 1951 budget:

(1) If the Programme and Budget Commission were to adopt a ceiling of $8,205,000, would this figure represent a real or a "paper" budget, having regard to the fact that certain Member States were in arrears in the payment of their subscriptions? Assuming that it was a "paper" budget, what should be the total of the real budget available to the Organization?

(2) If the sum of $8,205,000 represented a real budget, what should be the ceiling figure to be adopted by the Programme and Budget Commission?

(3) If the Programme and Budget Commission voted for a ceiling of $8,205,000 on the grounds that this ought to be the amount of the real budget, what would be the measures recommended by the Administrative Commission for making up the deficit caused by the default of certain Member States?

The General Committee would be glad to have the views of the Administrative Commission on these three points sufficiently early for the Programme and Budget Commission to be able to reach a decision in the course of the afternoon.

[3] In the General Committee it had been pointed out that economies could be effected if the Conference decided to apply a new salary scale in the case of local staff. The Director-General was anxious to make his own attitude clear on this point. When he took charge of the Organization, the staff, although it did not realize it, did in fact consist of two categories: personnel recruited internationally as international officials, and personnel responsible for less intellectual work and recruited locally. Though this principle obtained in all international organizations, it had remained a dead letter as far as a local salary scheme was concerned, as regards Unesco's local staff, the latter being paid according to the local scale *of the United Nations* based on New York salaries (considerably higher than those in Paris, and thus in practice receiving sums considerably larger than those paid for similar services to employees in Paris. Application of a local salary scale to this category of Unesco staff would affect 60 per cent of the staff as a whole. Having regard to the importance of the material and ethical considerations at issue, he (the Director-General) had discussed the question with the Staff Association and had urged the equity of the principle accepted by the United Nations and all the Specialized Agencies. This view had been rejected by the Staff Association, which took its stand on the fact that the Constitution made no distinction in this respect between members of the staff and was of opinion that the application of a different scale to local staff would weaken the moral authority of the Constitution within the Secretariat itself. He had been struck by the force of this argument and had raised the question in the Executive Board, which had authorized him to submit it to the General Conference. Since the publication of document 5C/ADM/9 the situation had changed in two respects: (1) the Food and Agriculture Organization had taken certain decisions in the matter; (2) the Secretary-General of the United Nations had decided to apply the measures in question to local staff in United Nations European offices, though leaving unchanged the position of staff recruited prior to that decision.

[4] The Director-General wished to stress that, if the General Conference disregarded the recommendations in document 5C/ADM/9 and decided to go further in this connexion than the United Nations had gone, it would be departing from the principle of close co-ordination between Unesco and the United Nations, a principle that had recently been confirmed on the political plane by the Credentials Committee, whose report had been adopted in plenary session.

Having regard to the seriousness of the salary problem's repercussions, the General Committee had decided to ask the Administrative Commission not to take this point into consideration when studying the three questions submitted to it.

[5] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the difference between the actual and anticipated receipts on which the budget was based would have to be covered either by increases in the contributions of Member States or by increasing the Working Capital Fund.

[6] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) agreed that it was unnecessary to discuss in detail local salaries, but pointed out that all economies realizable would have a definite effect on the programme; economies effected in Part I of the programme (covering priority items) would make funds available for items in Part II (covering items of secondary importance).

[7] Referring to the Director-General's mention of arrears, he pointed out that the report of the Administrative Commission dealt not with arrears, but with the possibility that Member States might be unable to pay part or even the whole of their contributions. In 1950, actual receipts in contributions were expected to be $500,000 less than the total assessments; it was probable that the same proportion, would apply in 1951. If the Organization was short of half a million dollars

on a budget of $8,000,000 during 1950, then it was probable that on a budget of $8,205,000 the actual figure received would be approximately $7,600,000. If the programme was based on an amount of 8,205,000 as spending money, then, on the basis of previous experience of failure to receive full contributions, it would be necessary to have a ceiling figure of $8,800,000.

[8] Sir Henry stressed, however, that the Government of the United Kingdom for its part could not agree to such a large increase in the Unesco budget from $8,000,000 in 1950 to $8,800,000 in 1951. Furthermore he pointed out that the rate of expenditure during the first half of 1950 had been in the region of $7,500,000 per annum. He proposed that the Administrative Commission advise the General Conference to pass a budget of $8,200,000, but that expenditure should be kept at $7,600,000. This would not be such a reduction as would cause a drastic curtailment in the work of the Organization.

[9]) Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) wished to know whether, in estimating the total of contributions likely to be actually received by the Organization at $7,500,000, Sir Henry French had taken into consideration the fact that a total of $270,000 would almost certainly be recovered from one Member State in respect of the years 1948 and 1949.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) explained that contributions made in arrears were placed to the credit of the year for which they were due and therefore did not affect the budget of any other year.

Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) recalled that under Regulation 26 of the Financial Regulations surpluses should be credited to the 1950 Budget.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Commission had already taken into account any surpluses before arriving at the figure of $7,500,000.

[10] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) thought that the proposal he would be making in due course regarding the amendment of Regulations 25 and 26 of the Financial Regulations would make it possible to set aside a reserve of $700,000 which could be used to make good certain deficits. Secondly, the figure quoted by Sir Henry French as the probable deficit for 1950 struck him as pessimistic, having regard to the accession of new Member States, to the economies consequent on various devaluations and to the possible recovery of certain arrears of contributions. In his view the deficit of $600,000 on the 1951 budget could be covered by drawing on the Working Capital Fund.

[11] Mr. SMITH (Australia) stressed that most of the points made had already been covered in the report of the Committee of the Administrative Commission (document 5C/ADM/18), at least by implication. In discussions in the Committee, the budget figure considered was that which resulted from the assessments of Member States.

The three proposals contained in paragraphs 2 (*a*), 2 (*b*), 2 (*c*) of document 5C/ADM/5 (*c*) for financing the 1951 budget had been rejected by the Committee; in accordance with United Nations recommendations it had been decided that expenditure should be kept within the income that might be reasonably anticipated, and this resolution was contained in paragraph 5 of the report 5C/ADM/18 which divided the programme into two parts, the first covering priority items and the second covering items of lesser importance. This resolution should be brought to the attention of the Programme and Budget Commission.

Mr. Smith thought it inadvisable to state an actual budget figure, but proposed that the Commission stress that approximately 7 per cent of the assessed contributions would probably not be received in 1951.

Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) thought the Commission should base its calculations on the percentages determined by Mr. Smith.

[12] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) pointed out that, if the Organization proposed to spend $8,200,000 on the programme, there would be a deficit of 7 per cent to 10 per cent; this would have to be met either by asking for increased contributions from Member States or by increasing the Working Capital Fund. His Government might find necessary to withdraw from one or more of the Specialized Agencies if its contributions were continually increased in this manner.

[13] Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) and Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) both agreed that their Governments would be reluctant to approve an increased budget. Mr. de Villiers added that, when sanctions came up for discussion, he would have to raise the question of defaulting Member States, as he felt it unjust to ask other Member States to bear the responsibility for that part of the programme which should normally have been financed by the defaulting States.

[14] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) was not proposing that an actual figure for the budget be suggested to the Programme and Budget Commission; he had used the figures of $8,200,000 and $7,600,000 by way of illustration.

[15] Dr. MASON (New Zealand) stated that, as Governments had already considered the budget in terms of their assessed contributions and had

agreed to a figure close to $8,000,000, the Programme and Budget Commission should consider this figure as the one which would be acceptable. If it was anticipated that 7 per cent less than this would be the amount actually received, then expenditure should be maintained at a level of 7 per cent less. His Government would be unwilling to make good any deficit caused by the default of countries which did not pay their contributions.

[16] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) stressed that, if receipts of funds fell short of the amounts anticipated, there would have to be a corresponding curtailment in the programme. Any economies effected would result in additional funds for the programme. It was not sound financial practice to keep on adding to the Working Capital Fund to make up deficits. The Government of the United States, if fully convinced that the Unesco programme was worth supporting, might be prepared to increase its contribution; but they had certain reservations about the programme as presented by the Executive Board. With these additional comments, he supported the views expressed by the delegate of Australia.

[17] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) declared that his Government would also feel more confident in supporting Unesco if there were less confusion and more concentration of purpose in the programme. He believed there could be no alternative to the proposal made by the Commission, that the programme be divided into two parts. Member States should not propose programmes to which they were unwilling to contribute financially, and the Programme and Budget Commission must face this situation realistically.

[18] It was *agreed* that the committee would draft a resolution for presentation to the Programme and Budget Commission, recommending that the latter divide the programme into two parts, as previously proposed by the Administrative Commission in document 5C/ADM/18: the first part would be financed out of approximately 93 per cent of the budget funds and the second part would be undertaken only if funds were actually available. The actual expenditure on the programme should therefore be about 7 per cent less than the budgetary ceiling. Furthermore, the resolution should contain a statement to the effect that, in the course of the discussion, it was made clear that some Member States would find unacceptable any increase of the budget over the 1950 figure.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

NINTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Replies of the Administrative Commission to the enquiries addressed to it by the Programme and Budget Commission [document 5C/ADM/20].

[1] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, read the report of the Sub-Committee appointed to deal with matters referred to the Administrative Commission by the Programme and Budget Commission [document 5C/ADM/20].

The report was *approved* and it was *agreed* to transmit it to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Member States in arrears with their contributions.

[2] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to the recommendation document [5C/ADM/19] inviting the General Conference to pass a resolution addressed to heads of delegations of Member States in arrears with their contributions, asking them to inform the Director-General before the end of the Conference of the date upon which payment of those arrears could be expected. The Deputy Director-General and the Comptroller

were at the disposal of any delegation which wished to discuss its contribution with them.

[3] Professor PHOTIADES (Greece) supported the Deputy Director-General's suggestion that delegations should discuss their contributions with him or with the Comptroller.

[4] The Secretary recalled that the resolution addressed to heads of delegations was to have been referred to the Plenary Session; but, as the latter was not to meet for several days, he suggested that it should be sent to the General Committee for communication to heads of delegations.

Agreed.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

TENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 7 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Report on the Application of the Medical Benefits Scheme with Detailed Actuarial Statement [document 5C/ADM/10].

The resolution [paragraph 3, page 2 of document 5C/ADM/10] was *provisionally approved.*

Report on the International Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies [document 5C/ADM/11].

The resolution [paragraph 4, page 2 of document 5C/ADM/11] was *approved.*

Distribution of members of the Secretariat by nationality [document 5C/ADM/12].

[1] Mr. KIRPAL (India) stated that his delegation was not satisfied with the composition of the Secretariat: out of a total of 345 posts, 185 were filled by Europeans, while Asia was represented so that the criteria laid down in Article IV of the Constitution were not fulfilled. The speaker expressed the hope that the size of financial contributions never influenced geographical distribution. In conclusion, he moved the following resolution:

The Administrative Commission receives the report of the Director-General on the distribution of members of the Secretariat by nationality, takes note of the fact that the distribution of personnel has not so far been made on a wide geographical basis and recommends that the General Conference instruct the Director-General to re-examine the methods of recruitment and to take all necessary steps to improve the distribution of posts by nationality as soon as possible.

[2] Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) seconded the proposal of the Indian delegate. In his view no progress had been made as regards better geographical distribution within the Secretariat, despite numerous recommendations to that effect.

The Egyptian delegation would have something to say regarding the recruitment of the staff of the Secretariat. On the present occasion it merely wished to point out that if certain delegations raised the problem of geographical distribution, the object was not to secure appointments for their nationals nor even observance of the Constitution; they were concerned to increase the effectiveness of the Organization and to give confidence to the peoples.

[3] Mr. GHANI (Pakistan) supported the view expressed by the delegate for India, particularly because Pakistan was not represented on the staff at all.

U BA (Burma) supported the Indian delegation's proposal. It was his country's wish to contribute fully to Unesco's work and to be represented at headquarters.

Dr. OBERPARLEITER (Austria) also supported the proposal and asked that his country's importance should be acknowledged by an increase of the number of posts allotted to it.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) associated himself with the views expressed by the previous speakers.

Mr. SMITH (Australia) supported the resolution and also the Egyptian delegate's remarks on recruitment. Posts had often been filled by

candidates who happened to be on the spot, and he thought a greater effort should be made to recruit suitable people wherever they might reside.

Dr. SOERACHMAN (Indonesia) supported the Indian delegation's proposal.

Mr. DESPOT (Belgium) said that the Belgian delegation supported the point of view expressed by the Australian delegation. He thought the present geographical distribution of the staff was a direct consequence of the system of recruitment hitherto adopted, the difficulty for Member States being to know exactly what posts were vacant in the Secretariat. He therefore suggested that in future the Secretariat notify all open posts to Member States, with a request that the latter insert announcements in the press and in official publications.

Dr. PARRA PEREZ (Venezuela) associated himself with the remarks of the delegate of India.

He went on to say that he himself had not been aware that a Venezuelan was employed in the Secretariat and had only learnt of this fact from the lists prepared for the Conference.

[4] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that no one could possibly take exception to the Indian proposal to improve the geographical distribution of the Secretariat. Attention should however be called to the fact that an improved distribution depended on a stable programme. The great number of changes in the latter had entailed corresponding changes in the Secretariat, but Unesco was moving rapidly toward a more lasting programme and, as a result, the Director-General would be able to embark on a long-term recruitment policy. In the past, pressure of time and qualifications had been the paramount considerations and had compelled the Director-General to seek immediately available assistance. For practical purposes he did not think it would be wise to adopt the policy of notifying the Member States of the vacancies which occurred: much time went by, and posts were usually filled because of pressure of time, before replies were received. At present a recruitment policy was under consideration which would look six months ahead.

The Commission *took note* of the Director-General's Report and *decided* to recommend to the General Conference the Indian delegation's resolution.

Report on the organization of the Secretariat [document 5C/ADM/13].

[5] Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) said his delegation was alarmed by the rapid increase of the Secretariat. The Beirut Conference had proposed a ceiling of some 720 staff members and the 840 envisaged for 1951 seemed to him too large a number; he thought 600 should be sufficient. He was also concerned by the size of the External Relations Service which was becoming a small Foreign Office with more staff than it really needed.

[6] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) stressed that the matter was very delicate to comment upon. The organization of any kind of Office depended, in a large measure, on the individual views of its head and the United Kingdom delegation had some hesitation to make adverse comment upon the Report. It felt, however, that the size of the Director-General's Office might prove harmful to the Organization, as it would tend to separate the Director-General from the Heads of Departments, Bureaux and Services. Furthermore, responsibility for over-all co-ordination could not be delegated and no buffer between the Director-General and those who ought to be his closest advisers should exist. From personal experience he knew that the smaller the private secretariat of a Minister, the more efficient the Ministry was.

[7] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) stated that his Government also felt concerned about the size of the Secretariat and of the scope of the External Relations Service, as referred to on page 2, paragraph 5. He agreed with Sir Henry's remarks concerning the Office of the Director-General.

[8] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the Commission's comments went to the very heart of the Organization. He asked whether the Commission might not wish the Director-General himself to reply to the views expressed.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) held the matter to be of such vital importance that he was in favour of the Deputy Director-General's suggestion.

Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) proposed that all further discussion on the paper should be postponed pending the Director-General's arrival. *Agreed.*

Proposal by the Venezuelan delegation for the establishment of a supervisory commission [document 5C/29].

[9] Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) drew attention to a typographical error on the first line, on page 3, of the French text of the document: "voting members" should read "retiring members".

First of all he wanted to make it clear that

this was a proposal involving no expense in 1951. Secondly, he thought it important to set up a permanent supervisory commission deriving its authority from the General Conference, now that there was a question of the Conference meeting biennially only and of consequential changes in the powers of the Executive Board.

If the proposed figure of five members was felt to be insufficient, he thought that it could be raised to seven, but not more. The majority, but by no means all, of these members, would be financial experts.

Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) wondered whether it would not be better to submit the question to the Executive Board before asking the Commission to take a decision.

Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) thought it would be preferable to submit the question to the Executive Board only if accompanied by a report by the Director-General on the subject.

[10] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) was very glad to support a very careful study of the Venezuelan delegation's proposal, but he was not quite clear how it would work out, since the new body envisaged would be composed of government officials and its work would overlap, to a certain extent, with that of the Executive Board and of the Finance Committee, whose members sat in their individual capacity. He suggested bringing into the resolution a consideration of the Budget Committee's views on the subject, and was somewhat troubled by the reference to the inclusion of the matter in the Agenda of the Sixth Session—a decision which should be left, according to him, to the Executive Board.

[11] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) welcomed the Venezuelan delegation's effort to draw the attention of the Conference to the very serious problem of financial organization. He agreed that Unesco must have a more efficient and effective procedure in that respect than heretofore. He endorsed the remarks of the United States delegate and urged that the experience of the other Specialized Agencies in connexion with this problem should be taken into consideration. In his opinion, the matter of auditing was not entirely satisfactory and should also receive the Executive Board's further consideration.

[12] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) was in favour of deleting the words: "and inclusion . . . Conference", at the end of the resolution.

Dr. PARRA PÉREZ (Venezuela) did not see how the question could be resolved by the Executive Board in 1951. It must be included in the Agenda of the Sixth Session of the General Conference, since the proposed Supervisory Commission must be set up by the General Conference itself.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) did not wish to press the point, but he thought that the Budget Committee should be invited to comment on the proposal.

Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) agreed with the delegates of the United States and Canada.

[13] Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) seconded the proposal of the Venezuelan delegation. He had noted that one dominant feature of the whole Conference was its concern with regard to the budgetary repercussions of all the projects considered. This state of affairs might well threaten to suffocate all Unesco's activities. A Supervisory Commission deriving its authority direct from the Conference could certainly improve the financial position of the Organization and thus allow such considerations to be relegated to second place.

Dr. de GODOY (Brazil) supported the Venezuelan proposal and said he would welcome any procedure which would ensure speedy consideration of the matter.

[14] The Commission *adopted* the resolution submitted by the delegate for Venezuela, slightly amended to read as follows:

The General Conference requests the Director-General to study a proposal for setting up a Supervisory Commission, in accordance with the principles described by the Venezuelan delegation, and with the Budget Committee's comments on it, and to submit the results of his investigations to the Executive Board for consideration and inclusion in the Agenda of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

Report on the organization of the Secretariat (*continued*) [document 5C/ADM/13].

[15] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the organization of a Secretariat such as Unesco's was a very difficult and complex problem, in which theory was far removed from practice.

Unlike certain other organizations, Unesco had a very wide field of activity, which had involved the creation of a number of departments to carry out the Programme. Within these departments, each of which was concerned with a particular discipline, it was necessary to recruit qualified specialists; while secondly, the execution of the Programme required considerable administrative services; for instance, a Unesco without a documentation or a statistical service would be inconceivable.

It thus followed that the task of the Director-General was essentially one of co-ordination, and he was daily obliged to examine and discuss problems from fourteen widely differing services or bureaux.

[16] A number of systems had been considered with a view to securing the best possible co-ordination:

(1) The Director-General could have the assistance of a Deputy Director-General and a number of Assistant Directors. In practice, this solution had proved unsatisfactory, as it was difficult to place several disciplines under a single specialist;

(2) There could be two Deputy Directors-General, one to be responsible for assisting the Director-General in the execution of the Programme and the other to assume all administrative responsibilities. This solution had also been rejected, as it would tend to create two rival authorities within the Secretariat, between which the Director-General would constantly have to arbitrate;

(3) What had been felt to be the only possible solution for Unesco had been the strengthening of the Director-General's Office, with a Director (Grade 19) and a Senior Executive Office (Grade 17).

[17] The Director-General, who was at the centre of all Unesco's enterprises, needed extensive direct assistance within his Office in the consideration of the problems submitted to him, which it was physically impossible for him to deal with single-handed. Secondly, part of the Director-General's duty was travelling, and he would need to travel still more if the General Conference met biennially only. In such cases it was essential that the Deputy Director-General should be able to replace him; and the Deputy Director-General would himself be required to do considerable travelling. All this was only possible, both for the Director-General and for the Deputy Director-General, if they had the help of a strong Office.

The Office of the Director-General was not, as had been said, a screen between the Director-General and the Departments; on the contrary it was a bridge by which liaison was maintained. It was, in fact, that Office which classified and examined problems from the twofold standpoint of balance in the Programme and administrative practice. This resulted in the Director-General receiving full documentation on the various problems, so that he could take decisions in the light of full knowledge and a clear general picture.

Secondly, the Director of the Office of the Director-General acted as secretary of the weekly meeting of Heads of Departments and Services and ensured the co-ordination and consolidation of the reports presented by the departments.

Planned on these lines, the Office was still far too small, and all its members were heavily burdened.

[18] As regards the External Relations Service, it too had to perform a wide variety of duties, maintain contact with Member States, National Commissions and non-governmental organizations, and secure the necessary co-ordination with the United Nations. Only with the help of this Service could the National Commissions develop as all delegates hoped they would. It was this Service, too, which ensured that specialists sent on missions to Member States were supplied with the necessary documentation and which gave them directives, so as to avoid a new crop of regrettable experiences due to the inadequate preparation of such missions.

The Director-General felt that the organization of Unesco must not be judged by the standard of a Ministry, or even of other Specialized Agencies like the International Labour Organization, which had many years of practical experience behind them.

[19] Dr. WALKER (Australia) was very interested in the Director-General's statement. He was sure everyone recognized how carefully the Director-General had studied the very complex problem of the organization of the Secretariat for which he was alone responsible. The Australian delegation was confident that the Director-General would take into consideration all the views expressed in the Commission and wished to thank him for his explanations.

[20] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) also praised the Director-General's exposé and agreed with Dr. Walker's remarks, but it still seemed to him that in technical fields—with the help of the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget, the External Relations Service and the Bureau of Personnel, all fairly independent units—the Director-General's work could be decentralized by many decisions being taken at a lower level, and by closer integration at that level.

[21] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL felt that it was not possible to place all administrative questions in charge of a single man without that person having simultaneously a degree of responsibility in the execution of the Programme. As he had already pointed out, the expedient of appointing an Administrative Assistant Director could not be entertained.

To his mind the only solution was to make the Director and Senior Executive Officer of the Director-General's Office responsible for examining both policy questions and their administrative implications. It would appear necessary for these two officials to consult together before submitting the questions to the Director-General.

Furthermore, the idea of creating a post of

Administrative Director had been rejected to avoid placing the administrative services in a position of inferiority vis-à-vis the Programme Departments, which were not under a single Head.

The Director-General concluded by stating that the solution adopted seemed to him to be from all points of view the least bad which could be found in the circumstances.

[22] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) wished to say that his apprehensions were greatly relieved by the Director-General's statement. He noted with great satisfaction his intention to hold bi-weekly meetings with the Heads of Departments and realized the colossal task the Director-General was facing.

[23] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) was extremely grateful to the Director-General for clarifying the position. He emphasized that the problem of co-ordination within Unesco should be the responsibility of every member of the Secretariat.

[24] Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) also thanked the Director-General for his exposé which would give a very satisfactory answer to the Norwegian National Commission's preoccupations.

[25] Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) thought the course of the Organization should be re-directed so as to put more stress on its ends and less on the means to achieve them.

The Commission *decided* to receive the Director-General's report on the organization of the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Thursday, 8 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Report of the Committee on Currency of Contributions [document 5C/ADM/21].

[1] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) declared that few Member States had applied for a transfer to another category with regard to currency of their contributions. The report under consideration applied only to contributions for 1951. Contributions from Member States were divided into three categories:

(*a*) Paid in U.S. dollars, pounds sterling or French francs;

(*b*) Paid in U.S. dollars;

(*c*) Paid in Swiss francs. This last category was limited to one country—Switzerland.

Brazil and Mexico had been transferred from category (*b*) to (*a*).

Uruguay would remain in Category (*b*) during 1951, as it could pay in pesos for the Field Science Co-operation Office established there.

The two new Member States, Indonesia and Yugoslavia, had been accepted in category (*a*).

Korea and Hashemite Jordan had been recommended for category (*a*) and Costa Rica for (*b*).

[2] The new percentage in hard currency at the disposal of Unesco would be 44.92 per cent instead of the 47.6 per cent which had been estimated as necessary. However, in view of the proposed reduction in hard currency salary transfers, the Committee felt this reduced hard currency budget would suffice.

Sir Henry FRENCH stressed, however, that if many more applications for transfer to soft currencies were received, the whole question of the provision of hard currency by Member States would have to be reviewed.

[3] The annex to document 5C/ADM/21 contained a proposed resolution which was an amendment of the resolution in document 5C/ADM/4; this required the approval of the Administrative Commission. The resolution stated the alterations and additions to the different categories and retained the part which enabled the Director-General to accept contributions in national currencies when he deemed it advisable, at the best prevailing rate of exchange against the U.S. dollars.

Sir Henry FRENCH moved that this annex be substituted for the resolution in document 5C/ADM/4.

[4] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), referring to paragraph 10 of the report of the sub-committee, felt that arrangements should be made to place Member States in an equivalent position so far as payments of contributions were concerned; there was little justification of a continuation of the present system.

In reply to an enquiry from Mr. JAWAD (Iraq), the CHAIRMAN stated that Iraq had been placed in category (*a*).

[5] Mr. RODRIGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) emphasized that the solution adopted as regards Uruguay's payments was directly connected with the existence in his country of a Field Science Co-operation Office. If that Office were to be closed, Uruguay would automatically revert to category (*b*) for payment of its subscriptions.

The Uruguayan delegation asked most earnestly that this solution, which was the result of an *ad hoc* bargain, should be regarded as provisional and applying only to the year 1951. For subsequent years the delegation asked that Uruguay, like Mexico and Brazil, be given the right to request a change of category.

The CHAIRMAN made it clear that this solution would in fact be deemed provisional.

[6] In reply to an enquiry from Mr. SMITH (Australia), Mr. HARPER-SMITH (Comptroller) explained that the limitation of the categories to three, instead of four, had been a suggestion of the Director-General and had no consequence on Unesco's Budget.

The report was *adopted* unanimously.

Report of the Headquarters Commission [document 5C/ADM/14].

[7] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this document was a report from the Headquarters Commission and not from the Director-General. The problem was to find a method of financing the proposed building.

The SECRETARY explained that page 3 of the document should be entitled: "Annex I — Estimate of the Chief Architect of the Palais de Chaillot for building the new Headquarters".

[8] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) wondered whether it would not be well to submit Mr. Carlu's estimate [Annex I of document 5C/ADM/14] for consideration by an international group of architects.

[9] Mr. SMITH (Australia) agreed in principle with the desirability of Unesco having its own building but felt that the present General Conference should not take a final decision. Member States had at the moment insufficient information on both the financial and location aspects. Unesco was at present going through a difficult period but it was hoped to reach before long financial and staff stability; until that stage was reached, no decision should be taken. He proposed that further investigations be undertaken in the coming year and that it be left to the Sixth General Conference to take a final decision.

Agreeing with this view, Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) proposed that the Director-General be requested to make sure that all the space available was actually used by Secretariat members instead of being lent to delegations of Member States and other international bodies as at present.

[10] On an enquiry from the Chairman whether the resolution which appeared on page 2 of document 5C/ADM/14 was acceptable to members, Mr. SMITH (Australia) stated that he could not agree that an authorization should be given to the Director-General to accept, with the approval of the Headquarters Commission, a site and an interest-free loan. No commitment of this type should be made. He reminded members of the discussion in the Budget Committee as to whether it was permissible to draw certain amounts, as provided for in paragraph (II) of the resolution, from the Working Capital Fund.

[11] Dr. BENDER (Chairman, Budget Committee) declared that the Budget Committee had taken no decision on the matter though it had been suggested that if a special fund were set up for building new Unesco Headquarters fees for investigations should be drawn from that fund.

[12] The SECRETARY explained that two different sums had been discussed under paragraph (ii) of the resolution. The first sum was $5,000 in payment for the architect's plans of the building. The second was $16,000, which would be needed if it were decided to appoint a Board of Design Consultants to discuss the plans submitted. If the Commission decided that no commitment must be made at present, then it would not be necessary to provide this latter amount. Any sums now drawn from the Working Capital Fund would be reimbursed to that Fund when the appropriation for the construction of the building was decided upon.

[13] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) thought that an instruction to the Director-General to pursue discussions with the French Government would be a merely nominal solution and would be equivalent to referring the question to the Sixth General Conference.

The French Government could make land available to Unesco but the available areas were

free now and as things were today they could not remain unused indefinitely pending a decision by the 1951 Conference.

[14] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the real estate situation in Paris; the Organization would receive very few offers of sites if it had not the power to enter into a commitment.

The Director-General had pointed out that Unesco's present premises were unsatisfactory from the point of view of efficiency and there was definite need of a new building. As an interim measure, the annex to the Hotel Majestic had been rented, but that did not solve space problems in a satisfactory manner.

[15] Mr. SMITH (Australia) reminded members that while he accepted the principle of the desirability of building a new headquarters, he thought it would create a bad impression if the Organization declared it was unable to carry out certain urgent programme activities owing to lack of funds and then spent approximately $4,500,000 on new premises.

He proposed an amendment to the resolution on page 2 of document 5C/ADM/14, to the effect that, while the Commission approved in principle the provision of a new building for the headquarters of the Organization, it felt that, in view of the financial situation, it was not opportune to take a final decision at present.

[16] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) admitted the administrative economies that would ensue from the construction of an appropriate headquarters and felt that the additional cost above the present rental paid would not be excessive. However, he stressed that further negotiations and investigations were necessary before any commitment could be made and that Member States should have full information on all aspects of the question.

[17] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), declaring the willingness of his Government to support the original resolution, enquired whether the resolution proposed by the delegate of Australia would impede negotiations for a site and an interest-free loan. He felt the creation of a Board of Design Consultants inadvisable, but suggested that Government architects from Member States be called in for the examination of plans proposed by the chief French architect.

[18] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the Headquarters Commission was formed of representatives of Member States and it was disturbing that the Administrative Commission now proposed that the Director-General, in consultation with the Headquarters Commission, should not be allowed to go beyond the negotiation stage.

[19] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) said he understood that the French Government would be prepared (1) to grant Unesco a site free of charge; (2) to grant a long-term loan free of interest, repayment being spread over as much as twenty or twenty-five years. If this was so, the difference between the rent now paid and the yearly payments under the new scheme would be very small. He accordingly felt that, if Unesco were to receive a suitable offer from the French Government, the Director-General should be authorized to consult the Executive Board with a view to an immediate decision.

[20] Mr. de GODOY (Brazil) was surprised at the hesitation displayed by some members of the Commission. He had thought that there was agreement already on the need for Unesco to build headquarters of its own and that the only problem was exactly how this was to be carried out.

He agreed with the Egyptian delegate that a difference of $70,000 per year between the present rent and the proposed annual payments was very small. He disagreed completely, however, with the United States delegate's suggestion that action in 1951 should be confined to meetings of government architects.

In his view, the problem was not merely one of finance or of erecting a building for use as offices, but rather of creating a work of art which might be epoch-making in architecture and which, from this point of view, laid on Unesco certain artistic responsibilities.

He accordingly supported the Secretariat's suggestion regarding the continuance of negotiations and the acceptance of an offer of a loan.

[21] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) stressed that there was a fundamental difference between the resolution originally proposed and that of the delegate of Australia; this hinged on the word "accept". If the Director-General accepted a site and a loan, then Unesco was under a moral obligation to build, and he wished to know from where the necessary funds would come.

[22] Mr. SMITH (Australia), reverting to the statement of the Deputy Director-General, declared that representatives of Member States forming part of the Headquarters Commission had not been able to receive instructions from their governments as no detailed information on the project and its cost had been made available to these governments.

[23] Dr. MASON (New Zealand) asked whether the real estate position would be worse in one year's time than now, and did not find precipitate action advisable.

[24] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) declared his Government ready to approve the construction of a new building. He asked whether there had been any negotiations so far on a site and an interest-free loan. The acceptance of a site did not necessarily commit Unesco to start construction, which could be left till after the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[25] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) emphasized that the problem had two facets. (1) First of all, a site had to be found in Paris within the circuit of the outer boulevards. As things were today, there were very few sites available in this area and consequently the time factor was important. It would be difficult for the French Government to do anything without having received, if not formal assurances, at least some degree of assurance from Unesco justifying its taking a year's option on a site. (2) Pending a firm decision, the question of a loan, too, was not easy to solve. If it was difficult for Unesco to give formal assurances without knowing the actual conditions of any loan, it was also difficult for the French Government to consider a loan without having any details in its possession.

In reply to the delegate of Canada, the speaker said that the negotiations undertaken with the Ministry of Finance in the latter connexion had taken a favourable turn and could be completed rapidly if the Conference took a formal decision. The meeting could rest assured that the problem could be satisfactorily solved in both its aspects, given a positive reply from Unesco.

[26] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) felt he should correct a reference by the Chairman to his (the speaker's) earlier remarks. He had said he was in favour of accepting the French Government's offer; that, however, did not imply that the erection of the building must be undertaken forthwith. A considerable time would necessarily elapse between acceptance and the completion of the plans for building.

[27] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) could not agree to the Director-General being authorized to accept a site and interest-free loan before the next meeting of the General Conference, as Unesco would then be committed to build at an early date. However, he thought the Director-General should be authorized to obtain from the French Government a clear understanding that they would grant to Unesco such a site and loan.

[28] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) suggested the following amendment to paragraph (i) of the resolution proposed by the Headquarters Commission [document 5C/ADM/14, page 2]:

To continue negotiations with the French Government and, with the approval of the Headquarters Commission, *to take an option on a site and accept* an interest-free loan for a suitable period of time.

The French motion, supported by the delegates of AUSTRALIA, CANADA, the UNITED KINGDOM and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, was *unanimously adopted.*

[29] In reply to a question by the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL, Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) said he did not think that exact details regarding the proposed building could be supplied to the Sixth Session of the General Conference unless the site had been definitely chosen.

[30] It was *agreed* that it was unnecessary to have the construction proposals examined by an international board of design consultants before the Sixth Session of the General Conference, and paragraph (ii) of the resolution contained on page 2 of document 5C/ADM/14 was therefore *adopted.*

Provision of Space and Facilities at Unesco House to Member States and International Organizations [document 5C/ADM/15].

[31] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) found it undesirable that so much space in the Unesco building was devoted to persons other than Secretariat members, and proposed the following motion:

The Director-General is instructed to take steps as soon as possible in order to obtain vacant possession of all parts of the existing buildings which are at present occupied by delegates of Member States and by bodies other than Unesco itself, alternatively, in any exceptional case where the Director-General is of opinion that the present occupation is desirable in the interests of Unesco, he shall be free to allow this to continue provided that a proper tenancy agreement be entered into, including the payment of a commercial rent from an early date.

[32] Mr. SMITH (Australia) seconded this motion, with the proviso that, as some non-governmental organizations housed at Unesco received grants from Unesco, it would be necessary to increase these grants by the amount of the estimated rent, or rather to mention the amount of estimated rent in the terms of their grants.

[33] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the work of those organizations was to assist in the implementation of Unesco's

programme and they must maintain very close contact with Unesco. It would therefore seem undesirable to charge them rents.

[34] Sir Henry FRENCH (United Kingdom) asked the Director-General to reconsider whether the presence of those institutions on the premises was necessary, and advocated leaving the final decision to his discretion.

[35] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) indicated that under a recent decision of the Official and External Relations Commission subventions to international non-governmental organizations could take the form of the provision of premises in Unesco House and that such facilities would not require formal agreements.

Incidentally, the provision of accommodation was proving extremely useful both for non-governmental organizations and for Unesco, as the working relations between them were very close and it was in their interest to be accommodated in the same building.

Now that Unesco was in possession of the Annex to the Hotel Majestic, it had more than sufficient accommodation for its own needs and would certainly be in a position to accommodate delegations and non-governmental organizations until such time as it could install itself in the building whose erection was under consideration.

[36] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) requested that the Director-General assess the relationship between the programme departments of Unesco and the non-governmental organizations housed in the building. He agreed that delegations of Member States should pay rent for space and facilities.

[37] It was *agreed* that the estimated rental amount should be mentioned in the terms of Unesco grants to non-governmental organizations.

[38] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked the Commission to take into account that some Member States found difficulty in paying their contributions and the establishment of rents might preclude their maintaining close contact with Unesco and thus impede the development of the Organizations's work in those States.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) did not think the argument applied to the Member States listed as occupying space in Unesco House. He enquired whether it was proposed to charge "commercial" or "adequate" rents.

Dr. BENDER (Netherlands) thought that Member States might maintain sufficiently close contact with Unesco through their Embassies or Legations.

[39] In reply to a question by Mr. Pollock (Canada) and a similar enquiry from Mr. de Godoy (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN stated that there was a motion to charge *adequate* rent for space occupied by delegations of Member States; the actual amounts would be left to the Director-General's direction.

The motion was unanimously *adopted.*

A further motion, that the list of non-governmental organizations occupying space in the Unesco building should be reviewed by the Director-General was unanimously *adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

TWELFTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Second report of Committee No. 1 [document 5C/ADM/24].

Section I.

SUB-SECTION (*a*).

[1] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, said that the Committee had taken into account the views expressed in this matter by representatives of the Staff Association, and had unanimously agreed on resolution No. 1. He wished to emphasize that the Director-General was instructed to bear in mind social security and related benefits in fixing the scale, and not consider it as a bare salary scale.

As regards resolution No. 3, the Committee was unwilling to tie the Director-General to any specific date, but they hoped that the new scale would be inaugurated in 1950 at the earliest opportunity.

[2] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that, if the United Nations did not decide at its autumn Assembly to adopt a policy similar to that of Unesco, the members of Unesco's staff might find themselves in a much less desirable position, under those new regulations, than those of the United Nations and of certain other Specialized Agencies. There was no question of reopening the whole matter at that stage, but, on behalf of the Director-General, he must reserve the right to bring the matter before the Sixth General Conference if in the meantime the United Nations decisions provided for a more generous policy than was here proposed.

[3] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), supported by Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom), considered that the Director-General had not only the right, but also the duty to bring up this matter again if conditions turned out to be such as had been described by the Deputy Director-General, and also to inform the Conference on how the decisions were working out in practice.

Sub-section (*a*) was *approved*.

SUB-SECTION (*b*).

[4] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, drew attention to the note on page 6 of the document, and pointed out that the Director-General should bear in mind the interests of the Organization rather than those of the individual only when granting the privilege to carry forward annual leave.

With regard to home leave, dealt with under Point 2, the Committee had not felt that any definite instructions could be given to the Director-General, and had confined itself to recommendations.

On Point 3, paragraph (*b*), the Committee would not accept the recommendations of the Expert Committee until after the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

Point 5 contained merely formal redrafts of the regulations to meet the above proposals.

There was, however, one new point which had been omitted from the Report. The Committee had discussed at what stage the Director-General might sign the Agreement by which Unesco would become a participant in the United Nations' Joint Staff Pension Scheme. They had decided to recommend that the Director-General should be freed of the obligations previously imposed on him, so as to enable him to sign this agreement as soon as convenient. Mr. Smith recommended that a paragraph to that effect should be incorporated in the final report.

[5] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) recalled a point which had been discussed previously, and recommended that the first resolution in paragraph D on page 5 of document 5C/ADM/9, including the words "as soon as possible", should be incorporated into the text of paragraph 3 (*b*) on page 4 of the document under discussion.

[6] On the question of holding over annual leave, and with particular reference to the note on page 6 of 5C/ADM/24, the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the situation in the past years, in which several members of the staff had been unable to take the leave due to them, was not one which had been of the Director-General's seeking or which he had desired in any way to perpetuate. Again and again, members of the staff had been completely exhausted, but had been prevented by pressure of work from taking the rest they needed, not only for their health, but to renew their efficiency.

More stable programmes should make it possible in the future to ensure a reduction in the annual leave carried forward, by permitting the staff to take their proper time off.

Sub-section (*b*) was *approved*.

Section II.

[7] On sub-section (*b*), Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, explained that the Committee preferred the term "procedures to be followed", in the event of non-payment of contributions, to "sanctions" or "penalties".

The Constitutional amendment recommended under sub-section (*b*) might be circulated to Member States and presented to the General Conference. It went further than earlier recommendations, but less far than that considered by the Executive Board at its Twentieth Session and then withdrawn.

Point 4 of sub-section (*a*) was the text of the resolution already approved by the Administrative Commission and which had been forwarded, in an earlier report, to the General Conference for urgent consideration.

As regards the first paragraph on page 8, Mr. SMITH pointed out that the change proposed was that any State which had not paid its full contributions for the preceding year but one, should have no vote in the General Conference.

Mr. Smith also drew attention to the request contained in Resolution 2 at the bottom of page 8, that the Director-General consider the procedures suggested by the delegations of Denmark and the

United Kingdom, circulated as documents 5C/ADM/22 and 5C/ADM/23.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out a typographical error in the first paragraph of 8; its last line should read: "the current year and immediately preceding financial year" (singular).

The amendment was *adopted.*

[8] The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that, if resolution 4 on page 7 were adopted, he would instruct the Comptroller to contact delegates of Member States whose contributions were in arrears, in order to obtain assurances from them as to the probable payment of those contributions or payments into the Revolving Fund. It was, however, very difficult to contact the appropriate members of delegations, and he was therefore preparing a brief circular to Heads of delegations, asking them to provide any additional information by Thursday, so that the Secretariat might issue by Saturday at the latest a conference paper indicating the present state of contributions. He invited the members of the Administrative Commission to help the Director-General by urging the Heads of their delegations to send in their reports as quickly as possible.

Section II was *approved.*

Section III.

[9] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, recalled that the Committee had had before it the proposals of the Director-General and the Executive Board, as well as those of the Australian and French Government [document 5C/14 and 5C/106]; the Committee was asking the Director-General to arrange for the consideration of the latter two proposals by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The Committee realized that the adoption of the Director-General's and the Executive Board's proposal would call for certain modifications of the regulations, and those alterations were included here.

Finally, Mr. SMITH drew attention to the final paragraph of Section III, appearing on page 11 of the document.

Section III was *approved.*

Section IV.

[10] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, said the Committee had felt that the recommendations already adopted by the Administrative Commission [document 5C/ADM/18] should be expressly restated, and they had therefore been included in the present document. He pointed out, however, that owing to a typographical error, the quotation marks on page 12 had been placed after "be anticipated" instead of after the following paragraph which ended: "necessary reductions in expenditures", and was part of the original recommendations.

[11] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) considered the French text was more formal than the English, and to make it conform more nearly he moved that it be amended to read: "La Commission administrative est d'avis que le programme 1951 devrait être divisé . . ."

This amendment was *approved* and Section IV thus amended was *adopted.*

Section V.

[12] Mr. SMITH (Australia), Rapporteur, explained that no unanimous decision had been reached over this section. The question therefore remained of how to present that part of the report to the Programme and Budget Commission.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that in the view of his delegation the practice proposed was both sound and in conformity with previous decisions. He proposed the deletion of the part of the section which began by "The Committee was unable to reach", and ended with ". . . contained in document 5C/ADM/18 and 5C/ADM/20", and of the opening words: "In addition" in the following paragraph. In his opinion, the Commission should not send in a report indicating disagreement.

[13] Mr. SMITH, speaking as the delegate of Australia, said the subject was one on which it was the Commission's duty to advise the General Conference. If they reported to the Plenary Session of the Conference only that, if put into effect, this proposal would require amendments and exceptional financial regulations, they would be shirking their responsibilities. It was their duty to express clearly the financial implications of any matter they discussed. He could not accept the United States amendment. A decision on the matter had been reached earlier, and the Commission should now decide whether the proposals under consideration conformed with their previous decisions, and whether, which was more important, they represented sound financial practice.

[14] Dr. MASON (New Zealand) also thought there was no major reason for the deletions proposed by the delegate of the United States. The report constituted a record of the Committee's discussions, on which it was its duty to present a full account to the General Conference.

[15] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) was also unable to accept the United States amendment—which was in direct contrast to the

recommendation to be found in document 5C/ADM/18—that the Programme be divided into two parts. The Programme and Budget Commission had considered that report and referred it back, but it still represented the views of this Commission, whereas the United States proposal would be inconsistent with them.

He proposed, as an alternative amendment, deleting from "was unable to reach" in the first paragraph, to "other delegations", so that the text would read: "The Committee considered that those proposals . . ."

[16] Mr. SMITH (Australia) supported the latter amendment. He pointed out that the idea behind the Committee's proposal was to help cover past deficits rather than problematical future ones. He did not see how all payments by Member States in 1950 could be used as income in 1950. Previous resolutions had already laid down that the Director-General should keep expenditure within income in 1950 and 1951. There were three sources of revenue in 1951, but the United States proposal was contrary to the fundamental principles accepted by the Commission, and which were very specific as regards 1950 and 1951. From a purely financial point of view, he could not accept the proposals as sound financial practice.

[17] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) maintained that the Commission was repeating previous arguments and anticipating a discussion which would have to be held in the Programme and Budget Commission. The Administrative Commission had clearly formulated its views in earlier papers, and they were still on record. Unless they wished to reverse them, they must state the present position clearly, and neither the United States nor the New Zealand proposed amendments did that. He therefore suggested the following alternative text to replace the second part of the first paragraph on page 13:

In view of the fact that the Administrative Commission has already submitted its views in document 5C/ADM/18 and 5C/ADM/20 on the appropriate basis for financing the 1951 programme, it limits itself to an indication of the steps which it would be necessary for the General Conference to take if it decided to adopt the proposals made by the Programme and Budget Commission. These would consist in passing the following resolutions. . .

[18] Mr. SMITH (Australia) thought the question was not one to be decided by the Programme and Budget Commission, but by the Plenary Session of the Conference. He did not, therefore, propose to withdraw his opposition to the United States amendment.

[19] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said his proposal had been made only in the hope of shortening the debate. His delegation was not proposing the use of any shady methods for sinister purpose. What it was proposing was entirely normal and consistent with the daily practice of private individuals and public bodies. Even if Unesco were a bank or a commercial enterprise, would they insist on its declaring a dividend each year from investments, whether or not those investments were essential to long-term development? All it was suggesting was that Unesco should use in 1951 funds which it could have used, but did not use, in 1947 to 1950. Admittedly, the cash surplus of 1947 amounting to some $247,000, could have been returned to the contributing Member States. But income was not sacrosanct; it was what they defined it to be. They had a miscellaneous and a budgetary income, and this could be called income for 1951. It would be gratifying if Unesco could declare a dividend, but if the latter was merely money which had not been spent in 1947-1950—and which governments had expected would be spent—then it implied that the programme had not been fully implemented.

In the view of the United States delegation, the sole question at issue was of judging whether, in the long run, Unesco's financial soundness would be impaired by this decision. The present proposal, however, concerned only one year, and was not a long-term proposal; it could impair neither Unesco's working capital, nor its financial soundness. Unesco's debts were good debts, and the money was gradually coming in. Unesco was adequately protected against deficits in 1951 (since the adoption of the United Nations recommendations to keep expenditure within income), so that it was spending only what it had, which was essential in this year of crisis.

[20] Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) pointed out that the Rapporteur's text went back to the original Conference document. He could see no advantage in debating a decision already taken elsewhere. The Commission had of course full responsibility toward the General Conference; the text he proposed showed what conclusions the Commission had reached, and left it to the Plenary Session to take the relevant decisions.

[21] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) thought the Canadian proposal was in fact very similar to his own, except that his amendment had drawn attention to the financial practices involved. His delegation still believed that the present proposal was undesirable and that it was not really daily practice, as had been suggested by the United States delegate. Those Member States which paid their contributions regularly were entitled to a rebate if the money was not spent, and it was quite inequitable that those funds should be used to cover non-payment by other Member States. It was also most undesirable, in dealing with econo-

mies which might be made in the coming year, to use a surplus to cover any shortages in revenue.

[22] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) was prepared to support the Canadian motion when he was in possession of the text in writing. Like the Canadian delegate, he was afraid that the point might give rise to further prolonged discussion in the present Commission, and his advice was to reserve a new discussion for the Plenary Meeting at which the problem would be examined.

[23] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) also supported the proposal of the delegate of Canada, as he felt this was a realistic suggestion taking into account the wish of all delegates to make Unesco something other than a mere commercial organization.

[24] Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom), who largely agreed with the Canadian delegate, suggested that the Commission might use the first sentence of the paragraph by way of introduction, and then go on to state two facts: (1) that it adhered to the position adopted in documents 5C/ADM/18 and 5C/ADM/20; (2) that if the Programme and Budget Commission stood by its decision to try to find as nearly as possible the total of $8,200,000, the General Conference would have to pass the resolutions given at the bottom of page 13.

[25] Mr. PUTONG (Philippines) supported the Canadian proposal. He was anxious to avoid giving the impression that the Commission considered unsound the proposal at the bottom of page 13. It was faced by two conflicting points of view: (1) the ivory-tower one which considered that any family or organization should live within its income whether strictly or theoretically defined, and (2) the more practical view which understood that the two approaches set out in the first and second part of page 13 might have to be combined.

The delegate of the United States had set forth his point very clearly. Unesco had been told that this was the year of decision, and it must show that it was willing to take an active part in helping the world to peace and better understanding. Personally, he thought the Canadian proposal the more acceptable, since it left the matter of financing the Programme in the hands of the Programme and Budget Commission, and dit not compromise the Administrative Commission's previous position.

[26] Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom), supporting a proposal made by the CHAIRMAN, moved the following amendment to be inserted in the first paragraph following the first sentence:

The Commission reaffirms the view expressed in documents 5C/ADM/18 and 5C/ADM/20, which were communicated to the Programme and Budget Commission.

The Commission wishes to indicate the steps which it would be necessary for the General Conference to take if it decided to adopt the proposals made by the Programme and Budget Commission .

[27] Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said the wording of the proposed amendment was satisfactory to his delegation, but he wished to make it clear that (1) there was no contradiction between the United States proposal and the position originally adopted by the Administrative Commission; and (2) the recommendations of the Commission were made before the introduction of the United States proposal, so that his delegation was not being inconsistent.

[28] Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) was in favour of the draft resolution read by the Chairman, but asked that in the French text the sixth line should read: "ce budget sera alimenté . . . et par des recettes provenant d'autres sources"; the present version was in accord neither with the English text nor with the spirit of the whole resolution.

[29] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) and Mr. SMITH (Australia) withdrew their amendments and indicated their agreement with the text proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

Section V was *adopted* with the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom delegation.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 9.45 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Report of the Administrative Commission to the General Conference [document 5C/ADM/25].

[1] Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) and Mr. GUIGNOLET (France) deeply deplored the delay in the distribution of the French text, but Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) pointed out that the delay could not be ascribed entirely to the Secretariat, whose task had been considerably complicated by the prolonged discussions of the Commission and the resulting numerous changes in the programme of meetings.

[2] Miss LAISE (United States of America) had noticed several superficial errors in the English text, which altered the meaning, whereupon Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom) suggested that the "Roseman Committee" meet at 9 a.m. the following day to revise the text which could be presented to the Commission in the afternoon.

That proposal, seconded by Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) and Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand), was *adopted*.

The meeting rose at 10 p.m.

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. TARA CHAND (India)

Report of the Administrative Commission to the General Conference (*continued*) [document 5C/ADM/25].

[1] After putting the final touches to the draft report revised by the "Roseman Committee", the Commission *adopted* the final text as given in document 5C/ADM/25 (rev.) and in Section IV of document 5C/Resolutions.

[2] Miss LAISE (United States of America) thanked the Chairman, Dr. Tara Chand, and the Rapporteur, Mr. W.G. St.C. Smith, on behalf of the Commission.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

FIRST MEETING

Monday, 22 May 1950, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia)

Election of Chairman.

[1] At the proposal of Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), Dr. Walker (Australia) was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee.

Nominations for the offices of President and seven Vice-Presidents of the General Conference [document 5C/NOM/2].

Office of President of the General Conference.

[2] Mr. DELBOS (France) proposed the election of H. E. Professor Guido Gonella, Italian Minister of Education and Head of the Italian delegation. He was well aware that Professor Gonella's official duties would oblige him to absent himself on frequent occasions, but he hoped that he would accept the Presidency, subject to his right to be replaced whenever necessary.

Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) warmly seconded that nomination.

[3] Professor GONELLA (Italy) expressed deep appreciation of the honour shown him, but regretted being unable to accept, as he was afraid that he would not be able to carry out his duties as President sufficiently regularly. He recommended in his place H. E. Count Stefano Jacini, member of the Executive Board, who, having participated in Unesco's work since the Beirut Session of the Conference, would certainly be in a position to occupy the important office of President. *Adopted by acclamation.*

Offices of Vice-Presidents of the General Conference.

[4] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) proposed the nomination of representatives of the following countries: Brazil, Egypt, the United States of America, France, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and Venezuela.

Unanimously *adopted.*

[5] The CHAIRMAN announced that the foregoing nominations would be submitted for approval to the Plenary Session of the General Conference.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 10.15 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia)

Nominations for the offices of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Commissions and Committees [document 5C/NOM/2].

[1] The CHAIRMAN reminded the Nominations Committee that, in making recommendations to the various Commissions and Committees for the election of their Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs, due attention should be given to geographical distribution and to the difficulty experienced by smaller delegations in providing officers for organs of the Conference and in attending the numerous Commissions and Committees.

In accordance with the Executive Board's proposal, the General Committee of the Conference had met and considered the names to be put forward for consideration by the Nominations Committee.

Report of the Chairman of the General Committee of the Conference.

[2] Count JACINI (Italy), Chairman of the General Committee of the Conference, stated that, in accordance with the procedure followed at the Fourth Session of the General Conference, as given in document 5C/NOM/2, the President and the seven Vice-Presidents of the Conference, the Chairman of the Nominations Committee and the Chairman of the Executive Board had met on the previous afternoon after the Plenary Meeting in order to draw up a preliminary list of persons who, in virtue of their competence and knowledge of the Organization, might be considered as candidates for the posts of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Commissions and Committees of the Conference.

The General Committee of the Conference had also taken into consideration the importance of ensuring a fair geographical distribution.

Consequently, the General Committee submitted the following recommendations to the Nominations Committee:

1. *Programme and Budget Commission:*
   Chairman: Mr. Roger Seydoux (France);
   Vice-Chairmen: Professor Louis Verniers (Belgium);
   A representative of Persia;
   Rapporteur: Dr. C. E. Beeby (New Zealand).
2. *Official and External Relations Commission:*
   Chairman: A representative of Mexico;
   Vice-Chairmen: Professor Jean Piaget (Switzerland);
   A representative of Burma;
   Rapporteur: A representative of Norway.
3. *Administrative Commission:*
   Chairman: A representative of India;
   Vice-Chairmen: A representative of Greece;
   A representative of Thailand;
   Rapporteur: Mr. W. G. St. Clair Smith (Australia).
4. *Procedure Committee:*
   Chairman: Professor Jakob Nielsen (Denmark);
   Vice-Chairman: A representative of the Philippines;
   Rapporteur: A representative of Sweden.
5. *Budget Committee*: The General Committee, having accepted the draft resolution presented by the Executive Board, defining the composition and terms of reference of the Budget Committee [document 5C/BUR/1-Add. and Corr.], recommended that the latter Committee should consist of twelve members and be constituted as follows:
   Chairman: Professor H. R. Kruyt (Netherlands);
   Vice-Chairman: A representative of Canada;
   Rapporteur: A representative of Israel;
   Other members: A representative of each of the following countries: Australia, Brazil, France, India, Italy, Mexico, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America.

On submitting the recommendations of the General Committee, Count Jacini pointed out that the Nominations Committee was not in any way bound by those recommendations and could consider them as mere suggestions. Moreover, the Commissions, Committees and subsidiary bodies would remain quite free to elect their own Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs in accordance with Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure.

In conclusion, Count Jacini invited the delegations, if the proposals of the General Committee were accepted, to indicate in writing the names of the members designated by them for the posts in question.

Programme and Budget Commission.

[3] The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Dr. C. E. Beeby (New Zealand) was unable to accept the office of Rapporteur of the Programme and Budget Commission.

Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) thanked the Committee for having recommended him as Vice-Chairman of the Commission; but, since Dr. Beeby could not accept the onerous duties of Rapporteur of the Commission, Professor Verniers proposed that he should be nominated Vice-Chairman, and that another member of the Belgian delegation should be appointed Rapporteur. For the latter office, he recommended Mr. Marcel Florkin, who had been Vice-Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission at the Beirut Session of the General Conference. *Agreed.*

Subject to that change, the nominations for the Programme and Budget Commission were *accepted.*

Official and External Relations Commission.

[4] Dr. WEN (China) observed that three of the names put forward for offices on the Official and External Relations Commission were those of delegates of countries which had recognized the Communist Government in China.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Credentials Committee would deal with that matter.

Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico), much flattered by the recommendation that he should again be appointed Chairman of the Official and External Relations Commission, suggested that that post should be entrusted to another delegation: he recommended Dr. Mariano Brull y Caballero, Head of the Cuban delegation. *Agreed.*

Dr. BRULL Y CABALLERO (Cuba) thanked Mr. Castro Leal for having proposed him as Chairman of the Commission. He would endeavour to carry out those important functions to the best of his ability.

With that change, the nominations for the Official and External Relations Commission were *accepted.*

Administrative Commission.

[5] The nominations for the Administrative Commission were *accepted.*

Procedure Committee.

[6] Although the Procedure Committee was then in session, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the General Committee's nominations for that Committee should be presented to the Plenary Session. *Agreed.*

Budget Committee.

[7] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that nominations not only for the officers of the Budget Committee, but also for its membership, had to be considered for recommendation to the Plenary Session of the Conference.

Professor KRUYT (Netherlands) stated that it would be impossible for him to accept the Chairmanship of the Committee. He proposed instead Dr. F. Bender of the Netherlands delegation for that office. *Agreed.*

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq), recalling the Chairman's earlier reference to geographical distribution, declared that his delegation did not feel that Israel had the right to such representation as proposed on the Budget Committee; he asked for a vote to be taken on the countries nominated for a seat on that Committee.

The proposal was seconded by Dr. WEN (China).

Professor SAMBURSKY (Israel) recalled that it was the second year of Israel's full membership of Unesco and that his country had a right to representation on all bodies of the Conference. He therefore took exception to the remark of the Iraqi delegate. He proposed the name of Dr. Kohn (Acting Head of the Israeli delegation) for the office of Rapporteur of the Budget Committee.

Subject to the substitution of Dr. Bender for Dr. Kruyt, the General Committee's nominations for the Budget Committee were *accepted* by 26 votes to 3 and 1 abstention.

Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) made it clear that he had voted against the nominations, not because he objected to the constitution of the Budget Committee as a whole, but because he objected, on grounds of regional representation, to the inclusion of the member whom he had already mentioned.

In order to meet the objection made by the delegate of Iraq, and in the interests of equitable regional representation, Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) proposed that the Budget Committee should be enlarged to include another member from the Middle East.

The proposal was seconded by several delegates, including those of PAKISTAN, BRAZIL, FRANCE and GREECE.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) pro-

posed to recommend the inclusion in the Budget Committee of a member from Iraq.

The proposal was seconded by the delegate of PAKISTAN and *adopted.*

The Nominations Committee *agreed* to recommend that thirteen persons, including a delegate of Iraq, should be selected to constitute the Budget Committee.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

THIRD MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia)

Nominations for six new members of the Executive Board.

[1] The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article V of the Constitution and of the need to ensure a balanced geographical and cultural distribution.

He had received three nominations in writing:

(1) Dr. Mahmoud Hasan (Pakistan), proposed by the delegations of Persia, Lebanon, Indonesia and Burma;

(2) H. E. Mr. Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico), proposed by the delegations of Cuba and Guatemala;

(3) Professor Rafael Jiménez (Colombia), proposed by the delegations of Venezuela and Brazil.

[2] Mr. WEN (China) proposed the names of Senator Gerónima Pecson of the Philippines and Dr. Hu Shih of China.

Speaking of Senator Pecson, he pointed out that hitherto women had been conspicuous by their absence from the Executive Board; it was time to repair that grave injustice. There was also a need for greater representation of the Far East on the Board; the position of the Philippines was especially important, since they formed a vital connecting link between the Far East and South East Asia. From the point of view of personal qualifications, Senator Pecson was an eminent educator, administrator and social worker, without whose talent the Executive Board would be the poorer.

[3] Dr. Hu Shih belonged to no party and was a true representative of all that was best in Chinese life and thought. More honorary degrees had been conferred on him by universities all over the world than on any other living man. He was the leader of the "Renaissance" movement in China, yet he was not only a Chinese, but a citizen of the world. His contributions to Chinese history, philosophy and education were familiar all over the world.

[4] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) had great pleasure in seconding the Chinese nomination of Senator Pecson. Apart from her personal competency to fulfil the duties of a member of the Board, her election would show that Unesco recognized the place of women in the present-day world.

[5] Dr. BARÓN CASTRO (Salvador) warmly supported the nomination of Senator Pecson for the reasons stated by the Chinese and American representatives.

[6] Dr. BEEBY (New Zealand) proposed General Sir Ronald Adam, leader of the United Kingdom delegation after the departure of Mr. Hardman. Sir Ronald was one of the best-known and most highly respected persons in the Conference, his honesty, sincerity and extraordinary fairness being familiar both to delegates and to the Secretariat. He had been in charge of Army Welfare and Education during the war. He was a member of the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Education, Chairman of the Institute of Education of the University of London, Chairman of the National Institute of Psychology and of the British Council, and a former President of the British Library Association.

[7] Dr. JAMALI (Iraq) seconded the nominations of Senator Pecson, Dr. Hasan, Sir Ronald Adam and Dr. Hu Shih.

[8] Mr. MAMELI (Italy) proposed Mgr. Jean Maroun of the Lebanon, whose great personality

and whose high qualifications as a philosopher and educator were appreciated by all.

[9] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) recommended the nomination of Professor Piaget, who was considered not only in Switzerland, but throughout the world, as an authority in the field of education and had taken particular interest in the psychology of young people. During his term of office with Unesco's Department of Education, he had given proof of his wide understanding of educational problems and of his competence in other fields of the Organization's activities.

[10] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) recommended the nomination of Dr. Raphael Bernal Jiménez, Head of the Colombian delegation at the present session of the General Conference. In addition to his other qualifications, Dr. Bernal Jiménez was a Doctor of Laws, a Graduate of the Colombian Institute of Political Sciences, Founder of the Teachers' Training College, Member of the Council of Education and Senator of the Colombian Republic. He had written a large number of outstanding works on philosophy and education. As professor and philosopher, he would be able to play a most useful part on the Executive Board.

[11] Mr. HEKMAT (Persia) supported the nomination of Sir Ronald Adam, known for his great service to education in many countries; of Mgr. Maroun, a scholar of great repute in the Near East; and also of Dr. Hasan, an Oxford graduate, a member of the London Bar, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Eastern Bengal and Head of Educational Administration in Pakistan.

[12] Sir Ben THOMAS (United Kingdom) put forward the name of Mr. W. J. Weeden of Australia, who had been Assistant Director of the Commonwealth Office of Education since its foundation in 1945. He was a graduate of Sydney University and had had extensive experience of education at all levels, having taught in secondary schools and technical colleges, and having directed educational research. He had played a very important part in developing the Commonwealth Office of Education. In addition, he had been present at all the sessions of the General Conference and had carried out valuable work for Unesco with its co-operating bodies in Australia.

[13] ANAS Khan (Afghanistan), stressing the urgency of having adequate representation of Islamic culture and of the countries of the Middle East on the Executive Board, seconded the nomination of Dr. Hasan. He also seconded the nominations of Sir Ronald Adam and Mgr. Maroun.

[14] Dr. SOMMARUGA (Liberia) seconded the nomination of Mgr. Maroun.

[15] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) seconded the nomination of Professor Piaget.

[16] Professor ZÉREGA FOMBONA (Venezuela) seconded the nominations of Mgr. Maroun, representing Middle Eastern culture, of Senator Pecson, representing Far Eastern culture, of Sir Ronald Adam and Professor Piaget, both well known to the delegations, and particularly of Messrs. Bernal Jiménez and Castro Leal, the pride of Latin America.

[17] Mr. SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) thanked the delegates who had proposed Senator Pecson. Speaking of her training and background, he stated that she had a wide experience in the fields of education, social welfare, and legislation; furthermore, she was a woman of the world and a lover of the home. She was Chairman of the Senate Committees on Education and on Social Work, a member of the Governing Board of the University, a member of the Board of Directors of the Red Cross, of the Amateur Athletic Association and of the Y.W.C.A. and President of the Women's Civic Assembly.

Apart from Senator Pecson's personal qualifications, she should be elected to the Executive Board in order to prove Unesco's sincerity in supporting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in particular the rights of women. Such an action on Unesco's part would serve as an example to other international organizations in enlisting women's organizations in the cause of peace.

[18] Dr. AUNG (Burma) recalled that he had already nominated Dr. Hasan of Pakistan, who was a brilliant scholar and had served during the war as a Colonel in the Anglo-Indian Army. He also supported Sir Ronald Adam, as a tribute to the work of the British Council throughout the world. As he was unable to support a proposal made by the Chinese Nationalist delegation, whose right to be at the Conference was not recognized by Burma, he himself proposed the name of Senator Pecson.

[19] The CHAIRMAN then read the names of the nine candidates who had been proposed, and announced that the vote would take place by secret ballot, in accordance with the procedure adopted at meetings of the Nominations Committee at earlier sessions of the General Conference. He called upon Mr. Stewart (Union of South Africa) and Dr. Zeissl (Austria) to serve as scrutineers.

[20] After a short discussion, it was *agreed* to follow the same procedure as the previous year and to count as valid all ballot papers containing 1 to 6 names, and to count as invalid any ballot papers containing more than 6 names, but to ask the General Conference to request the Procedure Committee to establish precise rules to cover this

question and also that of the secret ballot, so as to facilitate the work of the Nominations Committee in future years.

The result of the vote was a follows :

General Sir Ronald Adam (United Kingdom)	42 votes
Senator Gerónima Pecson (Philippines)	42 votes
H. E. M. Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico)	40 votes
Professor Jean Piaget (Switzerland)	36 votes
Dr. Rafael Bernal Jiménez (Colombia)	31 votes
Mgr. Jean Maroun (Lebanon)	31 votes
Dr. Mahmoud Hasan (Pakistan)	25 votes
Mr. W. J. Weeden (Australia)	20 votes
Dr. Hu Shih (China)	9 votes

It was thus *agreed* to recommend the nominations of the first six candidates to the General Conference.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Saturday, 17 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Dr. E. RONALD WALKER (Australia)

Nominations for the new Budget Committee.

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Nominations Committee had to advise the General Conference on the election of the eleven members of the Budget Committee which was to meet one week before the next Session. The Committee would consist of eleven government representatives, whose expenses would be met by their respective governments, and its terms of reference would be to examine the Budget Estimates presented by the Director-General with a view to determining whether the estimates were reasonable and accurate. It would consider the report and recommendations of the Executive Board, and as soon as possible after the opening date of the Conference, submit a report making such recommendations as were necessary. It would also examine new proposals, draft resolutions and amendments presented by Member States and having budgetary implications, and finally, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Commissions and Committees, would submit to the Plenary Session the Draft Appropriation Resolution, the Appropriation Table for 1952 and the General Report on the Budget.

The Chairman pointed out that it would be desirable to include on the Committee those countries which were best able to provide competent persons to serve on such a technical body, while preserving a reasonable geographical distribution.

[2] Professor PIAGET (Switzerland) asked whether the Budget Committee would report to the Programme and Budget Commission or to the General Conference itself. In his opinion, financial competence could not be dissociated from programme competence.

[3] The CHAIRMAN indicated that the Committee would report to the Conference which, if it thought fit, could refer its findings to any other body. He suggested that the Netherlands, whose representative had so ably presided over the 1950 Budget Committee, and the United States, United Kingdom, and France as the three largest contributors to Unesco's budget, should be members of the Committee.

Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) proposed Australia and New Zealand.

Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) declined this honour for his country.

Dr. SIDDIQUI (Pakistan) proposed Persia.

Dr. AUNG (Burma) proposed India to represent Asia and Yugoslavia to represent Eastern Europe.

Dr. CHAND (India) proposed Thailand.

Dr. JUMSAI (Thailand) regretted that his country was unable to delegate a representative to the Budget Committee.

Professor SOMMERFELT (Norway) proposed that Sweden should represent the countries of Northern Europe.

Dr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay), seconded by Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico), proposed Cuba.

Mr. HEKMAT (Persia) proposed Egypt.

[4] Dr. BRULL Y CABALLERO (Cuba) sug-

gested that the number of members of the Budget Committee might be increased so as to secure a better distribution, and because not all its members would be able to attend every meeting.

[5] The CHAIRMAN explained that the size of the Budget Committee could not be increased, as it had been laid down by the General Conference; the Nominations Committee could, however, recommend alternates from neighbouring countries who could act as "regional" representatives.

Dr. BRULL Y CABALLERO (Cuba) supported this suggestion.

Mr. COMPTON (United States) pointed out that no South American countries were so far represented on the Committee.

[6] The CHAIRMAN stressed that the Committee's composition might vary from year to year. It was open to the Nominations Committee to suggest additional names, in which case there would have to be a vote. If no other nominations were proposed, he would assume that the Nominations Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference the election of Australia, Cuba, Egypt, France, India, the Netherlands, Persia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia.

[7] Professor VERNIERS (Belgium) wondered whether, in view of the parallel nature of their work, the composition of the Budget Committee should not be complementary to that of the Finance Committee of the Executive Board.

[8] The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the Executive Board would make arrangements for one of its members most competent in financial matters to sit with the Budget Committee in an advisory capacity.

[9] It was *decided* to recommend to the General Conference the election of the eleven countries whose names had been proposed.

It was *agreed* that the expenses of the "regional" alternates should be borne by the countries who sent them.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

FIRST MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Election of Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

[1] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the Nominations Committee had proposed as Chairman of the Committee Professor Jakob Nielsen (Denmark), who had been Chairman of the Procedure Committee at the General Conference in Beirut.

Mr. DAVIES (Australia) seconded that proposal.

Professor Nielsen was unanimously elected and took the Chair.

[2] The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for the honour conferred upon him, and indicated that the Nominations Committee had recommended the delegate of the Philippines for the office of Vice-Chairman.

Professor ZÉREGA FOMBONA (Venezuela) and Mr. OJEDA (Mexico) seconded the proposal.

Mr. Procedo Sebastián (Philippines) was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

[3] The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Nominations Committee proposed the delegate of Sweden for the office of Rapporteur.

Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) seconded the proposal.

Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) suggested postponing the election of the Rapporteur until the afternoon meeting, in view of the absence of the Swedish delegate. *Agreed.*

Adoption of Agenda [document 5C/PRO/1].

[4] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) asked whether the question of biennial Unesco General Conferences would be discussed under item 9 (other questions), in the event of its being assigned to the Procedure Committee by the General Committee of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee was to examine all questions referred to it by the General Committee according to the Rules of Procedure.

[5] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) drew attention to item 7 of the Agenda (Draft Amendment to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure: Working Languages), presented by the Mexican delegation. The General Committee of the Conference, in accordance with the text of document 5C/BUR/1, had asked that the Budget Committee should be consulted on the budgetary implications of all recommendations, and that the Committee should not take any decision concerning them before examining the Budget Committee's report.

[6] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) thought that it was for the Procedure Committee to take a decision on the question of principle raised by the draft amendment.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) remarked that in any case the Budget Committee would have to report on the financial aspect of the question.

The agenda was *adopted* without modification.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

SECOND MEETING

Tuesday, 23 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: S. Ex. Mr. PROCESO SEBASTIÁN (Philippines)

Later: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft Amendment to Paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution [document 5C/PRO/2].

[1] The SECRETARY pointed out that the amendment proposed in document 5C/PRO/2 has been considered by the General Conference at its Fourth Session, with a view to making the term of office of members of the Executive Board coincide with the interval between the annual sessions of the Conference, so that members of the Board would relinquish office immediately after the close of the Third Session of the General Conference following their election. It was therefore a question of replacing the fixed term of three years by a variable term corresponding to the interval between three regular sessions of the General Conference. That proposal, contained in document 5C/PRO/2, had been submitted to Member States. A number of favourable answers had already reached the Secretariat, and no objections had yet been received.

[2] Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) said his Government had no objection to the proposed amendment as it stood; there was, however, the possibility of consequential amendments if the General Conference decided to hold biennial sessions.

The draft amendment to paragraph 3 of Article V of the Constitution [document 5C/PRO/2, page 2], was *adopted* unanimously.[1]

Draft Amendment to Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of Procedure [document 5C/PRO/4].

[3] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) proposed that the Committee should straightway examine the draft amendment to Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of Procedure, so as to harmonize them with Article V of the Constitution, which had just been amended.

The draft amendment to Rules 95, 96 and 97 of the Rules of procedure [document 5C/PRO/4] was *adopted* by 25 votes to none.[1]

Draft Amendment to Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure [document 5C/PRO/3].

[4] The SECRETARY said that the Credentials Committee had noted that the credentials of a large number of delegates were signed, not by the Head of the State or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs (was provided by Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure), but by other Ministers, particularly by the Minister of Education. At the Fourth Session of the General Conference, the Credentials Committee had requested that Rule 22 be amended so that the credentials of delegates could be regarded as valid, even if they were signed by a Minister other than the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Certain international organizations had extended that power to other Ministers.

[5] Professor KUŠEJ (Yugoslavia) did not think that every Minister was qualified to issue credentials to those representing his country at Unesco's General Conference. The principle of "Ministerial solidarity" could not be invoked in such a case, and only those Ministers who maintained relations with Unesco should be regarded as having such a power, the Prime Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Education.

[6] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the Secretariat had asked various Specialized Agencies to supply information concerning the policy they adopted in the matter.

[7] Mr. DAVIES (Australia) said that his delegation did not see the appropriateness of making

1. In final form: Resol. 40.1.

1. In final form: Resol. 40.21 to 40.23.

an amendment of the nature proposed. As far as they could see, international conferences were a matter of external affairs, which usually came under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Foreign Affairs or of the Head of the Government. He agreed with Professor Kušej, and the Australian delegation was in favour of maintaining Rule 22 as it stood. If an amendment was thought necessary, Mr. Davies suggested adding the words "the Head of the Government".

[8] Mr. CAIN (France) thought it would be wise to adopt the Australian delegate's suggestion, which, by extending the power to the Head of the Government as well as to a member of the Government, widened the possibilities of choice, while maintaining the desirable element of unity.

[9] Although he saw the relevance of the objections raised by Professor Kušej, Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) thought that, to bring Unesco into line with the other Agencies, the ideal solution, and one which would give sufficient flexibility without too wide a choice, would be to do as the other Agencies were doing. He proposed the following amendment: "The credentials of delegates and alternate delegates shall be issued either by the Head of the State or of the Government, or by an appropriate Minister."

[10] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) thought the Australian proposal too limited. He therefore supported the United Kingdom proposal.

Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) also supported the United Kingdom proposal, but he did not think the Committee could invoke the principle of "ministerial solidarity", which was peculiar to parliamentary systems. It should therefore be specified that the power was to be granted to a competent Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs or the Minister of Education.

[11] Mr. ZÉREGA FOMBONA (Venezuela) agreed with Mr. Mahmassani so far as "ministerial solidarity" was concerned, but thought that the credentials of delegates should be issued only by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who alone was qualified to deal with international organizations.

[12] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) supported the United Kingdom proposal. Unesco must avoid imposing on Member States rules which were too strict, and it would be better to allow them some latitude in choosing the Minister they considered best qualified.

[13] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) considered that, in order to facilitate Unesco's work, the right to sign credentials should be granted to other Ministers as well as to the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

[14] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that, in the United Kingdom, it was not the Foreign Minister who appointed delegates to the Conference, but the Minister of Education. He reminded the Committee that other Specialized Agencies had a more flexible procedure and found it appropriate.

[15] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) said that her delegation was content with the present Rule 22. They agreed with the United Kingdom proposal as amended by the delegate of Belgium and suggested the following wording:

The credentials of delegates and alternate delegates shall be issued by the Head of the State or the Minister for Foreign Affairs; except that when the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a Member State has filed with the Director-General a statement that some other member of the government is authorized according to the laws of that country to issue such credentials, they shall be acceptable by the Organization as properly issued.

Dr. SOMMARUGA (Liberia) seconded the United States proposal.

[16] Professor KUŠEJ (Yugoslavia) said that, as Unesco was an international organization, the Head of the Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs were competent to grant the credentials in all countries, whether the principle of "ministerial solidarity" was recognized by them or not. But as Unesco was also a cultural organization, the Minister of Education also seemed to be qualified, the only difficulty being that this latter title did not in all countries always designate the competent Minister. The best solution would therefore be to propose that "the credentials of delegates shall be issued by the Head of the State, or by the Head of the Government, or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, or by the Minister of National Education or other competent Minister". The Minister of Fine Arts, for instance, could be designated as a competent Minister.

[17] The CHAIRMAN thought there was general acceptance of the principle to authorize not only the Head of the State, but also the Minister for Foreign Affairs or some other appropriate person to sign credentials, and he proposed the appointment of a drafting sub-committee.

It was *decided* to appoint a drafting subcommittee of seven members, composed of the delegates of Australia, Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, to draw up a text designating the appropriate person to sign credentials.

Draft Amendment to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure (Working Languages), presented by the Mexican delegation [document 5C/PRO/5].

[18] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) said that, after Spanish had been admitted as a spoken working language by Unesco's General Conference at Beirut, it had been adopted in turn by the United Nations (December 1948), by FAO (December 1949) and by ILO (1950). The latter organizations, however, had adopted it not only as a spoken language, but also as a written language. The Mexican delegation had recommended the General Conference at its last Session to adopt a similar policy.

Mr. Castro Leal emphasized that Spanish was spoken by 155,000,000 persons in more than twenty countries. Unesco, an organization devoted to culture, should take that fact into consideration so as to associate more closely with its work those masses of people who had always shown the deepest concern for cultural progress.

The sole object of his proposal was to complete the arrangements made at the Beirut Conference by authorizing the use of Spanish, not only as a spoken language for certain conferences, but as a full working language, as had already been done by the United Nations.

[19] Mr. DRAGO (Honduras) warmly supported Mr. Castro Leal's proposal. The most recent international broadcasting congresses had recognized Spanish as the world language spoken by the greatest number of persons after English. Its adoption by Unesco was indispensable from the point of view of equity and so would not constitute a concession. It was impossible to reject Spanish while recognizing other languages that were no doubt illustrious, but were spoken by only a relatively small *élite* and not by some hundred million persons, as was the case with Spanish.

[20] Mr. CALDERON (Peru) fully supported the views of the delegates of Mexico and Honduras. The fact must also be considered that Spanish was not only a language spoken by more than 100,000,000 people, but also a very important vehicle of human culture to which scholars and universities of all countries devoted special studies. This being so, he wondered how Unesco, which was eminently a cultural organization, could ignore the universality of the Spanish language.

[21] Although fully appreciating the substance of the Mexican delegate's arguments, Professor GLEDITSCH (Norway) was unable to support his proposal, for it was necessary to take into account practical considerations which rendered it difficult to implement. The adoption of Spanish as a permanent working language would involve very great expenditure and necessitate an increase in the Secretariat's budget, which seemed quite impossible at the present time. Moreover, the duration of proceedings with consecutive interpretation would thereby be considerably lengthened, which was hardly desirable. Lastly, since all the delegates understood and spoke French or English, it seemed useless to have a translation into a third language, for that might detract from the intimate atmosphere of the discussions, which largely depended on the direct expression of opinions.

[22] Professor DÜRING (Sweden) associated himself with the opinion expressed by Professor Gleditsch. The reasons put forward by Mr. Castro Leal were weighty, but so were those on the other side. In the view of the Swedish delegation, it was more practical for Unesco to keep to two working languages. The Swedish Government and people had most intimate relations with South America and the Spanish-speaking peoples, and the deepest reverence for their language and culture; but French and English had not been chosen for any other than practical reasons.

[23] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) agreed with Professors Gleditsch and Düring; a rejection of the Mexican delegation's proposals should not be taken in any sense as an insult to the Spanish language or culture. The chief concern was how best to complete the business of the General Conference with the limited time and money at its disposal. Although there were fourteen States, the Spanish-speaking Members of Unesco, taken together, contributed roughly 4 per cent of Unesco's total budget; yet the cost of the project would far exceed that amount. Finally, there was the question of principle, raised in one sense by Professor Gleditsch, that an international organization should try to use the minimum number of languages, for once the door was open to one further language, others would inevitably be asked for, and it would be difficult to refuse.

For these reasons, the United Kingdom delegation found itself compelled to vote against the Mexican proposal.

[24] Professor SAGLAM (Turkey) said that in Beirut he had already opposed the proposal, which he thought would involve considerable expenditure and much time. Moreover, it would establish a dangerous precedent, as each Member State could in its turn ask for similar arrangements for its own language, which might considerably hamper the proper functioning of Unesco. Although he

himself experienced the same difficulties as his Latin-American colleagues in expressing himself in a foreign language, he maintained the point of view he had expressed at Beirut, and would oppose the adoption of the Mexican delegate's proposal.

[25] Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France) pointed out that it was not the business of the Committee to discuss the cultural value of the Spanish language, since that could not be called in question; nor was it to prevent the mass of the Spanish-speaking peoples in any way from collaborating in Unesco's work. Unesco's *Courier* had long been published in Spanish; and the translation into Spanish of other Unesco publications which aimed at promoting cultural progress in the Latin-American countries was quite a different question from the one now before the Committee, namely the use of Spanish as a working language of Unesco's General Conference.

He thought that the Committee should consider only the practical aspect of the problem: it was a question of facilitating the business of international meetings attended by the representatives of governments which had to decide on a programme of action in the shortest possible time and with the minimum of expenditure. Certain countries, including France, had always been concerned to reduce administrative expenditure to a minimum, so as to devote the greatest possible part of the budget to programme activities. It was in that practical spirit that the French delegation would associate itself with the delegations of Norway, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom, and vote against the Mexican proposal.

[26] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) said the Mexican proposal was first mentioned at the Mexico City Conference, again at Beirut and again in Paris; he believed it had been received with sympathy by other delegates, but the only result of all the discussions seemed to be requests for a delayed decision. Unesco's aim was to reach the masses, and his delegation considered that the most adequate vehicle to that end was a language which they understood. Dr. Chediak considered it absolutely necessary and vital for Unesco's needs that the Mexican delegation's proposal should be adopted.

Other speakers had said that the greatest obstacle was expense; the Director-General had studied the problem, and figures were given in document 5C/PRO/5; it would therefore be unnecessary to re-submit the question to the Budget Committee. It had also been said that, if Spanish were used, it would delay Unesco's work; but at that time, the United Nations had not taken a decision regarding the use of Spanish as a working language; its use had, however, since been approved by the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies. It would be lamentable to paralyse Unesco's work for budgetary reasons, yet that was what would happen if Spanish did not become an official working language. The countries of Latin America wished to be extremely friendly towards Europe, and French and English were used in their conferences; it was thought that there should be a certain amount of reciprocity in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN adjourned the discussion.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Saturday, 27 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Agenda of the Committee.

[1] The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would have to add the consideration of three additional questions to the agenda:

(1) A United States draft resolution on biennial sessions of the General Conference [document 5C/16];

(2) A United States draft resolution concerning the status of Associate Members of Unesco [document 5C/20];

(3) The general question of the rules govern-

ing recommendations to Member States and International Conventions [document 5C/OXR/16].

Draft Amendments to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure (Working Languages), presented by the Mexican delegation (*continued*) [document 5C/PRO/5].

[2] Mr. HEWITSON (Union of South Africa) said his delegation had carefully considered the Mexican proposal. He thought the Committee were in complete agreement as to the prestige of the Spanish language, but other questions were paramount. In common with many others, his delegation had consistently urged that administrative expenses should be kept as low as possible. In their view, the Secretariat's estimate of the costs involved in making Spanish a full working language were very conservative, and he was therefore reluctantly unable to support the Mexican proposal.

[3] Mr. SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) gave his full support to the Mexican proposal on the basis of both the historical and the present relationship of his country with the Spanish-speaking peoples. On fundamental grounds, also, he supported the proposal, which he felt would go a long way towards helping Unesco in its aim of securing peace and understanding between nations. He recalled that the introduction of Spanish as a working language in the United Nations had also been sponsored by the delegate of the Philippines. If Unesco were to reject the present proposal, it would be tantamount to telling the United Nations they had made a mistake.

Dealing with the practical points raised in objection to the Mexican proposal, Mr. Sebastián thought that: (*a*) the use of simultaneous interpretation solved the question of the additional time which would be required; (*b*) a careful study of the Budget would enable certain savings in other directions (he emphasized that the proposal was only for the translation of certain important documents), and the additional expense would be more than compensated by the additional masses who could thereby be reached; (*c*) as regards the objection that the adoption of this proposal might lead to further similar demands in the future, such a development should be welcomed if it could better serve the purposes of Unesco, strengthen the peace and secure better understanding among peoples and nations.

[4] Dr. BERNAL JIMÉNEZ (Colombia) was concerned to show the weakness of the arguments invoked against the Mexican proposal. The precedent that it would create if adopted could only be used by another equally large language group, and the Spanish-speaking delegations would not be in the least opposed to a similar advantage being conferred on any group of their own size.

As to the cost of putting the proposal into effect, savings could doubtless be made in other directions so as to counter-balance the additional expense. It would be useless to refer the proposal to the Budget Committee, since document 5C/PRO/5 contained an exhaustive survey of the financial consequences of adopting Spanish as a working language of the General Conference. The Committee had all the data and could give its decision without further delay.

In conclusion, Dr. Bernal Jiménez pointed out that the adoption of Spanish as a working language would be the best way of influencing the peoples who wished to obtain greater access to culture.

[5] Dr. BARCÍA (Uruguay) believed that no contact could be made with the peoples of Latin America unless Spanish were used.

Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) recalled that his delegation's proposal did not ask for all documents to be published in Spanish; it was merely designed to complete Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure. Spanish should become a written language for the sessions of the General Conference, where it was already a spoken language; in this, Unesco would merely be following the example set by the United Nations. The suggestion had been made that China might use this as a precedent, but although the population of China was greater than that of Latin America, the uniformity of language was by no means the same; nor did China consist of several States with international status. Finally, Mr. Castro Leal drew attention to the fact that the obstacles to the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the General Conference had been overcome by other Specialized Agencies; the reasons which led them to adopt Spanish were equally applicable in the case of Unesco.

[6] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) regretted that her delegation would have to vote against the Mexican proposal. She was, however, very anxious that this should not be considered an arbitrary decision. Several documents and publications of Unesco were already being issued in the Spanish language. Further, the fact that the proposal had originally been raised at the Mexico City Conference had enabled the problem to be studied in full for a year before the decisions were taken at Beirut. The United States delegation had not opposed the proposal at that time, because they fully realized the cultural importance of Spanish; but she felt that the present arrangements should be given a fair trial

before it was decided to extend them still further.

[7] Professor DÜRING (Sweden), supported by Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark), recapitulated the points he had made at the previous meeting. The proposition must be considered from the practical standpoint; of the present 58 Member States, English, French or Spanish was the mother-tongue of only 25 at most; for at least 33 of them, the work in Unesco involved speaking and reading a foreign tongue. The Spanish-speaking delegates already had the great advantage that they could express themselves in their own language at the main meetings, and further that many publications were already being produced in Spanish. Now they were also asking for the translation of conference documents. Were these really read by anyone outside the Conference? Would the issue of additional Unesco documents in Spanish really contribute to the knowledge of Unesco among the world's 150,000,000 Spanish-speaking individuals? He thought the money might be better spent on issuing more general documents in the Spanish language. His delegation would therefore regretfully have to vote against the Mexican proposal.

[8] Dr. MAJUMDAR (India) said that, despite his sympathy with the Mexican proposal, the argument that the 150,000,000 Spanish-speaking people constituted the biggest linguistic group was invalid when viewed in the light of China's population of 450,000,000 and India's of 400,000,000. Before adopting such a proposal, they must take a comprehensive view of the world as a whole, and he would therefore emphatically oppose it.

[9] Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) felt that the Committee must now weigh the various arguments which had been put forward and against the proposal: his delegation found the former more convincing, and he would therefore vote in its favour.

[10] Mr. BOLLA (Switzerland) recalled Switzerland's multilingual tradition, which was fruitful when observed in a tolerant and generous spirit. Only one of the four languages used in his country was a working language of Unesco. However, Spanish was one of the most widespread languages in the world, and, if Unesco's publications were to fulfil their purpose by influencing the masses of the people, the most important documents of the General Conference should be published in Spanish. Moreover, savings could be effected in Uesco's marginal activities. The Swiss delegation therefore supported the Mexican proposal.

[11] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) felt that the Committee should take a firm stand on controversial issues and decide whether any proposal was, or was not, in the spirit of Unesco. For himself, he thought the Mexican proposal was in that spirit, and he therefore gladly supported it.

[12] Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) thought it unlikely that the publication of the General Conference documents in Spanish would contribute anything towards spreading Unesco's influence. This latter process depended on the activities of the Mass Communication Department, and was effected through the press, the radio and the cinema. Doubtless, the use of Spanish during the General Conference would assist the participation of Spanish-speaking delegates, but heavy additional expenses would be incurred. Those who quoted the United Nations as an example lost sight of the fact that, in proportion to the total budget, the expense would be far greater for Unesco than for the United Nations. The Committee ought, therefore, to confine itself to recommending a larger number of publications in Spanish.

[13] Dr. WEN (China) said he would support the Mexican proposal for two reasons: (*a*) on grounds of practical convenience, and (*b*) on cultural grounds. At the same time, he reserved the right for China, at some future date, to claim the inclusion of Chinese as a working language of Unesco. The only serious objection which had been made was the financial one, but Dr. Wen felt sure that some other way could be found of cutting down expenses, for example in the printing of documents.

[14] Mr. MURTHINHO (Brazil) was in favour of the Mexican delegation's proposal, as was Mr. GÓNZALEZ RISOS (Argentina), who in support of his point of view, referred to the contribution made by "Hispanity" to world civilization and peace.

[15] Dr. El DIWANY (Egypt) also supported the Mexican proposal. Unesco's appeal must be to the masses, and in any case to the National Commissions; there were about twenty National Commissions whose members on the whole knew only their own language; the General Conference documents must be published in Spanish if these National Commissions were to be associated in Unesco's work.

[16] Dr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom) pointed out that a fair trial had already been given to the method of simultaneous interpretation. In his opinion, the question of the literary and cultural value of the Spanish language was totally irrelevant to the question at issue, which was purely whether or not its use would facilitate the working of Unesco and the General Conference.

As to the suggestion that the use of Spanish would promote the knowledge of Unesco, heads of delegations were already complaining about the spate of paper reaching them; he therefore asked the Committee to consider whether this additional paper would really be likely to reach the mass of the people. He was prepared to support any proposition made within the limits of their financial capabilities; but he thought they were deceiving themselves if they supposed the Conference papers could have more than a negligible effect outside Unesco.

Finally, he feared that the Organization could ill afford at this moment to drop other important work in favour of expanding the use of Spanish; but he suggested that the position might be eased if certain Member States paid their contributions to Unesco.

After a personal tribute to the Director-General, Dr. Huxley recalled that the latter had pointed out that Unesco's honeymoon period was coming to an end, that they must now justify themselves by practical results. He therefore appealed to the sense of loyalty of the Spanish-speaking delegates not to spend money which the Organization could not at present afford.

[17] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) observed that weighty arguments could be advanced in support of both points of view. On the one hand, there was the fear, expressed by some, that a precedent might be created and that the expenses incurred would be too heavy for the Organization's budget. On the other hand, no one could deny that to a certain extent Spanish had to be used in order to reach the Spanish-speaking populations; but did not the measure proposed by the delegation overshoot that mark?

The Belgian delegation suggested that more documents with a mass appeal, and likely to further international understanding, should be published in Spanish; but a careful choice should be made. Many pamphlets and documents containing general information were more suitable for the masses than were General Conference documents. The Belgian delegation therefore shared the United Kingdom delegate's view.

[18] Professor KUŠEJ (Yugoslavia) thought the adoption of the Mexican proposal would be one of the best ways of giving proof of the Organization's democratic spirit. It would no doubt be impossible to grant the same facilities to all Member States; but the Spanish language was a special case, since it was used by twenty nations linked by common traditions and history.

[19] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) drew a distinction between two classes of General Conference documents: (1) working papers distributed to delegations each day, and (2) basic documents prepared before the Conference (programme, budget, reports of committees of experts). The latter category at all costs, ought to be available to Spanish-speaking peoples.

[20] Mr. CAIN (France) emphasized the importance of the remarks made by Messrs. de Visscher and Tremblay. He wondered whether a proposal made by the former would not secure unanimous approval, viz., a recommendation that Spanish should be used for disseminating Unesco's aims and work, which would entail the translation of the basic documents published before each Conference.

This proposal was seconded by Mr. HUXLEY (United Kingdom).

[21] Mr. CASTRO LEAL (Mexico) thanked the French and Canadian delegates for having sought an approximately satisfactory solution that would secure unanimous approval. However, he asked that the Mexican proposal be first put to the vote.

[22] After some discussion, a motion on the adjournment of the debate, presented by Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America), was *rejected* by 19 votes to 14.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the setting up of a small drafting committee to try to reach agreement between the Mexican, Canadian and French proposals on the text of an amendment.

After discussion, this suggestion was *rejected* by 20 votes to 16.

Finally, the Mexican proposal [document 5C/PRO/5] was *adopted* by 23 votes to 12, with one abstention.

Draft Amendment to Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure [document 5C/PRO/7].

[23] The draft text on the submission of credentials proposed by the Drafting Committee [document 5C/PRO/7) was *adopted* unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

[1] The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the Committee had already considered Items 1 to 7 of its Agenda. With regard to Item 7 [Draft Amendment to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure (Working Languages), presented by the Mexican delegation] the Committee's conclusions had been embodied in a preliminary report communicated to the General Committee of the Conference for immediate transmission to the Programme and Budget Commission.

The present extraordinary meeting had been convened, at the request of the General Committee of the Conference, for the consideration of the following:

(1) Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions [document 5C/OXR/16];

(2) Draft resolution on biennial sessions of the General Conference, presented by the United States of America [documents 5C/16 and 5C/16 Annex];

(3) Draft resolution concerning the status of associate members of Unesco, presented by the United Kingdom delegation [document 5C/20].

Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions [document 5C/OXR/16].

[2] The CHAIRMAN stated that the Official and External Relations Commission, which was to consider the first of those items, was awaiting the report of the Procedure Committee. He therefore suggested adopting the same procedure as for Item 7 and preparing a preliminary report. He had just been informed that the final report, for which the Official and External Relations Commission had first been made responsible, would be drafted by the Programme and Budget Commission. As the first part of document 5C/OXR/16 explained the background of the question, the Chairman suggested that the discussion should turn upon the practical suggestions embodied in the second part of the document (Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions, covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution).

[3] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) submitted document 5C/OXR/16. Speaking of the need for taking sufficient time over the drafting of texts involving international obligations and leading, finally, to the adoption of legislative or regulatory measures by Member States, he referred to Unesco's sole experience in the matter; the agreement on audio-visual material had been drafted too hurriedly and it had been necessary to prepare a protocol, containing certain amendments, for signature. The draft submitted provided for the preliminary consideration of any matter it was proposed to regulate and for consultation with Member States, who would be requested to send in their observations and comments, on the basis of which the Director-General would prepare the final draft for submission to the Conference. Provision was made in document 5C/OXR/16 for the preparation of conventions either by a standing committee or by the Secretariat. The Official and External Relations Commission had advocated adopting the latter method for the time being.

[4] Dr. WALKER (Australia) stated that his delegation attached great importance to the matter. Before the draft rules of procedure were considered in detail, he thought he might usefully make a few general observations.

Although action had been very slow hitherto, it was to be hoped that it would speed up now that the Secretariat had a small group of legal experts competent in the matter. From Unesco's earliest days, action through international conventions had been contemplated as one of the most important means of regulating educational problems on an international basis. The delay was due to the fact that, during its first years, Unesco had been fully occupied with the preparation of its general programme. Whilst Australia had not been one of the first States to submit comments to the Secretariat, it none the less attached the highest importance to the problem, and the Australian delegation intended to present its observations thereon to the Conference.

[5] Under its Constitution, Unesco was prohibited from interference in the domestic affairs

of Member States, yet it could promote the cause of education by solemn recommendations and conventions. Dr. Walker mentioned that the agreement on audio-visual material was to be replaced by a convention on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural matrial. He thought it essential ot adopt some definite policy regarding the choice of subjects which might be covered by future conventions. The distinction between "recommendations" and "conventions" was, in his opinion, of the utmost importance; the Conference could do no more than "recommend" that Member States should adopt any particular convention which would not enter into force until it had been ratified by Member States. A recommendation had moral force only and no legal validity; if too numerous, recommendations would lose their value. There were several types, from the general recommendation (recognizing the value of such matters as teaching about the United Nations) to the more technical recommendation advocating specific, effective assistance to countries willing to co-operate. Every question raised should be considered with a view to determining whether it would be best regulated by a convention binding States or by less rigorous recommendations. When some activity undertaken by one State had repercussions in other States, the obvious course was to adopt a Convention, an excellent example of which was afforded by the Convention concerning the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Material.

[6] Dr. Walker hoped that a more important rôle would be assigned to the Executive Board which should be made responsible for initiating preliminary studies and deciding whether each particular case should be dealt with by means of a convention or a recommendation. For the time being, the Official and External Relations Commission was not favourable to the establishment of a standing legal committee. He personally did not feel there was any urgent need for laying down procedure for the presentation of reports by the Director-General and he suggested appointing a small sub-committee, of not more than five to seven members, to revise the draft regulations as soon as the general discussion was completed.

[7] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) shared many of Dr. Walker's views. However, the United Kingdom delegation would prefer to have conventions framed not on specially selected problems, but on those arising in the normal course of the Organization's work. Unesco's fundamental principle was to encourage Member States to make voluntary efforts for the advancement of education, science and culture, and except in cases where joint action was essential for success, Mr. Cowell hoped that the progress of Unesco's work would depend on general agreement among its loyal supporters rather than on legislative measures.

With regard to the practical proposals set forth in document 5C/OXR/16, the United Kingdom delegation considered them a decided improvement on the previous draft, but was nevertheless critical of certain minor points; in particular, it could not agree to the establishment of a standing legal committee. Whilst, therefore, approving in general the contents of the draft, Mr. Cowell supported the proposal that it should be referred to a drafting sub-committee.

[8] The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to submit, in writing, any proposals they wished to make to the Drafting Sub-Committee before the evening of Tuesday, 6 June 1950.

[9] In reply to a question from Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) as to whether originators of written proposals could defend them in the sub-committee even if they were not members of the latter, the CHAIRMAN said that that was for the Sub-Committee to decide, though he felt sure it would give due consideration to such a request.

[10] Miss PEDERSEN (Denmark) made a few general comments. Unesco was tackling a tremendous problem which was summarized in a very condensed working paper, whereas volumes would be needed to deal with every aspect of the question. The Procedure Committee could do no more than suggest the course to be adopted. Under other provisions of its Constitution, besides Article IV, Unesco could resort to the procedure of conventions and recommendations. The speaker shared the views of the delegate of the United States of America, who, in the Official and External Relations Commission, had spoken against the establishment of a standing legal committee; she also subscribed to the opinions expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom with regard to the desirability of adopting the procedure of recommendations, as they were less complicated than conventions. Referring to the Statement of Methods [document 5C/5 (I), Rev., pages 80 and 81], providing for the possibility of "declarations" and even of mere "appeals", the speaker thought it advisable to keep to declarations, the success of which depended primarily on the persuasiveness of the text adopted by the Conference. Very careful and costly preparation was essential when any draft agreement was being planned. Under the procedure followed by the Economic and Social Council, there were four possible methods for the preparation of conventions: drafting by a commission of the General

Assembly, by an international legal commission, by an *ad hoc* Committee of Experts or by a general conference convened for that purpose. Then came the procedure for ratification, which took time and afforded excuses for delays in the implementation of the Convention. Miss Pedersen thought that a recommendation authorizing the Director-General to enquire from Member States after some interval of time why they had not given effect to a recommendation adopted by the Conference would be more effective than a convention signed by a small number of States and ratified by an even smaller number: a good recommendation or, still better, a good declaration would carry far more weight, especially as it was difficult to express lofty ideas in legal terminology (as evidenced by the International Convention on Genocide and the Covenant on Human Rights).

[11] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) congratulated the Secretariat on its work; the document submitted to the Third Session of the General Conference had not enabled delegations to realize the full implications of the problem and to present useful observations.

Document 5C/OXR/16 covered three different matters: procedure for the framing of conventions; definition of recommendations and procedure relating to them; and the establishment of a standing legal committee. The delegation of the United States of America would take a negative stand on the latter point. It would also advocate making clearer reference to the part to be played by the Executive Board. It thought the time had come to lay down regulations for conventions, a more effective method in that it would be seldom used. With regard to recommendations, the United States delegation thought that Unesco should consider a procedure which had proved very effective in the case of ILO; it was necessary for such a procedure to be clearly defined in a document and for the resultant responsibilities of Member States to be specified. It should not be forgotten that recommendations frequently had to be carried out by non-governmental organizations. Mrs. Brunauer thought the drafting Sub-Committee should give separate consideration to the three matters dealt with in document 5C/OXR/16.

[12] Dr. ZEISSL (Austria) agreed with Miss Pedersen that recourse should seldom be had to conventions; however, they were necessary in certain cases, as for instance, recognition of the equivalence of university degrees, or the draft convention for the protection of monuments in time of war, presented by the Italian delegation. The first necessity was to arrive at a clear definition of the term "recommendation", which would win unanimous support and meet with the approval of legal experts. Dr. Zeissl thought there was no need to adopt strict rules to determine whether any particular problem should be regulated by a convention or a recommendation: the responsibility of deciding each case on its merits should be left to the Conference or the Executive Board.

[13] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) fully endorsed the views so clearly expressed by Miss Pedersen. With regard to the question of definition, raised by Mr. Cowell and Dr. Zeissl, Dr. Beaglehole remarked that definitions were already given under Sections 13 and 14 of the Statement of Methods: he would be glad to know whether that was sufficient for delegates, or whether they required clearer definitions. Lastly, he wished to know whether the Procedure Committee was discarding the idea of establishing a standing legal committee.

[14] The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Programme and Budget Commission had deferred consideration of Sections 13 and 14 of the Statement of Methods until it had the opinion of the Procedure Committee on the matter of conventions and recommendations. As regards the establishment of a standing legal committee, it was for the General Conference to take some decision; the fact that the Official and External Relations Commission had not approved the establishment of a standing legal committee would appear to authorize the Procedure Committee not to go too deeply into the question; it was to be presumed that the General Conference would also decide against the establishment of such a committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions (*continued*) [document 5C/OXR/16].

[1] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) supported the suggestion made by the Australian delegate at the previous meeting that a distinction should be made between the adoption and the application of conventions. He proposed that the Committee should confine themselves for the time being to discussing the first part of the draft Rules of Procedure, and postpone their consideration of the articles dealing with the application of conventions until later.

Mr. Murtinho thought that Articles 16 and 17 in the draft Rules of Procedure were too specific: the Secretariat should be able to obtain some explanations from Member States, but some States might find it difficult to submit a formal report on the reasons why they had not given effect to a convention to which they had been opposed at the General Conference. He did not see how any Minister of Foreign Affairs who thought that a particular convention was not in the interests of his country could ask the competent authorities to ratify it.

[2] The CHAIRMAN thought the question of the reports Member States were asked to submit might be reopened when the Committee came to discuss the question of establishing a standing legal committee.

[3] Mr. LACHARRIÈRE (France) wished to congratulate the Secretariat on the excellent document it had prepared.

Speaking of the preference some delegations showed for conventions, Mr. de Lacharrière said he was in favour of technical recommendations in certain cases. He therefore thought it necessary to draw up regulations concerning such recommendations.

[4] Dealing next with the suggestion made by the United States delegate that the Committee should deal with the matter as three separate problems, Mr. de Lacharrière stated that, in his opinion, there were four distinct problems: conventions, recommendations, the legal committee, and reports from Member States. He thought it would also be possible to discuss the question of conventions and that of recommendations concurrently with the problem of the legal committee which might be used in both cases, turning later to the question of reports from Member States. He agreed with the Australian delegation that the form in which the reports were required was too restrictive. He also agreed with that delegation's views on the part to be played by the Executive Board, which he would like to have stated more clearly in the document.

[5] Mr. de Lacharrière also supported the Brazilian delegation's views on the implications of the adoption of conventions by Unesco's General Conference. He advocated including a regulation regarding the procedure for signature, for he thought that matter should be separate from the question of adoption by a two-thirds majority and ratification by the competent authorities in Member States.

[6] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) associated himself with Mr. de Lacharrière's congratulations to the Secretariat. He agreed with him that recommendations or conventions should be used according to the needs of the particular case in question, and urged that regulations concerning recommendations as well as conventions should be prepared.

Mr. Pilotti pointed out that the powers conferred on delegates to the General Conference were, at the present time, general powers, valid solely for the work of the Conference. He thought that, when a draft convention was to be submitted to the General Conference, delegates should be given full powers, so that they could sign the convention on behalf of their government, which would merely have to proceed to the ratification of the convention afterwards. In conclusion, Mr. Pilotti drew the Committee's attention to the draft agreement relating to the protection of monuments and works of art in the event of armed conflict [document 5C/11-Add. I], which in his opinion should be the subject of a convention.

[7] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) thought the question of conventions and recommendations was

very important at a time when public opinion was looking for practical achievements from Unesco. Nevertheless, because of the importance of the problem, Mr. de Visscher warned the Committee against the danger of rushing a decision. He pointed out that it had been impossible for Member States to consider the document, which was dated 3 April, until some weeks later; it therefore seemed that Member States had not had enough time to go into this important question sufficiently thoroughly, or to secure the advice of qualified experts (technical organizers of international conferences, specialists on international law, etc.).

[8] In the circumstances, Mr. de Visscher thought it would be better for the current session of the Conference to take no final decision regarding the preparation of a procedure to be followed in future years, for success would depend on how satisfactory that procedure was. In that connexion, he reminded the meeting that the conventions prepared in haste at The Hague in 1930 had either not been ratified or had been denounced almost immediately.

[9] Mr. de Visscher had noticed that a number of important problems had come to light in the discussion and did not seem to have been solved: terminology, full powers, obligations resulting from the vote, from signature and from ratification, reports to be submitted by Member States. He thought it would be unwise to proceed with the Rules on such a doubtful basis.

[10] He suggested that the document, together with the observations made on it, should be circulated to Member States so that they might make a thorough study of the matter concurrently with their consideration of the work undertaken by the United Nations and the Institute of International Law on the same problem.

[11] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the views expressed by the various delegations should be included in the report to be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission by the Committee, leaving the General Conference to decide whether or not to take any definite measures in the matter. He considered it was also for the General Conference to decide on the reports to be submitted by Member States.

[12] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) also recommended caution, for he thought it necessary to retain some discretion to deal with each problem in the most appropriate way. He did not think it desirable to set up a legal committee, nor did he believe that the time was ripe for Unesco to draw up permanent regulations for the treatment of international conventions, which did not seem to him to be the best means of stimulating that spirit of initiative which alone could lead to progress and the accomplishment of Unesco's aims.

Dr. Kadhim agreed with Mr. de Visscher that Member States should study the problem thoroughly.

[13] Dr. BLANCO Y SANCHEZ (Cuba) agreed with the delegations of Belgium and Iraq; the views they had expressed were similar, incidentally, to those of the Cuban delegation at the previous session of the General Conference. He agreed with Dr. Zeissl about the relative importance of the various questions involved in the problem.

[14] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that it had been anticipated that document 5C/OXR/16 would be circulated to Member States, and that another document setting out their comments would be submitted to the General Conference for consideration; unfortunately, the time had been too short for Member States to send in their comments by the due date.

[15] Mr. Saba reminded the Committee that the definition of recommendations had been given in the general directions issued by the preceding session of the General Conference, and that only recommendations in line with that definition were to be covered by the regulations: the recommendations in question were those requiring Member States to lay down rules or standards and to institute procedure for the application of those rules or standards. In fact, such recommendations differed from conventions only in the fact that they did not entail contractual relations between States and that they were not subject to signature and ratification; greater flexibility in their application by Member States was therefore possible. The General Conference would have to decide what it considered the most appropriate method in every specific case, after a careful examination of the subject and the possible means of procedure. A text would then be drafted, which would make it possible to obtain from Member States some indication of the minimum and maximum rules they would be prepared to adopt.

[16] A document dealing with Unesco's various methods of action, which included conventions and recommendations for the regulation of problems, had been submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission. The latter was deferring further consideration of this document until it had received the Procedure Committee's report on the procedure to be adopted.

[17] With regard to the reports from Member States, Mr. Saba drew attention to Article IV, paragraph 6, of the Constitution; all the General

Conference had to decide was in what form the reports should be submitted. He explained that, when the General Conference adopted a convention, Member States contracted obligations only when they signed or ratified it. Provision was made in the Constitution for every Member State concerned to submit the text of conventions or recommendations to the competent authorities of its own country.

[18] He agreed that the procedure set forth in the draft Rules was complicated; the fact that there was no permanent legal body in Unesco made it difficult to prepare conventions or recommendations, as the Secretariat had to apply direct to Member States in an attempt to work out rules which were likely to be adopted by the majority.

[19] The CHAIRMAN suggested two possible ways of dealing with the report the Committee was to submit: it might either ask the drafting sub-committee to give a summary of the Committee's discussions, or it might draw up a more detailed report putting specific proposals before the General Conference. The Chairman considered, however, that in any case, the Committee should give a definite opinion, and not merely ask the Conference to defer consideration of the question until the next Session.

He proposed that the members of the sub-committee should be nominated, and that its terms of reference should be as wide as possible, so that it might take into consideration the different points of view expressed.

[20] At the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN and Mr. de LACHARRIÈRE (France), seconded by Dr. ZEISSL (Austria), it was *decided* that the sub-committee should consist of the representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Egypt, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the the United States of America. The Rapporteur would also be a member of the sub-committee, which would hold its first meeting on Wednesday, 6 June.

Report on the interpretation of certain provisions of the Rules of Procedure [document 5C/PRO/6].

[21] The SECRETARY submitted document 5C/PRO/6, mentioning that, for greater clarity and in order to bring the wording into line with the provisions adopted by the United Nations, it was proposed that Rules 11, 14 and 36 should be amended as suggested in the document.

[22] The CHAIRMAN announced that the had just been informed of a draft amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation. As, however, it had been impossible to distribute the text to delegations, it was *decided*, at the suggestion of Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), that the Committee should wait until it had received the amendments in writing before considering the proposals contained in document 5C/PRO/6.

[23] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) drew attention to a difference between the second paragraph of Rule 14 and the wording adopted by the United Nations on the same point; it would be advisable to adopt another form of words closer to that of the United Nations.

[24] The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Cowell to consult with the New Zealand delegate so that they might submit a joint proposal for Rule 14. He pointed out, however, that the difference mentioned by Mr. Cowell was due to the fact that the length of the sessions of the two organizations was not identical; it would therefore be necessary to provide for more flexible Rules.

[25] At the suggestion of Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon), it was *decided* to ask the Secretariat to get into touch with the delegations of New Zealand and the United Kingdom in order to redraft Rule 11.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, 6 June 1950, at 4.20 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft resolution concerning the Status of Associate Memberships of Unesco [document 5C/20].

[1] In presenting the United Kingdom draft resolution contained in document 5C/20, Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) recalled the history of the proposal which had originated in the generous impulses of the United States delegation at Beirut in 1948. At that time a resolution on similar lines had been moved but had met with opposition on many sides. He regretted that the United Kingdom delegation had been among those opposing the motion, which had subsequently been withdrawn. Study of the problem had since led the Government of the United Kingdom to the conclusion that associate membership would be one effective means of associating non-self-governing territories more directly with the work of Unesco.

[2] He thought that there was substantial agreement on the end in view. If, however, the United Kingdom draft resolution, moved as a means to that end, raised difficulties of procedure, his delegation would welcome any alternative suggestion which would contribute to the removal of that difficulty. His delegation was well aware that, even if the draft resolution were approved in Plenary Session, no immediate steps could be taken, since the Director-General would first have to study the matter. It would be for the Sixth General Conference to decide on the merits of the proposal. However, any proposal which would lead the Director-General to study the problem of non-self-governing territories would receive United Kingdom support.

[3] Mr. SEBASTIAN (Philippines), while agreeing with the aims of the United Kingdom proposal, voiced some doubts as to the means proposed for attaining them. He did not intend to oppose the draft resolution; he merely hoped that the procedural difficulties would be noted by the Director-General and the Executive Board when they made the necessary adjustments to the Constitution.

[4] He failed to see how the governments of non-self-governing territories could consent to participate in the manner suggested in the draft resolution. They were to be given the right to voice their opinions and to contribute financially to the funds of the Organization without having the right to take part in decisions on the use of such funds. He hoped that non-self-governing territories would be admitted either as observers or as full members.

[5] Moreover, the United Kingdom draft resolution stated that the Director-General (or the Executive Board) should consult

> . . . with Member States responsible for territories not responsible for the conduct of their own international relations, to formulate proposals for any necessary amendments to the Constitution.

What was the procedure contemplated for submitting amendments to the proposals made by the Director-General (or the Executive Board)?

[6] HAMED ZAKI Bey (Egypt) considered that the issue was really one of procedure: it was a question of amending Article II of Unesco's Constitution, but Article II made no mention of non-self-governing territories. This statement in no way implied that the Egyptian delegation was opposed to the admission of such territories. On the contrary, it wished to champion freedom, and believed that, at least in the cultural field, such areas should participate with full rights in United Nations activities.

If Article II of the Constitution were to be amended, it would clearly be necessary to have recourse to the procedure set out in Article XIII. In view of the procedure established in that Article, however, it seemed difficult to reach any solution.

[7] Mr. WAHAB (France) thought that common ground might be found by asking the Director-General to consult with those Member States that were responsible for the administration and foreign affairs of non-self-governing territories, and to forward the results of their enquiries to all the Member States. He therefore submitted the following draft resolution:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE,

CONSIDERING the Resolution whereby the Third General Conference of Unesco requested Member States responsible for the administration of non-self-governing territories to ensure the co-operation of such territories in the work of Unesco,

INSTRUCTS the Director-General:

To invite Member States responsible in one form or another for the development and conduct of the affairs of certain States or territories, to indicate in their annual reports the points on which they have achieved co-operation by such States or territories in the work of Unesco;

To invite the same Member States, after consulting the States or territories concerned, to send him any suggestions on the forms which such co-operation might take, including those which might involve amendment of the Constitution;

To communicate to all Member States the results of this enquiry by a date which will enable the Sixth General Conference of Unesco to discuss any amendment that may have been proposed in this respect.

[8] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) wished to draw a distinction between the two kinds of problems at issue:

In the first place, the Committee had to solve a question of substance: To what extent could non-self-governing territories be associated in Unesco's work? How far could they have the same rights and duties as self-governing States?

In the second place, a problem of constitutional procedure had to be settled.

The General Committee had asked for legal advice on these two points. In doing so, it had had regard to the provision of Article XIII, 2, of Unesco's Constitution, concerning the procedure to be followed in considering proposals for amendments to the Constitution, and stating that

> . . . the General Conference shall have power to adopt by a two-thirds majority rules of procedure for carrying out the provisions of this Article.

Unfortunately, the special rule to regulate this procedure for amendments did not yet exist. A problem of constitutional procedure therefore arose.

[9] According to Article XIII, the draft texts of proposed amendments must be communicated by the Director-General to Member States at least six months in advance of their consideration by the General Conference. It was not stated in that Article who was empowered to draft such amendments. If the procedure hitherto adopted as regards amendments to the Constitution were examined, it would be found that the General Conference had adopted the "first reading" of the proposed amendment, and then instructed the Director-General to transmit it to Member States, so that it could be submitted to the following Conference for adoption. But the delicate question of procedure in the case of an amendment to an amendment had not so far arisen.

[10] In the absence of such rules, Mr. Saba had to lay a request before the Committee. If the Committee decided to instruct the Executive Board or the Director-General to formulate a draft amendment, it was essential that the instructions should be most precise and that the procedure to be followed be laid down in specific terms.

[11] The CHAIRMAN thought there were two distinct tasks involved, to provide for an implementation such as would avoid undue delay to Article XIII, 2 of the Constitution, and to give an opinion on the produce to be followed.

He did not see any wide divergence between the French resolution and that of the United Kingdom. He therefore suggested that they be combined; the way would then be clear for suggesing a procedure for implementing Article XIII, 2 of the Constitution in a manner which would allow the Sixth General Conference to take a decision. As Mr. Saba had indicated that the Committee should not make a precise proposal regarding the implementation of that Article, he suggested that the preparation of a draft rule of procedure for submitting amendments to the Constitution should be left to the Director-General and the Secretariat. The Committee could, however, give useful suggestions to guide them in their work.

[12] Dr. WALKER (Australia) supported the Chairman's suggestion and expressed the hope that the United Kingdom and France would be able to come to an agreement.

In raising the matter of Article XIII, 2, in the Sub-Committee, he had had in mind not only the question of amendments to the Constitution, but also the doubful soundness of the practice of introducing an amendment to the Constitution and discussing it in principle at the same Conference without observing the statutory six months' notice.

[13] During the six months which should precede the discussion of principle, valuable preliminary discussions and study of technical problems could take place. Delegations also had time to get full instructions from their governments which they could not procure in the course of a single conference. If six months' notice were not given, many delegations would be compelled to abstain from the vote, regardless of their convictions on the merits of the proposed amendment. Moreover, the delegation proposing the amendment should be responsible for drafting the text,

and not the Director-General, whose part it would be to provide technical assistance to the delegation concerned and to arrange for consultations.

[14] He suggested the following procedure: The delegation submitting an amendment to the Constitution should give notice of its intention and explain the substance of the amendment at one Conference; the Director-General should then be authorized to arrange consultations and to provide assistance to the delegation sponsoring the amendment (a procedural decision not requiring a two-thirds majority), and the following General Conference should take the final decision. That procedure would give delegates who were ready to express an opinion the opportunity to do so at the time when notice was given.

[15] The CHAIRMAN explained that he had mentioned the matter of amendments in order to show that the provisions of the Constitution were not sufficiently detailed.

[16] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States) wondered whether the French resolution was designed to make it possible for the Sixth General Conference to adopt the solution of associate membership by a two-thirds majority if it so desired. If so, she thought that procedure in order. Everything should be done to prevent delay in the adoption of a solution.

However, she reminded the meeting that, when the Constitution was drafted, it had been intended that important amendments should be brought up at one Conference and adopted at the next. The more flexible wording had been included because a large number of minor adjustments had been expected.

[17] The CHAIRMAN emphasized the task of the Committee, which was to give advice on the way in which a final decision could be prepared. He suggested that the problem of preparing rules of procedure for submitting amendments to the Constitution gave place to the more immediate task of embodying the opinion of the meeting regarding procedure to be applied in the consideration of document 5C/20 in a definite form.

[18] Mr. OLLENNU (United Kingdom) agreed that, as a matter of general principle, the existing rules might prove adequate for the treatment of amendments of lesser importance. Dr. Walker's suggestion would be preferable for dealing with very far-reaching amendments. He understood that, when six months' notice had been given, an amendment would be put on the agenda of the Conference in the normal way. Sub-amendments would then be dealt with in the normal course of Conference procedure. As to the problem of associate membership, the misgivings which had been voiced were, in his opinion, details which could be dealt with by the General Conference. Since the matter had been raised at Beirut in 1948, he felt that Member States might be ready to deal with it under a procedure involving as short a lapse of time as possible.

Mr. Ollennu thought that any slight differences between the United Kingdom and French delegations in the matter of a text for submission to the General Conference could be overcome. The difficulty arose as regards discussion of the report before an amendment to the Constitution was proposed, but he felt that agreement was possible on this point.

[19] Mr. WAHAB (France) pointed out that the French delegation's draft resolution did not broach the basic question, which would have to be settled by a future Conference. The resolution merely asked Member States to set an enquiry on foot, so as to obtain suggestions which might serve as a basis for precise proposals, and to suggest such procedural methods as seemed indicated in this respect.

[20] On the CHAIRMAN's assurance that the question of reports would not prejudice the possibility of associate membership being discussed at the Sixth General Conference, Mr. OLLENNU (United Kingdom) withdrew the United Kingdom draft resolution in favour of the French proposal.

[21] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) asked that certain points be clarified. Firstly, was the object of this resolution to instruct the Director-General to ask Member States, six months before the Sixth Session of the General Conference, to forward to him all the suggestions which he might consider it proper to submit, in the form of an amendment or in some other form, on the question of the participation of non-self-governing territories in Unesco's work? Secondly, did this projected enquiry concern only those Member States that were responsible for the administration of the territories of other States?

[22] Mr. WAHAB (France) replied to these two questions in the affirmative.

The draft resolution proposed by the French delegation was *adopted.*

[23] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that the problem which had just been solved by the Committee had been referred to it for a legal opinion. In view of the decision just made, the difficulty of constitutional procedure raised by the preparation of amendments to Unesco's Constitution was

now settled. He therefore asked the Committee to instruct the Chairman to lay a report to this effect before the General Conference.

[24] Dr. WALKER (Australia) pointed out that, although the difficulty had been overcome on the question of associate membership, the same difficulty would again arise when the Committee came to consider document 5C/16 dealing with biennial sessions of the General Conference.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Friday, 9 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Report on the interpretation of certain provisions of the Rules of Procedure (*continued*) [document 5C/PRO/6].

Amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation to Rules of Procedure 11 and 14.

PARAGRAPH *(d)*.

[1] At the suggestion of Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom), it was *agreed* to insert the phrase "in accordance with Rule 36 (3)" at the end of the first sentence of paragraph *(d)* of the amendment.

[2] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) further proposed changing the last sentence of paragraph *(d)* to the effect that no new item might be considered until seven days had elapsed after it was placed on the agenda, unless the General Conference decided otherwise by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

[3] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) pointed out that such a change would mean that a two-thirds majority could demand immediate consideration of a new item, whereas the original text presented by the New Zealand delegation required the unanimous consent of all members. If new items were of major importance, it was preferable to require unanimous consent.

[4] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) remarked that in the original amendment, the questions to be included in the agenda were qualified as "important". It was therefore essential that they be considered, and Mr. Murtinho was consequently in favour of the adoption of the United Nations formula permitting delegations to ask their Governments for instructions. He also supported the suggestion made by Mr. Cowell, which was designed to enable such discussions to be adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN having seconded Mrs. Brunauer's point of view, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) withdrew his suggestion.

PARAGRAPH *(g)*.

[5] The CHAIRMAN felt that paragraph *(g)* of the amendment might be omitted as, according to Rule of Procedure 48, the sections under consideration applied to "commissions, committees and subsidiary bodies of the Conference". He proposed substituting this wording for that proposed in the New Zealand amendment.

[6] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) thought the inclusion of the sub-committees, which were of a more informal character, was inadvisable, as they should not be governed by elaborate procedure. A generic term should be used, or else all bodies enumerated.

Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) agreed with Dr. Beaglehole. As the enumeration in the present case was not long, he supported the New Zealand amendment and moved its adoption.

[7] Mr. SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) proposed the wording: "commissions, committees and subsidiary bodies of the Conference".

Mr. JAUME (France) pointed out that, in sections XII, XIII and XIV, and especially in Rules 61, 65 and 69, this was in fact the formula used. He therefore proposed, in order to preserve uniform terminology, that Mr. Sebastián's proposal be adopted.

The proposal of the delegate for the Philippines was *adopted*.

Consideration of the original text of document 5C/PRO/6.

[8] The CHAIRMAN stated that sections I and II of document 5C/PRO/6 had now been adopted, with the exception of the final paragraph for Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure.

It was *decided* to adopt the text proposed on page 3 of the document as a last paragraph to Rule 11, but to insert a (2) after Rule 14, so that the sentence would conclude: "Rules 14 (2) and 36 (3) of the Rules of Procedure".

Sections I and II were *adopted.*

Sections III, IV and V were *adopted* without comment.

[9] The SECRETARY suggested that consideration of section VI be deferred, in view of the establishment of a Budget Committee, which should be included in the Rules of Procedure together with the three former committees (Nominations, Credentials and Procedure). The procedure concerning new items with budgetary implications should be studied as a whole.

It was *agreed* to defer a decision on section VI.

[10] As regards section VII, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the rule stipulating that the President and Vice-President of the General Conference should not vote would apply equally to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of subsidiary bodies of the Conference.

Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) asked whether this meant that these persons could not record a casting vote in cases of parity.

[11] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that this interpretation was correct. Rule 90 did in fact stipulate that, if a vote were equally divided, a second vote would be taken in the course of the next meeting. If at that meeting the vote were again equally divided, the proposal was considered as lost. He added that, as Rule 90 was included in section XV of the Rules of Procedure, it was covered by Rule 48 and was therefore applicable to discussions in the committees and commissions, as well as to those in the subsidiary bodies.

Section VII was *adopted.*

Section VIII was *adopted* without comment.

[12] Presenting certain amendments under section IX, Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) said these had been drawn up in the light of the experience gained at the present Conference. Their object was to change the whole conception of the Procedure Committee, which the Belgian delegation at present considered too narrow. It therefore proposed to extend it by calling the Committee "the Committee on Procedure and Legal Matters". This would merely involve recognition of a *de facto* situation, since the Committee dealt with constitutional and legal questions referred to it by the other commissions.

This proposal would involve the following amendments to the Rules of Procedure:

RULE 31: COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND LEGAL MATTERS.

1. The Committee on Procedure *and Legal Matters* shall consist of . . . (*Remainder unchanged*)

RULE 32: FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

1. This Committee shall consider and report to the General Conference on *legal problems*, especially on amendments to or revisions of the Rules of Procedure and amendments to or revisions of the Constitution.
2. This Committee may appoint an advisory committee of nine members to consider and make recommendations for dealing with *legal* or procedural problems which may be referred to it . . . (*Remainder unchanged*)

RULE 33: INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

1. The Committee on Procedure *and Legal Matters* may . . . (*Remainder unchanged*)
4. In cases where the Organization is party to a dispute, the Committee on Procedure *and Legal Matters* may . . . (*Remainder unchanged*)

[13] Mr. LE BRAS (France) warmly welcomed the Belgian proposal on behalf of his delegation. The term "règlement" in French was much too narrow, and was suggestive of rather petty and tedious questions, whereas the Committee should deal with all legal problems and be competent to handle all legal difficulties.

The Belgian amendment was also seconded by Mr. de ICAZA (Mexico) and Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America).

[14] The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if the proposal to change the name of the Committee were accepted, it should be left to the Secretariat to make the necessary amendments throughout the Rules of Procedure.

[15] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) was not altogether favourable to the change, as he felt names of committees should remain as simple as possible. Furthermore, the proposed new name gave a false idea of the functions and composition of the committee, which was, in fact, not formed of lawyers. The legal branch of the Secretariat, and not the Procedure Committee, was the body to deal with juridical matters.

[16] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) stated that he had first thought of the name "Legal Committee", as covering both "règlement" and procedure; but it had been pointed out to him that such a title might be unwelcome to the Conference and also be confused with the special legal committee contemplated for the examination of

international conventions. The object of the Belgian amendment was to make the name of the Committee correspond to present realities.

[17] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) found the proposed change in name a mere recognition of fact. Legal questions had always been referred to the Procedure Committee, which was, in fact, making the laws within the Organization and adapting them in the light of experience.

[18] Dr. ROBBINS (Canada) enquired what was the practice in other Specialized Agencies.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) could give only a partial answer. The United Nations had a legal committee (the Sixth Commission), as did ILO and the International Civil Aviation Organization. He had no information concerning the other Specialized Agencies.

[19] Mr. LE BRAS (France) referred to the legal difficulty which had arisen at the previous evening's meeting of the Programme and Budget Commission with regard to the right of resuming a discussion after a formal decision had been taken. He asked whether Unesco had any body competent to decide questions of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, during the life of Unesco, questions of interpretation of rules had always been referred to the Procedure Committee, but this was not explicit in Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure. It might therefore seem advisable to request an alteration in the Committee's terms of reference.

Mr. LE BRAS (France) concluded from this that the Procedure Committee was in fact a real legal committee. It should constitute a kind of Council of State, dealing with all legal questions without necessarily being composed of professional lawyers. As he considered that what was lacking in Unesco was precisely a body for taking decisions on legal problems, he not only warmly supported the Belgian proposal, but went further and recommended the setting up of a committee which could deal with all legal problems confronting the Organization, without being confined to questions of procedure.

[20] Mr. PILOTTI (Italy) also thought the Committee's present name was too restrictive—at least in certain languages. Thus he did not see how the question which had arisen in the Programme and Budget Commission could have been referred to the Procedure Committee. As to the membership of the Committee, Mr. Pilotti himself had for many years presided as a judge with the assistance of two engineers who had done excellent work, although they were not lawyers. The name of the Committee should be as simple as possible. "Comité de procédure", in French, would be some improvement, but for himself, he would prefer simply "Legal Committee" (Comité juridique).

[21] Mr. de VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) considered the term "legal committee" too narrow in English, and proposed "Constitutional Committee" as the title of this body. All legal problems with which the Committee dealt arose from the Constitution itself.

[22] Dr. BLANCO Y SÁNCHEZ (Cuba), supporting the Belgian proposal, proposed the term "Committee for Legal Affairs" in English and "Comité des Affaires Juridiques" in French.

[23] The CHAIRMAN suggested that the proposed Belgian amendment might be put immediately before the General Conference, together with a request for alteration of the terms of reference of the Committee; alternatively, as many of the Rules of Procedure might be changed when a decision was taken on the question of biennial meetings, it might be preferable to avoid a series of successive modifications of the Rules, by entrusting this item to the body charged with recasting the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported the suggestion to defer this item.

Seeing that the majority seemed to favour his proposal, Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) was against deferring the discussion. He pointed out that a legal committee would be precisely what was needed for dealing with the questions referred to by the Chairman.

[24] Mr. LE BRAS (France) noted that there was agreement as to the need for having some body to deal with legal problems that called for more than mere interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. Such a task should devolve upon the Procedure Committee, subject to an alteration in its name.

[25] It was *decided* by 10 votes to 1 to adopt the Belgian amendment in principle, for inclusion in the final report of the Committee, but no final decision was taken concerning the new title of the Committee.

Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) requested that the various suggestions for a new title be set out for the consideration of members, so that they could select the most appropriate at the next meeting of the Committee.

Agreed.

The resolution on pages 6 and 7 of document 5C/PRO/6 was *adopted* as amended.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 40.5 to 40.58.

Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution (*continued*) [document 5C/OXR/16, page 9].

[26] The CHAIRMAN proposed that discussion of this document might be postponed, to allow members time to study it.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that the text was merely a provisional draft which might, it was suggested, be adopted for one year and subsequently revised. Furthermore, account had been taken of the various amendments presented by Member States that had not participated in the work of the Sub-Committee.

[27] Presenting the draft report, Mr. PILOTTI (Italy), Chairman of the Sub-Committee, emphasized that it contained four observations indicating that all the proposals were of an essentially provisional nature. The rules were in the nature of an experiment only, and would be given their final form by a future Conference in the light of experience. The Sub-Committee made no claim to have exhausted the subject.

Mr. Pilotti concluded by recommending the adoption of proposals, which had been carefully considered; in modifying the Secretariat's draft text, the Sub-Committee had, so far as possible, taken into account all the amendments presented to it.

[28] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee pass this document to the General Conference without formally adopting it, informing the Conference that, in drafting it, the Sub-Committee had taken into account the proposals of Member States.

[29] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) recalled that the Programme and Budget Commission was waiting for a report on this question from the Procedure Committee. Moreover, he did not think that a document drafted by a Sub-Committee could be submitted directly to the Conference without being first examined by the Procedure Committee. He therefore considered it preferable to adjourn discussion until a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

Monday, 12 June 1950, at 9 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft amendments to Rules 52 and 55 of the Rules of Procedure (Working Languages) presented by the Mexican delegation (*continued*) [document 5C/PRO/5].

[1] The CHAIRMAN read a communication from the Budget Committee in reply to a question from the Procedure Committee in connection with its previous discussion on the adoption of Spanish as a working language. The Budget Committee had considered the budgetary implications of the project, and considered that $99,422 was a reasonable estimate of additional costs; if approved by the Procedure Committee, the sum would be included in the Budget Committee's final budget figures.

Report of the Sub-Committee of the Procedure Committee on the draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution [document 5C/OXR/16-Addendum].

[2] Professor PILOTTI (Italy), Chairman of the Sub-Committee, recalled that, at its Fifth Meeting, the Procedure Committee had appointed a sub-committee to study and report on the question of the adoption of Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions. This Sub-Committee had met on 7 and 9 June. It had taken note of the comments and proposed amendments presented by

the delegations of Australia, Mexico, Union of South Africa and United Kingdom, and had finally adopted a revised text of the draft Rules of Procedure, which it now submitted for the Committee's approval as document 5C/OXR/16-Add.

In doing so, Professor Pilotti wanted to make certain observations on behalf of the Sub-Committee:

(1) The procedure to be followed for the framing and adoption of recommendations to Member States and of international conventions could be finally established only in the light of experience and by taking into account the frequency with which the General Conference would have recourse to the powers to make regulations vested in it under Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution.

(2) Hitherto, the General Conference had seldom had occasion to frame and adopt international conventions or recommendations for the regulation of any question on an international basis.

(3) The Sub-Committee considered that, in the circumstances, the proposed regulations should be adopted on a provisional basis, and that it might be desirable to revise them at subsequent sessions in the light of comments to be addressed to the Director-General by Member States, as well as on the basis of the experience acquired and the practice developed, and to the extent that the General Conference would have made, or might have decided to make, use of recommendations and conventions in the pursuit of the Organization's aims.

(4) The Sub-Committee considered that, in the event of the adoption of the draft regulations submitted, these should govern not only all proposals for the international regulation of any particular question to be presented to subsequent sessions of the Conference, but also any draft recommendations or conventions that the General Conference might have already decided to frame, in so far as the provisions of the draft might subsequently have become applicable thereto.

[3] The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the draft Rules of Procedure contained in document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum, article by article.

Articles 1-13 were *adopted* without comment.

Article 14.

[4] Mr. MAHMASSINI (Lebanon) observed that Article 14 was related to Article 1(*a*), and asked whether a convention adopted by a two-thirds majority of the General Conference had subsequently to be ratified by the parliaments of the contracting States, or whether the convention entered into force immediately it had been adopted by the General Conference.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) replied that the conventions adopted by the General Conference had to be submitted for subsequent ratification by Member States.

[5] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) pointed out that the text said nothing about signing treaties. He wanted to know what were the obligations of Member States with regard to conventions approved by the General Conference.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that Member States had undertaken, in the Constitution, to submit the drafts to their competent authorities, to permit them to give such effect to them as they deemed fit.

M. MURTINHO (Brazil) thought the necessity for initial adherence should be specified before there was any mention of ratification, and he asked that this point should be clarified.

[6] To meet this request, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the word "signature" be introduced into Article 1 (*a*), so that it would read:

International conventions for *signature and* later ratification by Member States.

[7] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) thought that Article 1 should dispel Mr. Martinho's apprehensions, and he proposed changing the words "soumettre à la ratification des" in the French text to: "à ratifier par les".

[8] Professor PILOTTI (Italy) agreed with Mr. Murtinho. A convention could not be regarded as such unless it hed been signed by the delegates who had approved it, nor could it be submitted for ratification by Member States unless it had already been signed. He therefore proposed that the words "which must also be signed by those who voted in favour of the convention" be added to the first clause of Article 14.

[9] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) could not see the need for signature by Member States who had voted in favour of the convention. He thought the text sufficiently clear, and was opposed to any addition, pointing out that Article IV of the Constitution gave the General Conference the right to adopt conventions for simple ratification by Member States.

[10] Mr. MAHMASSINI (Lebanon) thought there was no great difference between the opinions expressed by Professor Pilotti and Mr. Saba, which could be reconciled by adding to the first clause of Article 14 the words:

The convention should specify the conditions and procedure required for its signature and later ratification by Member States.

[11] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that it was necessary to give a precise definition of international conventions. He proposed that the terminology of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution should be followed.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that, when the Constitution had been discussed in 1945, certain States had objected to the word "ratification", which had therefore been replaced by "approval".

[12] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) thought that the draft rules under discussion were designed for the preparation of conventions, yet it seemed to him that the Committee was discussing what happened after the conventions had been prepared in accordance with those rules. He therefore asked whether the discussion was in order.

[13] In reply to a question from Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America), Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) stated that Unesco's Constitution had been based on the Constitution of ILO, which laid down that conventions were to be ratified by Member States. In no case, however, did the signatures of delegates to the General Conference constitute a ratification signifying that the Governments of the contracting States accepted the obligations laid down in the convention. Therefore, although the General Conference of ILO passed a real legislative act, Member States had to ratify the convention subsequently in order to be bound by it. It should be stated in the convention itself that only ratification constituted a binding obligation. Mr. Saba added that the position in the United Nations was entirely different, as conventions signed during the General Assembly were immediately binding on the signatories.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the insertion of the word "draft" before "convention" in Article 14, to show that it was not a question of final approval.

[14] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) proposed that the wording of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution be substituted for that of Article 14.

Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) indicated that Article 14 would then read as follows:

A two-thirds majority shall be required for the adoption of a *draft* convention.

A simple majority shall be sufficient for the adoption of a *draft* recommendation.

The United States proposal to adopt the wording of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution, seconded by Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) and Dr. BLANCO Y SÁNCHEZ (Cuba), was *adopted.*

Articles 15-22 were *adopted* without comment.

Draft regulations relating to recommendations to Member States and international conventions: Resolution submitted by the Belgian delegation [document 5C/OXR/16, Add. 2].

[15] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) explained why the Belgian delegation had presented the draft resolution contained in document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum 2. He recalled that, when the draft regulations had first been submitted, the Belgian delegation had commented on the rapid procedure which had had to be adopted.

The Belgian draft resolution contained in document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum 2, was unanimously *adopted.*

Statement of Methods [document 5C/5 (1) Rev., pages 80 and 81].

[16] The CHAIRMAN announced that it was the duty of the Procedure Committee to inform the Programme and Budget Committee whether or not the wording of section III, paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Statement of Methods was in conformity with the Draft Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions (document 5C/OXR/16, Addendum) which the Committee had just adopted.

It was *agreed* that this was so.

The meeting rose at 11.25 p.m.

NINTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft Resolution on Biennial Sessions of the General Conference, introduced by the United States of America [document 5C/16 (Rev.)].

[1] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) gave a short explanation of the substance of the United States revised resolution. She drew attention to the growing work of the Specialized Agencies and to the consequent burden placed on the Secretariat, as well as the high costs involved in annual meetings. The adoption of this amendment might involve changing the terms of office of members of the Executive Board.

[2] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was not opposed to biennial sessions, which meant that more time and money would be available for programme activities. He was aware that FAO and other Specialized Agencies were taking steps to alter their rules concerning annual conferences. However, there were not only legal problems to consider, such as the implications of two-yearly meetings for the structure of the Organization. The draft resolution under discussion requested the Director-General and the Executive Board to work out an amendment to the Constitution without, however, indicating the nature and extent of this amendment. The proposal should have been preceded by a thorough study of its effects on the functions of the Organization. The General Conference was the only body representing Member States. Under the Constitution, it was for the General Conference to determine the Organization's general policy and main lines of work, and to advise the United Nations Organization on the educational, scientific and cultural aspects of questions of concern to the latter. To renounce the principle of compulsory annual meetings would be to increase the responsibility of those bodies not representative of Member States. The question of a new distribution of responsibility would arise, as would the question of modifying the structure of the Executive Board. It might become necessary to envisage a Board composed not of individuals, but of representatives of Governments.

Following the tradition of the Institute for Intellectual Co-operation, the Conference might consider setting up, along with the Executive Board, a Committee of Intellectuals, having exclusively consultative powers, which would meet perhaps twice a year.

[3] Mr. de CLEMENTI (Italy) introduced a draft amendment to the United States resolution [document 5C/112].

He felt that annual meetings of representatives of National Commissions, as suggested in the Italian draft amendment, would result in a valuable exchange of ideas, as the questions discussed would be more specific in character than those coming up at a General Conference. Delegates would have consultative and advisory powers, and their discussions would be more realistic.

[4] The CHAIRMAN felt that the proposal submitted by the Italian delegation was more in the nature of an addition than an amendment to the United States proposal. He suggested that the Committee discuss the latter first, and the Italian draft amendment afterwards. The fundamental question of biennial conferences and their consequences on the whole of Unesco's policy would have to be discussed.

[5] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) supported the United States proposal, as this would result in considerable time-saving for delegates. It was, however, necessary to appreciate its effect on the Organization as a whole, and the Committee should carefully study the full implications. He wished to propose an amendment to the United States proposal, on the following lines:

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

INVITES Member States to bring to the notice of the Director-General before 15 September 1950 any suggestions or proposals which would seem useful to them with reference to the implications of having meetings every two years, and the modifications which would have to be made in this respect;

INSTRUCTS the Director-General to undertake a detailed study of the question and to prepare any necessary draft amendment to the Constitution in the light of the suggestions he may receive from Member States.

[6] Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon), while approv-

ing in principle the United States proposal, felt that it raised a procedural question which required the application of Article XIII of the Constitution. Consequently, they could not legally discuss this amendment unless it were introduced according to the special procedure of that Article.

[7] Dr. WALKER (Australia) felt doubts about discussing an amendment to the Constitution before the requisite six months' notice had been given to Member States. He was in favour of reserving a decision on the second paragraph of the United States proposal for the time being, as he could not give a final commitment. However, he saw distinct advantages both from the point of view of the budget and of efficiency in holding biennial meetings. Steps should be taken to make the Executive Board more representative of governments, as many fundamental policy decisions were bound to be required. He recalled that the Board, as at present constituted, was composed of private individuals and not of the spokesmen of the various governments. The Australian delegation's attitude would therefore depend upon a complete scheme of alterations in the present structural composition.

With regard to the Italian proposal [document 5C/112], while he was not opposed to periodic meetings of representatives of National Commissions, such meetings could not be regarded as substitutes for directives which could be issued only by Member Governments. He would approve the adoption of the United States proposal as amended by the Brazilian delegation, but would prefer to postpone consideration of paragraph 2 of the resolution, as due notice had not been given.

[8] Dr. BARÓN CASTRO (Salvador) in principle supported the United States proposal which he felt would be better, not only from the point of view of Member States, but also from the point of view of the Secretariat. He suggested, however, that the implications of the various problems involved be worked out and fully discussed at a later date.

[9] Mr. JAUME (France) regretted that a Specialized Agency such as Unesco should make decisions based on financial considerations. Nevertheless, he appreciated the argument put forward by the United States delegation, and regarded the draft resolution with complete objectivity. The Committee had heard the case both for and against it, and he merely wished to record the potential danger of weakening the link between Unesco and the National Commissions. There were obvious difficulties in stating precisely the new role of the Executive Board, and he feared that the role of the National Commissions would be even more difficult to define, as they had not been consulted.

The United States proposal involved procedure under Article XIII of the Constitution, and this seemed to him to be the decisive point. It seemed more logical that an exhaustive study be made first on the whole matter, and that a decision be taken on the basis of that study.

[10] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the underlying idea expressed in the letter he had received from the President of the United States delegation did not call for a decision at the present time, but only agreement on the draft amendment which would be circulated to Member States for their comments and suggestions. As suggested in the amendment proposed by the Brazilian delegation, these comments should be submitted to the Secretariat before 15 September.

[11] Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) agreed with Mr. Jaume's remarks, although it seemed to him that budgetary considerations were most important. He was of the opinion that biennial meetings would give small States an opportunity to be put on a par with big States.

The composition of the Executive Board would require alteration. There could either be two committees—governmental and intellectual— or a joint committee composed of intellectuals and State representatives. He feared that the Executive Board and the Committee of Intellectuals might have overlapping powers. He therefore proposed amending paragraph 2 of the United States proposal to read:

Takes note of the proposal with reference to having biennial meetings . . .

followed by the text proposed by the Brazilian delegation.

He hoped that the procedure involved would mean that the Director-General would send a questionnaire to Member States.

[12] Dr. BLANCO Y SÁNCHEZ (Cuba) was in agreement with the Director-General and Mr. de Visscher. It seemed to him that, for the time being, the United States proposal called only for agreement in principle.

[13] The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the text of paragraph 2, as proposed by the United States delegation, did not commit governments. It had been the Secretariat's idea to draw up a questionnaire, requesting an answer before 15 September, and this was in conformity with the suggestion made by the Brazilian delegation.

At present, the Executive Board was composed of representatives of governments, who acted as individuals and reviewed problems impartially.

There were two different kinds of patriotism—the national and the international—which Unesco was endeavouring to develop. Members of the Executive Board, many of whom were civil servants, were torn between these two patriotisms, these two duties. They faced this dual duty with a rare courage to which he himself paid tribute, but their position was a very delicate one. The difficulty would only increase if the Board had wider responsibilities. On the other hand, there was an urgent need for moral authority, and it was this which underlay his own suggestion for the constitution of a committee of intellectuals. It was his responsibility to work out a draft programme, but he must be advised by great minds. The General Conference would be there to impose restrictions on too bold a policy.

[14] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) favoured the adoption of the United States resolution, together with the Brazilian amendment which he felt would have far-reaching implications.

[15] Professor KUŠEJ (Yugoslavia) considered that the present Conference was not competent to take a decision on the draft resolution until after its implications had been fully studied. It seemed to him that the resolution would increase the powers of the Executive Board. He had felt that annual meetings were very necessary in view of rapidly changing conditions in the world today. Professor Kušej was not opposed on principle to the United States resolution, but wanted the Committee to recommend undertaking a study of all the problems involved in its adoption.

[16] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) supported Professor Kušej and wanted the Director-General to prepare such a study. While recognizing the value of the United States proposal, the United Kingdom might not wish to approve the policy as outlined in paragraph 2. The discussion had amply justified consideration of the Secretariat's proposal to set up an advisory body of distinguished representatives.

[17] The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the delegate of Denmark, supported Mr. Cowell's remarks. It seemed that a consensus of opinion was emerging from the discussion.

The Australian delegation had submitted the following amendment to paragraph 2:

RECOGNIZING the advantages of the proposal, but noting also the important consequential modifications which must be required in the procedure of the Organization . . .

[18] Mr. JAUME (France) supported the text of the second paragraph of the amendment submitted by the Brazilian delegation, beginning: "Instructs the Director-General . . . "

However, even this draft anticipated the results of such a study, and he therefore proposed inserting the phrase "if need be" after "Instructs the Director-General".

[19] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) saw no reason why the Committee should not express its approval or otherwise of this policy. His delegation favoured the adoption of the United States draft resolution which meant a saving of money and of dissipation of effort.

[20] Mr. de ICAZA (Mexico) approved in principle the United States draft resolution, together with the Brazilian amendment, modified as suggested by Mr. Jaume. He also agreed with the suggestion for setting up a committee of intellectuals and for altering the composition of the Executive Board.

[21] Mr. SEBASTIÁN (Philippines) strongly favoured the adoption of biennial conferences which were more advantageous both for Unesco and for Member States. He suggested the setting-up of a small drafting sub-committee to consider the proposals made by the delegations of the United States, Brazil and Italy.

[22] Mr. WEN (China) suggested the deletion of paragraph 2 of the United States draft proposal, and the substitution of the Brazilian draft amendment for paragraph 3.

[23] Dr. PIÑEROS CORPAS (Colombia) agreed with the principle of the United States draft resolution, together with the amendment proposed by the Brazilian delegation.

[24] Summarizing the discussion, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft resolution was not in the form of a definite proposal, but was merely a suggestion brought forward to test the attitude of the Conference. He felt that the testing had been successful, and he therefore wondered whether the United States delegation would accept changes in the text. Nearly all the delegates favoured the draft in principle, but preferred the more cautious attitude of the Brazilian amendment. It might be advisable to set a sub-committee as proposed by Mr. Sebastián.

[25] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) suggested retaining paragraph 3 of the United States draft resolution, and inserting his own amendment as an additional paragraph between paragraphs 2 and 3. He agreed to the insertion of the words "if need be" proposed by Mr. Jaume.

[26] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) was prepared to accept the Brazilian amendment, with the addition of the phrase "if need be",

but could not agree to the deletion of paragraph 2. The Australian amendment was acceptable in principle, but she proposed the following alternative wording:

After preliminary discussion expresses the view that this would bring about a desirable change in the schedule of the General Conference;

Considering the complexity and importance of the structural and operational changes which may be involved . . .

The CHAIRMAN called on the delegations of the United States of America and Australia to present a unified proposal.

[27] Mr. de CLEMENTI (Italy) wondered whether, in drafting the resolution, the drafting sub-committee would take into account the draft amendment presented by the Italian delegation in document 5C/112.

The CHAIRMAN thought the Italian proposal should be discussed independently of the United States draft resolution. He would suggest reaching agreement on the latter first.

[28] Mr. JAUME (France) wanted the draft amendment submitted by the Brazilian delegation as the basic text, and not as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN explained that this was a question of procedure, but promised that the drafting sub-committee would take this suggestion into account. The delegations of Australia, Brazil and the United States of America would meet that afternoon before the full meeting of the Committee, to prepare a draft which would take into consideration the amendments proposed during the present discussion. The Italian proposal [document 5C/112] would be discussed after agreement had been reached on that first point.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

TENTH MEETING

Tuesday, 13 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Biennial Sessions of the General Conference: Draft resolution prepared by the Sub-Committee.

[1] A proposal by Mr. JAUME (France), seconded by Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium), to delete the first three lines of paragraph 2, up to "noting also . . . " was *rejected* by 13 votes to 6.

A proposal by Mr. de VISSCHER (Belgium) to replace the words "he may receive" in the fourth line of paragraph 4 by the word "received" was *adopted.*

A proposal by Mr. JAUME (France) to insert in the second line of paragraph 4 of the French text the words "le cas échéant" after "et de préparer" was *adopted.*

The text of the draft resolution, thus amended, was *adopted* unanimously.[1]

1. In final form: Resol. 40.8.

Draft amendment to the United States resolution (5C/16) on biennial sessions of the General Conference, presented by the Italian delegation [document 5C/112].

[2] Mr. de CLEMENTI (Italy) explained that the purpose of the amendment was to ensure annual meetings of National Commissions to take decisions, not on matters concerning Unesco, but on matters concerning their own countries. The Italian delegation did not intend to propose that representatives of National Commissions, which were not governmental bodies, should discuss matters which fell within the competency of the Executive Board and the General Conference.

[3] Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) was worried about the budgetary implications of the Italian amendment: he pointed out that hitherto meetings of National Commissions had been held at the same time as the General Conference, and

had therefore involved no additional cost for Member States or for Unesco. If the meetings were to occur between sessions of the General Conference, he wondered who would pay for them and what the cost was likely to be.

[4] Dr. ALVARADO (Ecuador) suggested that meetings of National Commissions might be linked with regional conferences, the expenses being paid by the Member States concerned.

[5] Mr. JAUME (France) seconded the Italian amendment, as his delegation felt there would be a need for new contacts between Member States, in the absence of annual sessions of the General Conference; experience would show whether or not the meetings should be regional in character. In any case, the Procedure Committee should mention in its report that the Italian amendment could only be taken into consideration if it was finally decided to hold biennial sessions of the Conference.

[6] Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) recalled that the Director-General had informed the Conference of his intention to set up a council similar to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, a Brains Trust to advise Unesco on purely intellectual questions. Such a Brains Trust could not, however, replace either annual sessions of the General Conference or annual meetings of National Commissions, and Mr. Murtinho therefore suggested a third solution: namely, that a small assembly of governmental representatives should be formed in Paris to follow the work of Unesco and to transmit to the Organization the wishes and suggestions of their governments. He recalled the precedent of the Extraordinary Session of the General Conference held in Paris before the Beirut Session. Such an assembly, composed of permanent governmental representatives in Paris, would entail no budgetary implications and would ensure immediate and permanent contact between a number of Member States and Unesco.

[7] Mrs. BRUNAUER (United States of America) recalled that, in the External Relations Commission, her delegation had approved the resolution adopted at the meeting of representatives of National Commissions, which had made certain suggestions for increasing the number of such meetings, and, in particular, had proposed that preparations should be made in 1951 for the holding of a meeting lasting two to four weeks in 1952 of representatives of National Commissions. She asked whether the Italian delegation would accept the deletion of the following words in its resolution: ". . . Member States arrange for the holding of annual . . . " and ". . . common to those States", and the substitution of the following wording: "with a view to ensuring that meetings of representatives of National Commissions will be held for the discussion of certain problems involved in carrying out Unesco's Programme."

[8] Dr. ALVARADO (Ecuador) seconded the Italian amendment, and suggested that it should be left to the Executive Board and the Director-General to study the matter and decide upon the form which the meetings should take.

[9] Mr. JAUME (France) proposed the following revised text of the Italian amendment:

To invite the Executive Board and the Director-General to prepare for submission to the General Conference in 1951 a draft resolution providing for one or possibly several meetings, in the year in which the General Conference does not take place, of delegates of Member States or of representatives of National Commissions, according to the nature of the problems which have necessitated those meetings: the initiative of convening the meetings would be taken either by the Director-General or by the Member States concerned.

[10] Dr. KADHIM (Iraq) stated that his delegation objected to the Italian amendment for three reasons: (1) because of its budgetary implications; (2) because of the stipulation that the meetings should be held annually; (3) because of the way in which the resolution was drafted. The amendment proposed by the United States delegation would meet the last two objections and the Iraqi delegation would in principle accept it. As the issue was an important one, Dr. Kadhim suggested that no decision should be taken until the texts of the United States and French amendments had been circulated in English and in French.

[11] As the Committee was unable to find a text which was acceptable to all members, it was *decided* to refer the matter to a small drafting sub-committee composed of the delegates of Brazil, France, Italy and the United States of America.

Report on the interpretation of certain provisions of the Rules of Procedure: Amendment submitted by the Belgian delegation [document 5C/PRO/6-Amendment 2].

[12] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE (New Zealand) observed that proposals for the amendment or revision of the Rules of Procedure and of the Constitution did not constitute legal questions. He would therefore prefer the title of the Committee to be "Committee on Procedure and Constitutional Matters".

[13] After a lengthy discussion, Mr. COWELL (United Kingdom) proposed the maintenance of

the original title of "Procedure Committee", on the grounds that the Committee had operated successfully for five years and that everyone knew what its functions and terms of reference were.

This proposal, seconded by Mr. DAVIES (Australia), was *adopted* by 9 votes to 5.

[14] Dr. BEAGLEHOLE proposed the substitution of the word "and" for "particularly" in the first line of paragraph 1 of Rule 32. *Agreed.*

The Belgian proposal, thus amended, was seconded by Mr. MAJUMDAR (India) and *adopted* unanimously.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 40.58.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Thursday, 15 June 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Professor JAKOB NIELSEN (Denmark)

Draft resolution submitted by the Italian delegation on the subject of meetings of Representatives of National Commissions [document 5C/PRO/8 (II)].

[1] The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Italian resolution had been held over from the previous meeting, and that the wording had been revised by a small drafting sub-committee. He called for the adoption of the new wording, as it appeared in document 5C/PRO/8 (II), page 10, paragraph 7.

The resolution was *adopted.*[1]

Two resolutions concerning amendments to the Rules of Procedure submitted by the Budget Committee [document 5C/BUD/2, page 5].

[2] The CHAIRMAN observed that there was no time for the Committee to discuss the exact wording proposed by the Budget Committee, and he therefore suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to consider the matter and submit a proposal to the Procedure Committee at the beginning of the Sixth session of the General Conference. *Agreed.*

[3] The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the meeting of the Nominations Committee which had been called to propose candidates for the vacant posts on the Executive Board, there had been some confusion regarding voting procedure which the Procedure Committee had been asked to consider. The question was whether or not a ballot paper was valid if it contained more names than there were vacant seats on the Board. On three previous occasions, it had been agreed that a ballot paper containing more names than there were seats available was invalid. If the Procedure Committee decided to make that practice a rule, it would entail an addition to Rule 89 of the Rules of Procedure. He suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to make an exact proposal on those lines to the Procedure Committee at the beginning of the Sixth Session of the General Conference, *Agreed.*

[4] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) took note of a request from Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) that the Secretariat should study the question of the obligatory use of a standard ballot paper for the election of members of the Executive Board, and submit a proposal to the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[5] Dr. CHEDIAK (Cuba) requested that delegates should receive the new draft Rules of Procedure prepared by the Secretariat before the opening of the Sixth Session of the General Conference.

[6] In order to economize funds, Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) hoped that delegates might be satisfied with provisional correction slips before the General Conference, so that the revised Rules of Procedure would only have to be published once, after the Conference had approved them. *Agreed.*

Second Report of the Procedure Committee [document 5C/PRO/8 (II)].

The report was *adopted.*

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. 40.87.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

FIRST MEETING

Monday, 22 May 1950, at 12.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. JEAN DÉSY (Canada)

[1] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) proposed Mr. Jean Désy (Canada) as Chairman of the Committee, Messrs. Carneiro (Brazil), Joxe (France), and Khoury (Lebanon) seconding. *Adopted unanimously.*

Mr. Désy then took the Chair.

[2] The SECRETARY submitted the list of States whose delegates had been duly accredited by instruments under the hand either of the Chief of State or of the Minister of Foreign Affairs:

Australia	Italy
Austria	Lebanon
Belgium	Liberia
Brazil	Luxembourg
Burma	Mexico
Canada	Netherlands
Ceylon	New Zealand
Colombia	Norway
Cuba	Pakistan
Denmark	Panama
Dominican Republic	Persia
Ecuador	Philippines
Egypt	Switzerland
France	Thailand
Guatemala	Union of South Africa
Hungary	United Kingdom
Iraq	United States of America
Israel	Venezuela

These credentials were *approved.*

[3] Professor BOGDANOVIČ (Yugoslavia) and Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) having indicated that the credentials of their respective delegations had in fact been lodged, it was *decided* that the Chairman should examine the documents in question when they were communicated him.

[4] The SECRETARY submitted the list of delegations whose credentials were not completely in order, being either over the signature of the Minister of Education or in the form of a letter from an Embassy or merely a telegram. The accepted practice was, however, to regard such documents as provisional credentials. The States concerned were the following:

Argentina	India
Bolivia	Monaco
Costa Rica	Salvador
Czechoslovakia	Sweden
Greece	Turkey
Haiti	Uruguay
Honduras	Yugoslavia.
Hungary	

[5] The CHAIRMAN proposed that the cases of India and Yugoslavia be set aside for separate examination and that the credentials of the remaining delegations be accepted provisionally. *Adopted.*

[6] The SECRETARY then reported that three States (Ecuador, Monaco and Sweden) had presented credentials signed for the Minister by a senior official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. At the previous session of the General Conference the Credentials Committee had accepted credentials signed by another Minister on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs as regular, but had reserved its decision on credentials signed by a senior official of the Foreign Ministry.

[7] Mr. JOXE (France) asked whether the documents in question were in fact credentials in the strict sense or extensions of powers conferred under existing credentials, only these extensions being communicated over the signature of a high official. The SECRETARY explained that they were credentials proper.

[8] On the motion of Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), seconded by Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India), Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) and Mr. JOXE (France), it was *decided* to accept these credentials provisionally and to inform the States concerned that, as their credentials did not meet the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure, they should be regularized as soon as possible.

[9] The SECRETARY said that five Member States—Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Peru, Poland and Syria—had sent no credentials.

[10] The CHAIRMAN having moved that the delegates concerned be asked to lodge their credentials and meanwhile be permitted to sit provisionally, Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) enquired whether the delegates in question would have the right of audience and be entitled to vote until their credentials were lodged in due form.

The CHAIRMAN replied that they would, subject to their having lodged provisional credentials.

[11] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) said that, in point of fact, these were all States represented by a permanent delegate, i.e., by a representative already accredited to Unesco, who had indicated that he had been accredited to represent his Government at the General Conference. It was customary in the United Nations—as it had been in the League of Nations—to accord provisional rights to delegates whose official credentials were not yet to hand, but who, being permanent delegates or Ambassadors to a particular country, were well known, and to ask such delegates to regularize the position as early as possible.

[12] The CHAIRMAN explained that what was meant in that context was the lodging, less of credentials in due form, than of some form of written authority; this could be signed by the head of the permanent delegation, as in the case of Peru.

[13] Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) having asked whether votes of such delegates would be valid while they lacked credentials, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was perfectly easy for permanent delegates (who, being accredited to Unesco, were well known) to lodge documents which could be accepted as provisional credentials.

[14] Dr. WALKER (Australia) said that, in order to take part in the session, every delegate must produce some document to the Credentials Committee, on which the latter could rule as constituting full or provisional credentials. If a country's permanent delegate or its Ambassador lodged a note stating that he had been instructed to represent his Government at the General Conference, such document, being signed by a known authority, would be accepted as constituting credentials of a sort, if only provisional. Hence it was essential for delegates at present lacking credentials to secure from their country's permanent delegate to Unesco or from its Embassy in Italy or an adjacent country, a document enabling the Credentials Committee to permit them to take their seats, speak and vote.

It was so *decided*.

[15] The SECRETARY indicated that certain non-Member States had been invited to send observers, and credentials in due form had been received from the following States:

Bulgaria	Nicaragua
Korea	San Marino
Indonesia	Vatican
Nepal	

The Supreme Command of the Allied Powers in Japan (SCAP) had also accredited observers.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the report on observers be approved. *Adopted.*

[16] The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee examine the draft resolution submitted by the Czech delegation to the first Plenary Meeting regarding the credentials of the delegation of China.

[17] Dr. WALKER (Australia) explained that the Credentials Committee was required to make recommendation on that item to the General Conference.

It would be recalled that the communication from the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, to which the Czech delegate had referred, had been forwarded to the Director-General, the Executive Board and, by decision of the latter, to himself as Acting President of the Fifth Session of the General Conference. The contents of this communication had been made public at the time it was received, but the text was available for any delegation or Committee desiring to consult it. It was the speaker's intention to suggest to the President of the General Conference, when elected, that this communication, along with any further communications received, should be considered in the first instance by the General Committee of the Conference, which had the responsibility of coordinating the work of the Conference and dividing it among the different organs of the Conference.

[18] As regards the specific question raised by the Czechoslovak delegate, the situation at the moment was as follows: as two delegations objected to the admission of the Chinese delegation,

under Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure the delegation should "be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Conference has given its decision." The Committee could examine the matter at more leisure and report later; but the speaker felt it to be possible and desirable to determine the matter as soon as possible, preferably that same afternoon in plenary meeting, to avoid a protracted discussion dragging on indefinitely and delaying the Conference from proceeding to some of the tasks before it. He suggested, therefore, that they should have an exchange of views whereby they might evolve a recommendation making it possible to arrive that very day at a solution in the interests of the Organization as a whole.

[19] Professor BOGDANOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the case of China had to be elucidated by the Credentials Committee. Independently of the motion already mentioned, the Yugoslav delegation was of opinion that the credentials of the Kuomintang delegate could not be "verified", since the Kuomintang Government was a government with no legal status and hence no government at all: the Yugoslav delegation would accordingly vote against any proposal that the Kuomintang delegate be permitted to take his seat provisionally with full powers.

[20] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) recalled that the Czechoslovak motion had been moved and seconded in plenary meeting and the President had stated that it would be communicated to the Credentials Committee for consideration: in the circumstances it would be improper for this Committee's report merely to mention that this vital question had not yet been examined.

[21] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) asked whether the credentials of the Nationalist Chinese delegation conformed to the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure and were technically in order.

[22] The SECRETARY explained that the credentials bore the usual seal and were similar to those received in previous years. To be able to give an assurance that they were technically in order, a knowledge of the Chinese language would be necessary. However, the translator certified and Professor Chen Yuan confirmed that the credentials were duly signed by the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Education, so that the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure were more than met.

[23] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) pointed out that, of the governements represented at that Session, some accorded recognition to the Nationalist Government and some to the Central People's Government. It would be unfortunate if the General Conference of Unesco attempted to deal with problems of the recognition of governments, which were the hardest tasks falling to any committee, conference or government. Moreover, Article II of the Constitution stipulated that "membership of the United Nations Organization shall carry with it the right to membership of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization". In point of fact, the United Nations at present accorded recognition to a delegation of Nationalist China, of the same government which had appointed the delegation in Florence. It was indisputable that in fact Unesco took its guidance from the United Nations as regarded the Member States recognized by the latter; accordingly such Member States of the United Nations were entitled to be represented at the Fifth Session of the General Conference of Unesco. Mr. Sargeant therefore proposed, on behalf of his Government, that the Committee should report to the General Conference that the credentials of the delegation of Nationalist China conformed to the requirements of Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure and that that delegation should accordingly be permitted to take part in the present Session with all the rights of a Member State.

[24] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) said that he too had his instructions. First of all it was not a question of technical correctness or the legality of the position: the Constitution itself provided that each Member State should make such arrangements as suited its particular condition for the purpose of associating its principal bodies in educational, scientific and cultural matters with the work of the Organization. They had to decide whether they should accept the tyranny of a theory or recognize the facts as they were. Had the Government of Nationalist China the authority to work in the spirit of the Constitution? Could it carry out the obligations laid on it by Article VII and set up a national co-operating body to implement the resolutions of the Conference and make the Conference well known to the people of China? They had to go not on theories but on the facts, to find out the best practical means of fulfilling Unesco's function in a vast area with 450,000,000 inhabitants. The fundamental question was therefore whether the Nationalist Government had the power, the authority, the practical means and the techniques to work for Unesco.

[25] Secondly, they had to bear in mind the

future possibilities of the Organization. Already there were several States which were not members of Unesco. Any decision the present General Conference might take might have far-reaching consequences and could affect Unesco's future activities and make of it an organization representing only part of the world. They could add fuel to the existing ideological conflict, but each one should ask himself whether he preferred to secure Unesco's future or to cripple its activities by an ill-judged decision. It was not a question of deciding whether they approved or disapproved of the administrative methods of the Chinese Government; all that concerned them was to find the best means of promoting among the masses of the world's population the ideals for which Unesco stood.

[26] Lastly, as regarded representation of Nationalist China, Professor Chen Yuang who would continue to be a member of the Executive Board until the end of the present Conference would have the fullest opportunity of expressing his point of view.

[27] Thus, having regard to the fact that Nationalist China was not in a position to implement the resolutions of the General Conference, that recognition of its delegation would be bound to cripple the future activities of Unesco and seriously jeopardize its future and, lastly, that there was someone present at the General Conference capable of representing the point of view of Nationalist China pending a decision by the United Nations, the Organization would be in a much better position than if it decided on a point of law, theory or doctrine.

[28] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) thought that in a problem so complex they had to eliminate all extraneous elements. While it was well to take into account the element of effective co-operation requisite for acceptance as a Member State of Unesco they had to beware of creating a precedent with serious consequences for the future by having the Credentials Committee take cognizance of this factor and subordinating recognition of a State to the consideration of how far it was able to meet its commitments to the Organization.

Whatever the position regarding the Chinese question might be, all were agreed in thinking that what the Chinese themselves regarded as "China" should be represented at the General Conference. However, to change the present state of affairs, it seemed essential to await a decision by the United Nations. By accepting the credentials submitted by the Chinese Nationalist Government, the Committee would in no sense be setting itself up in judgment on the domestic affairs of China: pending the decision at political level, which was the prerogative of the United Nations, the Committee was merely recognizing the representative of China, who had co-operated with Unesco from the Organization's birth.

Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) supported Professor Carneiro's proposal.

[29] Professor BOGDANOVIC (Yugoslavia) repeated that, quite apart from the motion already submitted on the subject, the question of the credentials of Nationalist China could only be examined by the Credentials Committee. Sir Sarvepalli and Professor Carneiro had displayed great knowledge of the question and submitted brilliant suggestions. The delegates of Nationalist China could no longer take their seats in Unesco because they no longer represented anyone; on the other hand, it was impossible to shut the door of Unesco to hundreds of millions of Chinese. Hence the Yugoslav delegation would oppose any provisional solution however emphatically its provisional nature were stated.

[30] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of his government, said he could not support the proposition of the delegate of the United States of America. In saying that, he recognized the force of the arguments adduced for and against. What struck him most was that here was a great territory described by one writer as perhaps the largest area of civilization over thousands of years that we had in the world: there was no doubt in his mind that not China only, but another great country which was not a member of Unesco had a part to play in the development of the Organization. From that point of view the arguments in favour of non-recognition of a delegation from Nationalist China to the present Session of the Conference were very strong. China should be in Unesco but the delegation of the United Kingdom was not able to support the American proposal and, if a vote were taken on the subject, his delegation would abstain.

[31] The CHAIRMAN thought it impossible to present that same afternoon a satisfactory report on a discussion whose importance was plain to all.

The question was of great complexity, being simultaneously political and legal. Were the General Conference of Unesco and its Credentials Committee competent to deal with political questions? (in the present instance the credentials question before them had mainly political implications)? Ought that Committee to exceed its terms of reference? Should it state that the credentials submitted to it were not in order (in which case it had to give its reasons)? If those credentials were in order, could it recommend the exclusion

of the Chinese delegation on political grounds? Could Unesco tell the United Nations that a particular delegation did not belong to a Member State of the United Nations?

[32] As the question warranted fuller examination, while the Committee had to present a report at the beginning of the afternoon to avoid delaying the constitution of the Plenary Conference, the speaker suggested a statement that the Committee approved the report of the Secretariat as regarded all the other items examined and that question of the Chinese delegation's credentials would be the subject of a later report. That was a practical proposal, committing them neither way on the point in question. Nevertheless, pending a decision Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure should be applied.

[33] Mr. JOXE (France) was prepared to support the Chairman's proposal as regarded the method of working: the matter was too serious and too heavy with consequences to be settled in a few moments. It was clearly essential that China, with its civilization, its traditions and all that it could bring, be present at the Fifth Session of the General Conference in whole or in part.

[34] However, the problem facing them was one of those recently raised in the Co-ordination Committee of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies: the present political situation had made the normal operation of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies impossible and of that the present discussion was glaring evidence.

On the one hand, there were the arguments based on law adduced by the delegates of the United States of America and of Brazil; on the other, there were arguments based on fact presented by the delegate of India. Their Committee might see fit to take a decision on the point of law (which was within its competence) or a decision on political grounds (which would go further than the decision on law and for which the Committee would appear to have no competence).

[35] It would therefore be well to pursue the discussion so that all might be able to express their views. In any case it seemed essential that Unesco should approach the United Nations, the political body, and enquire how this delicate question, which was preventing the General Conference from starting its work, might most quickly be settled.

[36] Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) said that, of the proposals put forward, three (those of the United States of America, of Brazil and of France) were closely akin in spirit: all three sought to keep Unesco clear of the political problem. The speaker himself felt that the General Conference of Unesco had no competence to deal with the problem's political aspect, but if they confined themselves to the law in the matter, there was nothing to prevent recognition of the credentials of the Chinese Nationalist Government: it would seem, therefore, that until the question was settled by the United Nations, who alone had authority to do this, there were no valid grounds for objecting to the admission of the delegates of the Government of Nationalist China.

[37] On the motion of the CHAIRMAN it was *decided* to report at the beginning of the afternoon on the credentials examined by the Committee, including those of the Yugoslav delegate and of the permanent delegate of Peru (just handed to the Chairman), to reserve the question of the Chinese delegation's credentials for later consideration and meanwhile to apply the provisions of Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure in that delegation's case.

The meeting rose at 2.15 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Thursday, 25 May 1950, at 9.45 a.m.

Chairman: H.E. Mr. JEAN DÉSY (Canada)

[1] The SECRETARY reported to the Committee that, since the previous meeting, the Secretariat had received credentials in due form for the following:

(*a*) The delegates of Afghanistan, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Czechoslovakia;

(*b*) The observers of Chile and the Allied High Commission in Germany.

Regarding the Allied High Commission in Germany, the speaker reminded the meeting of the decision taken at the Nineteenth Session of the Executive Board:

The Executive Board

Requests the Director-General to invite the Allied High Commission in Germany to send observers to the Fifth Session of the General Conference, to be accompanied, if the High Commission so desires, by advisers of German nationality. The Board also requests the Director-General to bring to the attention of the High Commission that, in the Board's view, it would be desirable that any German nationals so sent as advisers should be chosen among the circles in Germany interested in Unesco's work, particularly the General Committee for Unesco Activities now in process of formation;

Requests the Director-General, when inviting the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to send observers to the Fifth Session of the General Conference, to inform the Soviet Government of the above decision and to invite it to have its observers accompanied by similar advisers from Eastern Germany.

On 23 May the Director-General received a cable from the Allied High Commission authorizing the following persons to represent the German Federal Republic at the General Conference:

Mr. L. Vogel (United States of America);
Mr. Schmitlein (France);
Mr. C. S. Hudson (United Kingdom);
Professor W. Hallstein (Germany);
Dr. R. Salat (Germany);
Dr. H. Rheinfelder (Germany).

On the motion of the CHAIRMAN, it was *decided* to approve the credentials submitted by the Secretary.

[2] The CHAIRMAN moved the resumption of the discussion on the approval of the Chinese delegation's credentials.

Dr. BARALT y ZACHARIE (Cuba) thought that, since the telegram received from Peking raised a problem having political aspects, the Credentials Committee (whose terms of reference were strictly confined to matters of law and technicalities) was competent to decide on the legal validity of credentials submitted, but not on the exclusion a Member State.

[3] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) disagreed and argued that it was the Committee's duty to give a decision and, in view of the telegram from Peking, to refuse to approve the credentials of the Chinese Nationalist delegation.

[4] Mr. JOXE (France) recalled that, at the previous meeting, the Committee had heard first legal arguments and later arguments based on psychology and politics which undoubtedly exceeded the competence of a Credentials Committee. In the speaker's view the Plenary Meeting ought to be supplied with a faithful report of the opinions expressed by the members of the Committee.

This motion was seconded by Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) and *adopted*.

[5] Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil) pointed out that, looked at purely from the legal angle, there was every justification for approving the credentials of the Chinese delegation to the present session of the General Conference. However, such a decision could not fail to have international repercussions and, as a similar case might arise in the future, it was important that Unesco should henceforward be in a position to conform to a policy line laid down by the competent organs of the United Nations. The speaker accordingly suggested a recommendation to the plenary meeting to authorize the Director-General to seek, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a ruling from the Security Council and the General Assembly regarding the authority competent to give Unesco directives in cases of this type. As regarded the problem under discussion, it was important that the United Nations should make their views known as early as possible.

Messrs. JOXE (France) and SARGEANT (United States of America) supported Professor Carneiro's suggestions.

[6] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) could not subscribe to that proposal, observing that the Government of India had accorded official recognition to the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. If they kept to the letter of the law, approval of the credentials of the Chinese delegation was legally acceptable. However, if they considered the kernel of the question, they would see how unsuitable it was that the hundreds of millions of dwellers in China should not be adequately represented at Unesco In the circumstances, the speaker proposed that Unesco take up a position of strict neutrality and make no decision either way as regarded the current session.

[7] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) said that, as his Government had been one of the first to recognize the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, he could not support Professor Carneiro's proposal.

[8] Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom) thought that the United Nations should be consulted. The attitude of his own delegation remained unchanged from the previous meeting: should a vote be taken, the delegation of the United Kingdom would abstain.

[9] Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) pointed out that

the Committee's task was to approve or disapprove the credentials submitted. However, in this particular instance, the speaker was inclined to favour Professor Carneiro's proposal.

Dr. LAZERTE (Canada) also supported Professor Carneiro's proposal.

[10] Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) thought they should consult the United Nations and meanwhile refrain from taking any decision. If there were any suggestion of approving the credentials of the Chinese delegation pending a policy decision by the United Nations, the delegation of India would oppose it.

[11] The CHAIRMAN suggested that the report to be rendered to the Plenary Meeting be first submitted to their Committee for approval. The report could be in three parts (introduction, summary of views expressed, conclusions), and the members of the Committee could thus express their views on each part separately.

[12] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) supported that proposal and asked the Chairman to undertake the drafting of the report. *Adopted.*

[13] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) wished it to be noted in the report of the Committee that his delegation was against the adoption of Professor Carneiro's proposal

[14] The CHAIRMAN read a communication from the Heads of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian delegations to the President of the General Conference, to the effect that the presence of the Kuomintang delegates was prejudicial to the General Conference's authority and indicating that, if no decision were taken before Friday, 26 May 1950, the Czechoslovak and Hungarian delegations reserved the right to draw the logical conclusion.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

THIRD MEETING

Monday, 29 May 1950, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: H.E. Mr. JEAN DÉSY (Canada)

Draft Report of the Credentials Committee.

Part I.

Paragraph 1 was *approved* without comment.

Part II.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 were *approved* without comment.

[1] Mr. SARGEANT (United states of America) asked that in the seventh line of *Paragraph 4* the words "in the capital of China" should read "in Pekin". *Approved.*

Paragraph 5 was *approved* without comment.

[2] Mr. JOXE (France) proposed a textual amendment in the French text of the first sentence of *Paragraph 6*. *Approved.*

[3] In *Paragraph 7* the Committee *decided*:

To delete, after the word "technical" in the eighth line, the words "under the terms of Article II to members of the United Nations", so that the paragraph continued from: "The authority which issued ...".

To delete, in the second sub-paragraph the words: "in deciding which government should exercice the rights of membership".

Paragraph 8 was *approved* without comment.

[4] *Paragraph 9*. Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India) observed that at the previous meeting he had drawn attention to the fact that the Chinese member of the Executive Board would be present during the session of the General Conference. He asked that this remark might be mentioned in the Report.

[5] After a short discussion on the right place for this new paragraph, it was *decided* to add the following words in Paragraph 6:

It was further remarked that there was a Chinese

member of the Executive Board, who might represent Chinese culture within the Organization, even though no Chinese delegation would be taking part in the work of the Conference.

Part I as a whole was *approved*.

Part III.

[6] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) proposed that part II be replaced by the following text:

10. The Credentials Committee considers that the General Conference is qualified to decide on its own authority the question of the credentials of all delegations and consequently of the Kuomintang delegation as well;

11. Taking into consideration the communication from the Government of the People's Republic of China, which is the only legal representative of the Chinese people, the Credentials Committee proposes that the General Conference should not validate the credentials of the Kuomintang delegation and should not authorize that delegation to take part in the work of the Fifth General Conference.

[7] After an extensive discussion in which Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India), Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon), Professor CARNEIRO (Brazil), Mr. HARDMAN (United Kingdom), Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) and Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) took part, the first paragraph of the amendment (No. 10) was *rejected* by 6 votes (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, Lebanon and the United States of America) to one (Yugoslavia) with two abstention (India and the United Kingdom); and the second paragraph (No. 11) was *rejected* by 6 votes (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, Lebanon and the United States of America) to two (India and Yugoslavia) with one abstention (United Kingdom).

[8] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) pointed out that as Part I of the Report contained a record of the opinion expressed by the members of the Committee, it would be expedient to mention at the end of *Paragraph 8* of that part the vote just taken. Any delegation could of course submit a draft resolution to the General Conference in Plenary Session.

[9] Mr. RIBNIKAR (Yugoslavia) reserved his right to present to the General Conference the complete text of the amendment rejected by the Credentials Committee.

[10] *Paragraph 10* in the form in which it appears in Part III of the Report was *approved* by 8 votes (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, United Kingdom, United States of America) to one (Yugoslavia).

[11] *Paragraph 11* in the form in which it appears in Part III of the Report was *approved* by 6 votes (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, Lebanon, United States of America) to two (India and Yugoslavia) with one abstention (United Kingdom).

Paragraph 12 was *approved* without comment.

Paragraph 13 was *approved* by 8 votes (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, United Kingdom, United States of America) to one (Yugoslavia).

The Report as a whole was *approved* by 8 votes to 1.[1]

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

1. In final form: Resol. document 5C/CRE/1.

FOURTH MEETING

Wednesday, 14 June 1950, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: H.E. Mr. JEAN DÉSY (Canada)

[1] The SECRETARY announced that Indonesia, Monaco, Sweden and Turkey had now submitted credentials which were properly signed and in order.

These credentials were *accepted* unanimously.

[2] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) read the following telegram which had been received from the Government of Syria:

Government of Syria has instructed Mr. Wadji Mallat

to represent it during election Members Executive Board.

NAZEM KOUDSI,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SABA explained that the Syrian Government had previously refrained from sending a delegation to the General Conference of Unesco; but a Government had a perfect right to change a decision of this nature. As far as the actual telegram was concerned, it was quite in order and could be accepted provisionally as constituting legal credentials; according to normal practice, the telegram would have to be confirmed before the credentials could be finally accepted. However, there was a question involved since this was the first time a Member State had proposed sending a delegation to attend only certain limited meetings of the Conference; this procedure would appear to be quite in order according to rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure, but it was nevertheless unusual.

[3] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) remarked that the text of the telegram did appear to meet the requirements of rule 22.

Dr. BARALT y ZACHARIE (Cuba) agreed with Mr. Sargeant and added that the question of the limited attendance of a delegation must surely be one which concerned only the Member State itself.

[4] Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon) stated that he had been requested by the Syrian Government to support acceptance of Mr. Mallat's credentials. He explained that, at the time of the opening of the Fifth Session, Syria was undergoing a governmental crisis and that the new Government had only been constituted five days previously.

[5] Mr. CAIN (France) also agreed with a remark of Mr. Sargeant, but pointed out that a question of principle was involved in the matter of appointing delegations at any point in the General Conference and for specific meetings only. If this precedent were followed in future years, the works of the General Conference would be seriously hampered. He suggested that this question be referred to the Procedure Committee.

[6] Mr. SABA (Legal Adviser) explained that the Procedure Committee had already completed its work and suggested instead that the Director-General be asked to send a circular letter to Member States drawing their attention to this matter and requesting them to expedite the submission of full credentials at the beginning of each session of the General Conference.

The proposal, supported by Mr. CAIN (France), was *adopted* unanimously.

[7] Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America), seconded by Mr. WARD (United Kingdom) and by Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon), moved formally that the credentials Committee find the credentials of the Syrian delegate in order.

Dr. BARALT y ZACHARIE (Cuba) asked whether the word "provisional" should not be inserted in this motion, since a telegram was not normally considered sufficient for final acceptance of credentials. Of course, in this special case, the Conference would probably end before tha full credentials could be received and finally accepted.

After discussion of this point, Mr. SARGEANT (United States of America) proposed the following amended motion:

The Credentials Committee approves provisionally the credentials of the Syrian delegate and recommends to the General Conference that he be permitted to exercise the mandate conferred on him by his Government.

This motion was *adopted* unanimously.

The meeting rose at 10.15 a.m.

INDEX

PART I

Index of subjects discussed, items on the agenda, and questions brought up for consideration by delegates during general debate.

A

Abstracts
See: Bibliographies. Committee for the Co-ordination of Abstracts. Committee on the Abstracting of Engineering Sciences. Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences

Administrative Commission - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 58.

Administrative Commission - report
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 226-234, 235-237.

Administrative Commission. Sub-Committee for Consideration of the Currency of Contributions of States
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 641.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 226-234, 235-237.

Administrative Commission. Sub-Committee for Consideration of Questions of Salaries, Allowances and Leave
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 645.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 226-234, 235-237.

Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, Paris 2-3 May 1950
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 54.

Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 637.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 228.

Admission of new Members
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 156-160, 182.

Adult education
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications

Agenda
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 49.

Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications

Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials (GATT)
See also: Programme 1951 - mass communications
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 223-224.

Agricultural sciences
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences

Allied High Commission in Germany - representation at General Conference, 5th Session
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 175.

Archaeology
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Archives of recorded music
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Arid Zone
See: International Arid Zone Research Council

Art
See also: Children - art exhibitions. Contemporary art - Unesco exhibitions. Exhibitions. International Association of Art Critics. "International Directory of Photographic Archives of Works of Art". "International Review of the Arts". Museums. Visual arts

Art - musical records
See: Basic programme - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Art - photographic archives
See: Basic programme - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Art - reproductions
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Art - teaching
See: Basic programme - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Artists - status
See: Basic programme - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Arts and Letters
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Associate Members of Unesco
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 174, 219.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 662, 672.

Audio-visual aids
See: Educational, scientific and cultural materials

Auditors - report 1949
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 610, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 227,234.

Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences

Avicenne
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950

B

Bach, Johann, Sebastian
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950

Balzac, Honoré de
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950

Basic Programme
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 273-274, 467.

Basic Programme-cultural activities
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 292, 303.

Basic Programme - education
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.

— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 274-284, 307-308.
Basic Programme - exchange of persons
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 304.
Basic Programme - mass communications
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 304, 308.
Basic Programme - natural sciences
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 284.
Basic Programme- preamble
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 309, 315-320, 466.
Basic Programme - relief assistance services
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 305
Basic Programme - social sciences
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 222.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 287-292.
Bibliographies
See: Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences. Germany - programme 1951. Japan-programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Biology
See: Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science. Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences
Book Coupon Scheme
See: Unesco Coupon Schemes
Book Exchange Centres
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Braille systems
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Bruno, Giordano
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950
Budget - Supervisory Commission
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 638-639.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 227.
Budget 1950 - currency devaluation
— *Budget Committee*, p. 561.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 227-238.
Budget 1951
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 624-625, 633-636.
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 478-566.
— *Committee of Eight*, pp. 567-572.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 210-213, 227-234, 235-238.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 322-326, 343-443.
Budget 1951 - appropriations
— *Budget Committee*, p. 563.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 210-213, 235-238.
Budget 1951 - transfers
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 242-243.
Budget Committee - establishment
— *Budget Committee*, p. 478.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 55-56, 210-213.
Budget Committee - reports
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 210-213, 238.

C

Calendar of meetings, pp. 22-23.
Children's Communities
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - education
China
See also: Recorded Music
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
— *Credentials Committee*, pp. 687-694.
— *General Committee*, p. 267.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 44-45, 46-49, 175-185.
Classics - translations
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Clearing House
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Code of policies
See: Statement of methods
Collection for the Italian Organization for Aid to Child Victims of the War
— *General Committee*, p. 268.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 204.
College of Europe (Bruges, Belgium)
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 87.
Commemoration tributes, 1950
— *General Committee*, p. 256.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 174, 191-195, 201-203.
Commission on Technical Facilities
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 610.
— *Budget Committee*, p. 478.
— *Credentials Committee*, p. 687.
— *Nominations Committee*, p. 652.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 57-58.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 658.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 273.
Committee for the Co-ordination of Abstracts
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Committee of Eight - establishment
— *Budget Committee*, p. 548.
— *General Committee*, pp. 269-270.
Committee of Intellectuals (proposed)
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 681.
Committee of Press and Publication Experts
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Committee on the Abstracting of Engineering Sciences
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Communications received from:
— *Committee for the Liberation of Istria*, p. 258.
— *International Relief Union*, p. 264.
— *Italian National Association for the Preservation of the Countryside and Monuments of artistic Value* p. 260.
— *One World Committee*, p. 267.
— *Poland, Embassy in Rome, Italy*, p. 267.
— *Sforza, Count*, p. 225.
— *Union of Slovene Cultural Associations*, p. 271.
— *Women's Permanent Peace Delegation*, p. 268.

— *World Federation of United Nations Associations*, p. 260.
Conduct of business
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 105.
Conference on Public Education
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Confucius
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950
Constitution - Article II - amendments
See: Associate Members of Unesco
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 4 - amendments
See: Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 8b - amendments
See: Contributions - arrears
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 658, 662, 681, 684.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 111, 189-190, 213, 218.
Constitution - Article V, Paragraph 3 - amendments
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 659.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 186-187.
Constitution - Article V, Paragraph 11
See: General Conference - rule 97 - amendments
Consultative Committee on Adult Education
See: Programme 1951 - education
Contemporary art - Unesco exhibitions
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Contributions - arrears
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 610, 613, 636, 646, 650.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 227, 234, 235-237.
Contributions - currency
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 615, 641, 650.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 227, 234, 235-237.
Contributions - scale 1951
See also: Working Capital Fund
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 615, 620, 624, 625, 650.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 227, 234, 235-237.
Contributions - United States
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 621.
Co-ordinating Committee of Social Science Associations
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
Co-ordinating Committee on Abstracting and Indexing of the Medical and Biological Sciences
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Copyright
See: International Copyright Bulletin. Universal Convention on Copyright. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Council for the Co-ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Council for the Co-ordination of International Congresses of Medical Sciences - formal agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206-210.
Credentials - submission
See: General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Credentials Committee - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 44-45.
Credentials Committee - report
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 46-49, 175-185, 186.
Cuba
See: Regional Offices (Cuba) - installation allowances
Cultural activities
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951
Cultural agreements and conventions
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 585, 605, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 210.
Cultural heritage - protection in armed conflicts
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Cultural publications
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Culture - dissemination
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Cuzco, Peru - destruction
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
— *Plenary Meeting*, p. 115.

D

Descartes, René
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950
Desert
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Devastated countries - assessment of needs
See: Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Devastated countries - direct assistance
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Dictionaries - multilingual
See: Programme 1951- cultural activities. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Direct assistance
See: Devastated countries
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 58-156, 160-174.
Director-General - submission of resignation
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 197-201.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 445-446.
Documentation services
See: Libraries and Documentation Services
Documentation specialists
See: Librarians and documentation specialists
Documents - reproduction
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Documents of Unesco
See: Publications and documents of Unesco.

E

Economic and social rights
See also: Human Rights - covenant (draft)
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - international conventions
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 223-224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 457-460.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - obstacles to the circulation
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Engineering sciences
See: Committee on the Abstracting of Engineering Sciences. International Engineering Science Congresses

Executive Board - budget 1951
See: Secretariat - general policy
Executive Board - members - election
See also: Constitution - Article V, paragraph 3. General Conference - rules 95, 96, 97
Executive Board - members - election 1950
— *General Committee*, p. 268.
— *Nominations Committee*, p. 654.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 187-189, 220-221.
Executive Board - members - term of office
See: Constitution - Article V, paragraph II - amendments. General Conference - rule 97 - amendments
Executive Board - membership
Procedure Committee, pp. 681-684.

F

Fellowships
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Fellowships - donors
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Fellowships of Unesco
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Field Science Co-operation Offices
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Field Science Co-operation Offices - South-East Asia
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 361.
Film
See: Press, film and radio
Financial regulations 25, 26 - amendments
See also: Contributions - arrears
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 647, 650.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 227-234, 235-237.
Flag
See: Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Folklore and popular arts
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - education
Food and Agriculture Organization
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Freedom of information
See: Information - obstacles to the free flow
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 568.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 454, 455, 468.
Fundamental education
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications
Fundamental education - bulletin
See: Programme 1951 - education
Fundamental education - campaigns
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Fundamental education - exhibitions
See: Programme 1951 - education
Fundamental education - experiments
See: Programme 1951 - education

G

G.A.T.T.
See: Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials
General Committee
See also: General Conference - rule 36 - amendments.
General Committee - establishment
— *Nominations Committee*, pp. 651, 652.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 50, 51.
General Conference - agenda
See: General Conference - rule 11 - amendments. General Conference - rule 13 - amendments. General Conference - rule 14 - amendments
General Conference - budget 1951
See: Secretariat - general policy
General Conference - committees
See: General Conference - rule 32 - amendments
General Conference - conduct of business
See: General Conference - rule 78 - amendments
General Conference - documents
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 219.
General Conference - General Committee
See: General Conference - rule 36 -amendments
General Conference - records
See also: General Conference - rule 55 - amendments
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 466.
General Conference - representatives - credentials
See: General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
General Conference - resolutions - amendments and proposals
See: General Conference - rule 78 - amendments
General Conference - rule 11 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 671, 675.
General Conference - rule 13 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 671, 675.
General Conference - rule 14 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 671, 675.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 659, 665, 686.
General Conference - rule 32 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 676, 686.
General Conference - rule 36 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 676.
General Conference - rule 48 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 675.
General Conference - rule 52 - amendments
— *Budget Committee*, p. 523.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 658, 661, 663, 666, 678, 686.
General Conference - rule 55 - amendments
— *Budget Committee*, p. 523.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 658, 661, 663, 666, 678, 686.
General Conference - rule 78 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 686.
General Conference - rule 81 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.

— *Procedure Committee*, p. 671.
General Conference - rule 89 - amendments
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 686.
General Conference - rule 95 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 187.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 659.
General Conference - rule 96 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 187.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 659.
General Conference - rule 97 - amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 187.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 659.
General Conference - rules 95, 96, 97 - amendments
See also: Constitution - Article V - amendments
General Conference - rules - interpretation
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 671, 675, 685, 686.
General Conference - sessions
See: Constitution - Article IV, paragraph 9 - amendments
General Conference - Subsidiary organs - procedure
See: General Conference - rule 48 - amendments
General Conference - voting
See: General Conference - rule 81 - amendments
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee - establishment
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 524-526.
— *Nominations Committee*, p. 656.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 210-213, 243.
General Conference, 6th Session - seat
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 189.
General Conference, 7th Session - seat
— *General Committee*, p. 267.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 190.
Geography - teaching
See: Programme 1951 - education
Germany - programme 1951
— *Joint Programme and Budget, Official and External Relations Commissions*, p. 470.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 111, 225.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 279, 468.
Greece
See: Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East

H

Hague Rules
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 413.
Haiti
See: Adult education
Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan - admission to Unesco
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 156-160.
Headquarters Commission - report
— *Administrative Commission*, p. 642.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
Headquarters of Unesco
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 642, 650.
— *Budget Committee*, p. 522.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 644, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
High altitudes
See: International High Altitude Research Station (Jungfraujoch)
History - teaching
See: Programme 1951 - education
History of mankind
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Homage paid to Florence
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 245-246
Homeless intellectuals
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Honorary Councillors of Unesco - appointment of Dr. Laves
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 244.
Human Rights
See also: Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications
Human Rights - covenant (draft)
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 452.

I

Illiteracy
See: Non-self-governing territories
" Impact"
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
"Index Bibliographicus"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
"Index Translationum"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
India
See: Fundamental education -experiments. Public Libraries
Industrialization
See: Social tensions
Information
See also: Scientific information
Information - obstacles to the free flow
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Information - obstacles to the flow - conventions
See: Programme 1951 - information
Information - postal and telecommunication facilities
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Installation allowance
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Inter-governmental organizations
See also: International Bureau of Education. International Committee in Weights and Measures. Organization of American States
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 576, 587, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 208-209, 210.
International Academic Union
See: International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International African Institute
See: International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International Anthropological Institute - relations with Unesco
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206, 210.

International Arid Zone Research Council
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
International Association of Applied Psychology - consultative arrangements
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206, 210.
International Association of Art Critics
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Association of Universities
See: Programme 1951 - education
International Bureau of Education
See also: Programme 1951 - education
International Bureau of Education - agreement (draft)
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 575, 587.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 208, 210.
International Commission on Folk Arts and Folklore
See: International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International Committee on Historical Sciences
See: International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International Committee on History of Art
See: International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International Committee on Weights and Measures - agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 576, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 208, 210.
International Comparative Law Association
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Computation Centre
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
International Conferences
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Congress of the Arts (1952)
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Conventions
See: Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
International Co-operation Studies
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - social sciences
"International Copyright Bulletin"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Council of Archives
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Council of Museums
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Council of Museums - formal agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
International Council of Music
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
International Council of Scientific Unions
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
— *Budget Committee*, p. 535.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 579, 595.
International Council of Scientifc Unions - formal agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
"International Directory of Photographic Archives of Works of Art"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Economic Association
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Engineering Science Congress
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
International Federation of Teachers' Unions
— *General Committee*, p. 270.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 608.
International Fund for the Preservation of Monuments and Museums
See: Monuments and historic sites - restoration and preservation
International High Altitude Research Station (Jungfraujoch)
See also: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 595.
International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Institute of Philosophy
See: International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
International Institute of the Press and Information
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
International Institute of Social Science
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Labour Organisation
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons. Programme 1951 - mass communications
International Museums Office
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Music Fund
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Organizations - secretariat's study
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Political Science Association
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Publishers' Congress - consultative arrangements
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206-210.
International Relief Council
— *Budget Committee*, p. 555.
"International Review of Arts"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Sociological Association
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences

International Statistical Institute
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
International Studies Conference - formal agreement
See also: Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207-210.
International Telephone and Telegraph Conference
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
International Theatre Institute
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
International Theatre Institute - formal agreement
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207-210.
International Understanding
See also: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications
International understanding - duty of the State
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 238-239.
International understanding - education
See also: Programme 1951 - education
— *Budget Committee*, p. 484.
International Union for the Protection of Nature
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and the History of Art
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207-210.
International Union of Local Authorities - consultative arrangements
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207-210.
International Universities Bureau
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
International Voluntary Work Camps
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - education
International Zoological Station (Naples)
See also: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 595.
Internships of Unesco
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Iqbal
See: Commemoration Tributes 1950
Italian National Association for the Preservation of the Countryside and Monuments of Artistic Value
See: Communications received
Italy, Government
See: Tribute of thanks

J

Japan - Programme 1951
— *Joint Programme and Budget and Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 475.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 112, 225.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 279, 468.
Japan - social tensions
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
Junior Red Cross
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 606.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207, 210.

K

Klatt plan
See: Programme 1951 - Relief assistance services
Korea - admission to Unesco
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 156-160.

L

Languages - indigenous
See: Non-self-governing territories. Programme 1951 - education
Languages - teaching
See: Programme 1951 - education
Latin America
See: Public libraries
Laves, W. H. C. (Deputy Director General)
See: Honorary Councillors of Unesco. Tribute of thanks
Law
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
League of Red Cross Societies
— *General Committee*, p. 259.
Librarians and documentation specialists
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Libraries
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Public libraries
Libraries - ex-German in Italy
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Libraries and documentation services
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Library of Congress (U.S.A.)
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Literature
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Literature - history
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Loan to Staff Members
See: Working Capital Fund
Local salary scale
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances

M

Masaccio
See: Art - reproduction
Mass Communications
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Mechanical devices of information
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Meeting of Observers of Non-Governmental Organizations, Florence, May 1950 - reports
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 580.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205, 210.
Meeting of Representatives of National Commissions, Florence, May 1950 - recommendations
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 587, 603.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205, 210.

Mexico
See: Training and Production Centres
Michelangelo
See: Art - reproductions
Microfilms
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Monuments and historic sites - restoration and preservation
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Muratori, Lodovico Antonio
See: Commemoration tributes, 1950
"Museum"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Museums
See: International Council of Museums. International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. International Museum Office. Publications - Museums. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Music
See: Archives of Recorded Music. Folklore and popular arts. International Council of Music. International Music Fund. Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Recorded music. "Unesco Anthology"
Music - festivals
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities

N

National Commissions - annual meetings of representatives
— *Procedure Committee*, pp. 681, 684, 686.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 214, 219.
National Commissions and cooperating bodies
See also: Member States - periodic reports
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 587, 603, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206, 210.
National Commissions and cooperating bodies - membership
— *General Committee*, pp. 270-271.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 608.
National Commissions and cooperating bodies - workers' representation
See: National Commissions and cooperating bodies - membership
Natural resources
See : Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Natural sciences
See : Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Nominations Committee - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 49-50.
Nominations Committee - reports
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 50-52, 243, 244.
Non-Governmental organizations - contracts and grants-in-aid, 1947-1950
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207, 210.
Non-Governmental organizations - and Fellowships
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Non-Governmental organizations - and scientific co-operation
See : Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Non-Governmental organizations - and social tensions
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
Non-Governmental organizations - and voluntary assistance campaigns
See: Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Non-Governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577-582, 590-594, 595-600, 601-603, 607-609.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
Non-governmental organizations - representation at General Conference, 5th session
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 57.
Non-self-governing territories
See also: Associate Members of Unesco. Technical assistance
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 574, 577, 605.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 206, 208, 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 398-399, 442-443.

O

Oceanographic Institute - Monaco
See also: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 595.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
Official and External Relations Commission - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 58.
Official and External Relations Commission - report
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 205-210.
Official and External Relations Commission. Subcommittee for Consideration of Questions Concerning Unesco's Relations with International Non-Governmental Organizations - establishment
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 580.
Official and External Relations Commission. Subcommittee for consideration of questions concerning Unesco's relations with international non-governmental organizations - report
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 590, 595, 606.
Official and External Relations Commission. Sub-Committee for Examination of Reports by Member States - establishment
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 589-590.
Official and External Relations Commission. Subcommittee for Examination of Reports by Member States - reports
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 604.
Organization of American States
See also: Training and Production Centres
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 576, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 209.

Oriental studies
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
O. S. E. Union - relations with Unesco
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 206.

P

Pavia International Institute for Public Finance
— *Budget Committee*, p. 482.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 87, 111, 220, 224-225, 239-242.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 443-446, 455, 462.
Pen Club
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Permanent International Committee of Linguists
See: International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies - formal agreement
Philology
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Philosophy - teaching
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Philosophy and Humanistic Studies
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Pollution of rivers
See also: Science - popularization
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 160.
Popular arts
See: Folklore and popular arts
Population problems
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Postage stamp
See: Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Prehistory
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Press
See also: Committee of Press and Publication Experts. International Institute of the Press and Information
Press, film and radio
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Privileges and immunities - agreement with the French Government
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 590, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207, 210.
Procedure Committee
See also: General Conference - rule 32 - amendments
Procedure Committee - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 58.
Procedure Committee - report
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 186-187, 213-219.
Programme 1951
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons. Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - relief assistance services. Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 479-576.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 311-469.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 219-226.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 489, 492, 516, 518, 546.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 570.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Committee*, pp. 391, 400, 404, 413, 420, 442.
Programme 1951 - education
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 479, 481, 510, 512, 527, 528, 531, 534, 539, 552.
— *Committee of Eight*, pp. 568, 569.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 326, 328, 334, 347, 441, 455.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 499, 523, 551.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 570.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 422, 441.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 495-499, 520, 553.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 571.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 425, 427, 441, 453.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 485, 511, 514, 534.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 570.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 353, 355, 359, 368, 390.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 500, 521, 554, 555.
— *Committee of Eight*, pp. 568, 571.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 435.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 487, 488, 515, 537.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 570.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 376, 383.
Programme 1951 - special projects
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 224, 242.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 342.
Programme and Budget Commission - establishment
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 57.
Programme and Budget Commission - report
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 466-468.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 219-226.
Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 508, 509, 524, 541, 544.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 455.
Propositions, resolutions and amendments
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 69.
Public libraries
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Publications
See also: Cultural publications. Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Publications - Museums
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Publications and documents of Unesco
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 502, 524, 558, 559.
— *Committe of Eight*, p. 572.
-- *Plenary meeting*, p. 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 452.
Publications for children
See: Programme 1951 - education

R

Racial prejudices
See: Social tensions
Radio
See: Press, film and radio
Raphael
See: Art - reproductions
Recommendations to Member-States and International Conventions
— *Budget Committee*, p. 522.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 582, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207, 213, 218.
— *Procedure Committee*, pp.. 663, 666, 669, 678, 686.
Reconstruction
See: Relief assistance services. Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Recorded music
See: "Archives of Recorded Music". Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Red Cross
See: Junior Red Cross
Refugees and displaced persons
See also: Homeless intellectuals
Refugee Arabs - Palestine
— *Budget Committee*, p. 564.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 91, 221, 224, 235.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 467, 469.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
— *General Committee*, p. 268.
-- *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 609.
-- *Plenary meetings*, pp. 91, 221, 222, 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 467, 469.
Regional Offices (Cuba) - installation allowances
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Relief assistance Services
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Religion and education
-- *Plenary meeting*, pp. 225-226.
Representation allowance
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Representation to General Conference, 5th session - credentials
— *Credentials Committee*, pp. 687-695.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 44-45, 46-49, 175-185, 186, 213.
Representatives to the Conference, pp. 9-19.
Representatives of Unesco accredited to Ministeries of Education
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 132.

S

School curricula
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Science - history and philosophy
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Science - popularisation
See: Programme 1951 - mass communication. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Science -teaching
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Science clubs
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Scientific apparatus and materials
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Scientific co-operation
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Scientific exhibitions
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Scientific information - mechanical devices
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Scientific publications
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Scientific terminology
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Secretariat - Appeals Board
See: Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies
Secretariat - Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget
See: Secretariat - general administration
Secretariat - Bureau of Personnel
See: Secretariat - general administration
Secretariat - Bureau of the Comptroller
See: Secretariat - general administration
Secretariat - common service costs
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 507, 524, 542.
-- *Committee of Eight*, p. 572.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 238.
Secretariat - cost-of-living adjustment
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Secretariat - Council of Directors of Departments
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 110.
Secretariat - dislocation allowance
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Secretariat - external relations service
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 503, 522, 555.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 571.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 226-228.
Secretariat - general administration
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 639-641.
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 505, 522, 524.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 569.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 226-234, 238.
Secretariat - general policy
-- *Budget Committee*, pp. 504, 505, 524, 544.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 226.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 637, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 227, 228, 234.
Secretariat - leave
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 645, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 227, 234.

Secretariat - library
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Secretariat - local salary scale
See: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 633, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
Secretariat - national income tax
See also: Secretariat - salaries and allowances
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 633, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 227, 234.
Secretariat - office of the Director-General
See: Secretariat - general administration
Secretariat - organization
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 638, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 626, 631, 645, 650.
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 509, 524.
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 567.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 227, 228, 234.
Secretariat - special language services
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 503, 560.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 625, 645, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 228, 234.
Secretariat - statistical service
— *Budget Committee*, pp. 504, 524.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 223-224.
Seminars
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - education
Social rights
See: Human rights - covenant (draft)
Social sciences
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
Social sciences - teaching
See also: Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
Social tensions
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Social tensions - survey
See : Programme 1951 - social sciences
Specialized Agencies - study
See: Programme 1951 - social sciences
Staff Housing Fund
See: Working Capital Fund
Staff Pension Scheme
See: United Nations Joint Staff Pension Scheme
Staff regulations - rules 11, 21, 36 - amendments
See: Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Standard of living
See: Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Statement of methods
See also: Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 225.
— *Procedure Committee*, p. 680.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 310, 455, 468.
Statistical Year-book on Education
See: Programme 1951 - education
Statistics - education
See: Programme 1951 - education
Swiss League for Human Rights
See: Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Symposia
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - natural sciences

T

Teachers - exchange
See: Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Teachers - status
See: Programme 1951 - education
Technical assistance
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, p. 311.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (TICER)
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 600, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 207, 209.
Textbooks and teaching materials
See: Programme 1951 - education
Theatre
See: International Theatre Institute. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Theme 1951
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 224.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 457, 460.
T.I.C.E.R.
See: Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Training and Production Centres
See: Programme 1951 - education
Translations
See: Classics - translations. "Index Translationum". Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Tribute of thanks to Government of Italy
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 245.
Tribute of thanks to Dr. Laves
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 244.
Trusteeship Council
See: Non-self-governing territories. United Nations and Specialized Agencies - co-ordination of programmes.

U

Under-developed countries
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications. Technical Assistance
Unesco aims and purposes
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
"Unesco Anthology"
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
"Unesco Bulletin for Libraries"
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Unesco Coupon Scheme
See: Germany - programme 1951. Japan - programme 1951. Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - natural sciences
"Unesco Courier"
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
Unesco exhibitions
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities

Unesco Journalists
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 107.
Union of Institutes
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - representation to General Conference, 5th session
— *Credentials Committee*, p. 692.
United Jewish Educational and Cultural Organization
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 209.
United Nations and Specialized Agencies - co-ordination of programmes
See also: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons. Programme 1951 - natural sciences. Programme 1951 - social sciences
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 624, 647, 650.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 590, 605, 607.
— *Plenary meetings*, pp. 208, 224, 235.
United Nations and Specialized Agencies -teaching
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons. Programme 1951 - mass communications
United Nations Joint Staff Pension Scheme
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 633, 637, 646.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 228.
Universal Convention on Copyright
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Universal decimal classification
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Universal Declaration of Human Rights
See also: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - mass communications
— *Committee of Eight*, p. 567.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 223.
— *Programme and Budget Commission*, pp. 447, 450, 460.
Universal Postal Union
See: Programme 1951 - mass communications
University degrees
See: Programme 1951 - education

V

Visual and auditory materials
See: Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character
Visual arts
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Voluntary assistance campaigns
See: Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Voluntary contributions
See: Programme 1951 - special projects

W

Workers
See: Programme 1951 - cultural activities. Programme 1951 - exchange of persons. Programme 1951 - natural sciences.
Workers' organizations
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 608.
Working Capital Fund
— *Administrative Commission*, pp. 619, 650.
— *Plenary meeting*, p. 227.
Working languages
See: General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
World Braille Chart
See: Braille systems
Word Braille Council
See: Braille systems
World Council of Churches - consultative arrangements
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, pp. 577, 580, 601, 607.
— *Plenary meeting*, pp. 206-207.
World Federation of Trade Unions
— *General Committee*, p. 270.
— *Official and External Relations Commission*, p. 608.
World Health Organization
See: Programme 1951 - education. Programme 1951 - natural sciences

Y

Youth
See also: International voluntary work camps. Programme 1951 - social sciences
Youth camps
See: Programme 1951 - education
Youth movements
See: Programme 1951- education

Z

Zoology
See: International Zoological Station (Naples).

INDEX

PART II

Index of statements, speeches and comments made by delegates, members of the Executive Board, the Director-General and members of the Secretariat. Remarks interposed by delegates in the capacity of president, rapporteur or secretary of a commission do not appear in the index.

REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES

Delegation of AFGHANISTAN

Basic Programme
Anas, p. 319.
Basic Programme - cultural activities
Anas, pp. 294, 296.
Basic Programme - education
Anas, pp. 275, 280, 283, 284.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Anas, p. 586.
Executive Board - members - election, 1950
Anas, p. 655.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Anas, p. 454.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Anas, p. 581.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Anas, pp. 392, 395, 400.
Programme 1951 - education
Anas, pp. 326, 327, 330, 340, 351.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Anas, pp. 357, 358, 364, 367, 370, 371, 373, 374.

Delegation of ARGENTINA

Contributions - currency
González Risos, p. 618.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
González Risos, p. 664.

Delegation of AUSTRALIA

Admission of new Members
Walker, pp. 156-157.
Associate Members of Unesco
Walker, pp. 673, 674, 675.
Basic Programme
Walker, pp. 317-318.
Basic Programme - cultural activities
Fletcher, p. 299.
Basic Programme - education
Fletcher, pp. 283, 308.
Basic Programme - natural sciences
Fletcher, pp. 284, 285, 286, 287.
Basic Programme - social sciences
Fletcher, pp. 288, 289.
Budget 1951
Smith, pp. 635, 647, 648, 649.
Walker, pp. 236-237, 324, 345-346.
Weeden, p. 563.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Walker, p. 688.
Committee of Eight - constitution
Weeden, p. 548.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendment
Walker, p. 682.
Contributions - arrears
Smith, p. 612.
Contribution - currency
Smith, pp. 616, 617, 618.
Contributions - scale 1951
Smith, pp. 615, 620, 622.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Walker, p. 141.
Documents and publications of Unesco
Weeden, p. 502.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Fletcher, p. 459.
General Committee
Walker, p. 57.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendment
Davies, pp. 659-660.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Walker, p. 243.
Headquarters of Unesco
Smith, pp. 642, 643.
Weeden, p. 522.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
Smith, p. 644.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Walker, p. 449.
Japan - Programme 1951
Walker, p. 476.
Member States - periodical reports
Davies, p. 574.
National Commissions - recommendations of représentatives
Weeden, pp. 588, 689.
Non-governmental organizations - agreements
Fletcher, p. 209.
Non-governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Cummins, pp. 592, 596, 597, 598.
Walker, p. 602.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Walker, p. 465.

Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Fletcher, pp. 391, 395.
Weeden, pp. 416, 419, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 517, 519, 520, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551.
Programme 1951 - education
Fletcher, pp. 329, 330.
Weeden, pp. 326, 327, 481, 482, 483, 484, 511, 512, 513, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 540, 552.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Weeden, p. 499.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Davies, pp. 425, 429.
Weeden, pp. 495, 496, 497, 498, 554.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Cummins, pp. 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 362, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375.
Fletcher, pp. 353, 354.
Weeden, pp. 485, 487, 514, 515, 534, 535, 536, 537.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Weeden, pp. 500, 521, 555.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Walker, pp. 389, 390.
Weeden, pp. 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 487, 488, 489, 516, 538, 539.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Walker, pp. 228, 230, 234, 236.
Programmes and budgets - methods of presentation
Weeden, p. 541.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Davies, p. 583.
Walker, pp. 666, 667.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Weeden, pp. 564, 565.
Secretariat - common service costs
Weeden, p. 543.
Secretariat - external relations service
Smith, pp. 556, 557.
Weeden, p. 507.
Secretariat - general administration
Weeden, pp. 505, 545.
Secretariat - general policy
Weeden, p. 524.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Smith, p. 637.
Secretariat - organization
Walker, p. 640.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Smith, pp. 526, 629, 632, 633.
Secretariat - statistical service
Weeden, pp. 504, 530.
Specialized Agencies - programmes and budgets
Walker, p. 208.
Staff rules and regulations - application
Smith, pp. 625, 626, 628.
Technical assistance
Fletcher, p. 312.
Working Capital Fund
Smith, p. 619.

Delegation of AUSTRIA

Contributions - currency
Zeissl, p. 616.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Zeissl, p. 605.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Zeissl, pp. 60-62.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Marinelli, p. 461.
Junior Red Cross
Zeissl, p. 606.
Member States - periodic reports
Zeissl, p. 608.
National Commissions
Zeissl, p. 608.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Zeissl, pp. 414, 415, 416.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Zeissl, pp. 375, 376.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Zeissl, p. 385.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Zeissl, pp. 667, 668.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Oberparleiter, p. 637.

Delegation of BELGIUM

Basic Programme - cultural activities
Van der Bruggen, p. 295.
Willems, pp. 293, 302.
Basic Programme - education
Van der Bruggen, pp. 281, 283.
Visscher, p. 280.
Willems, p. 278.
Basic Programme - mass communications
Visscher, p. 305.
Willems, p. 305.
Basic Programme - social sciences
Van der Bruggen, pp. 290, 291.
Budget 1951
Verniers, p. 344.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Verniers, p. 653.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - Amendmends
Visscher, p. 682.
Contributions - scale 1951
Despot, p. 622.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Visscher, p. 606.
Director-General - report on the Activities of the Organization
Mundeleer, pp. 86-88.
Educational, scientific and cultural material - importation - agreement
Visscher, p. 460.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Verniers, p. 655.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Van der Bruggen, p. 454.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Visscher, p. 660.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Visscher, pp. 675, 676, 677.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Visscher, p. 665.

General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Verniers, pp. 656, 657.
Germany - Programme 1951
Verniers, p. 475.
Human Rights - covenant (draft)
Visscher, p. 452.
International Bureau of Education - agreement (draft)
Verniers, p. 575.
Junior Red Cross
Visscher, p. 606.
Member States - periodic reports
Verniers, pp. 573, 574.
Non-governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Van der Bruggen, pp. 593, 595.
Verniers, p. 579.
Visscher, pp. 601, 603.
Non-self-governing territories
Verniers, p. 398.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Verniers, pp. 239, 240, 444, 462, 466.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Van der Bruggen, p. 419.
Verniers, pp. 394, 401, 403, 421.
Visscher, p. 406.
Programme 1951 - education
Van der Bruggen, p. 456.
Verniers, pp. 327, 330, 333, 335, 336, 341, 344, 347.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Van der Bruggen, p. 423.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Verniers, pp. 427, 434.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Van der Bruggen, p. 438.
Verniers, pp. 439, 440, 441.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Van der Bruggen, pp. 378, 386, 389.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Visscher, pp. 669-670, 679, 680.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Despot, p. 638.
Statement of Methods
Van der Bruggen, p. 455.
Visscher, p. 311.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Visscher, p. 601.

Delegation of BRAZIL

Basic Programme - education
Carneiro, p. 282.
Lourenço-Filho, p. 275.
Basic Programme - mass communications
Ozorio de Almeida, p. 308.
Basic Programme - social sciences
Ozorio de Almeida, pp. 288, 289.
Budget - Supervisory Commission
Godoy, p. 639.
Budget 1951
Carneiro, pp. 324, 344.
Murtinho, p. 649.
China - representation at the General Conference, 5th Session
Carneiro, pp. 690, 692.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Murtinho, pp. 681, 683.
Contributions - currency
Lourenço Filho, pp. 617, 618.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Murtinho, p. 606.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Mariani Bittencourt, pp. 122-125.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Carneiro, p. 655.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Murtinho, p. 660.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Murtinho, p. 675.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Carneiro, p. 212
Germany - Programme 1951
Carneiro, p. 473.
Headquarters of Unesco
Godoy, p. 643.
National Commission - annual meeting of delegates
Murtinho, p. 685.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Murtinho, p. 688.
Non-governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Murtinho, p. 593.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Carneiro, pp. 444, 446.
Programme 1951
Carneiro, p. 315.
Programme 1951 : cultural activities
Carneiro, pp. 400, 405, 407, 410, 412, 421.
Programme 1951 - education
Andrade Baleiro, pp. 482, 497.
Carneiro, pp. 340, 341, 347.
Ozorio de Almeida, p. 332.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Carneiro, p. 423.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Carneiro, pp. 357, 360, 361, 363, 364, 367.
Ozorio de Almeida, pp. 358, 365, 370, 375.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Carneiro, pp. 437, 438.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Carneiro, p. 381.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Murtinho, pp. 669, 679.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Murtinho, p. 629.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Murtinho, p. 627.

Delegation of BURMA

Admission of new Members
Aung, p. 157.
Basic Programme - social sciences
Aung, p. 291.

China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Aung, pp. 180, 181, 185.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Aung, pp. 155-156.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Aung, p. 655.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Aung, p. 656.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Ba, p. 637.

Delegation of CANADA

Basic Programme - cultural activities
Lazerte, p. 302.
Basic Programme - education
Lazerte, p. 276.
Basic Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Page, p. 285
Budget - Supervisory Commission
Pollock, p. 639.
Budget 1951
Desy, p. 346.
Pollock, pp. 636, 648.
China - representation to te General Conference, 5th Session
Lazerte, p. 693.
Commemoration tributes, 1950
Desy, pp. 201, 266.
Tonnancour, p. 202.
Contributions - arrears
Pollock, pp. 611, 613.
Contributions - currency
Pollock, pp. 616, 642, 645.
Contributions - scale 1951
Pollock, pp. 621, 622.
Director-General - Report on the activities of the Organization
Desy, pp. 75-77.
Documents and publications of Unesco
Pollock, pp. 502, 558.
Educational, scientific and cultural material - importation - agreement
Lazerte, p. 459.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Tremblay, p. 664.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Robbins, p. 677.
Headquarters of Unesco
Pollock, pp. 643, 644.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
Pollock, p. 645.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Tremblay, p. 461.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Lazerte, p. 393.
Pollock, pp. 490, 491, 493.
Tonnancour, p. 406.
Programme 1951 - education
Lazerte, p. 327.
Pollock, pp. 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 510, 512, 532, 533.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Pollock, p. 499.
Programme 1951 - mass communication
Pollock, pp. 495, 497, 499, 520.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Page, p. 360.
Pollock, pp. 485, 486, 487, 514, 515.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Pollock, pp. 500, 501, 521, 555.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Lazerte, p. 376.
Pollock, p. 488.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Pollock, pp. 231-232.
Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
Pollock, p. 541.
Secretariat - external relations service
Pollock, pp. 507, 556, 557, 558.
Secretariat - general administration
Pollock, pp. 505, 507.
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme
Pollock, p. 633.
Secretariat - organization
Pollock, p. 640.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Pollock, pp. 509, 629, 632.
Theme 1951
Desy, pp. 457, 460.

Delegation of CEYLON

Basic Programme - cultural activities
Seneviratne, p. 293.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Seneviratne, pp. 148-150.

Delegation of CHINA

Admission of new Members
Wen, p. 158.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Wen, pp. 47, 180, 185.
Commemoration Tributes 1950
Wen, p. 194.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Wen, p. 653.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Wen, p. 683.
Contributions - arrears
Wen, p. 611.
Contributions - scale 1951
Wen, p. 622.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Wen, pp. 146-148.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Wen, p. 654.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Wen, p. 664.
Japan - programme 1951
— p. 476

Delegation of COLUMBIA

Basic programme - cultural activities
Bernal Jiménez, p. 301.
Budget 1951
Bernal Jiménez, p. 345.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Pineros Corpas, p. 683.
Director-General - report on the activities of the organization
Bernal Jiménez, pp. 98-101.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Bernal Jiménez, p. 663.
Germany - programme 1951
Bernal Jiménez, p. 473.
Homage paid to Florence
Bernal Jiménez, pp. 245-246.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Henao-Henao, p. 588.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Bernal Jiménez, p. 446.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Bernal Jiménez, p. 382.
Recommendation to Member States and International Conventions
Henao-Henao, p. 584.

Delegation of CUBA

Basic programme - cultural activities
Chediak, pp. 296, 298, 467.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Baralt y Zacharie, pp. 692, 695.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Brull y Caballero, p. 653.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Blanco y Sánchez, p. 682.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Chediak, p. 586.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Brull y Caballero, pp. 106-108.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Chediak, p. 662.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Blanco y Sánchez, p. 677.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Brull y Caballero, p. 656.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Chediak, p. 450.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Chediak, p. 588.
Non-governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Chediak, pp. 581, 592, 593.
Organization of American States - agreement
Chediak, p. 576.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Brull y Caballero, pp. 240, 466.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Chediak, pp. 396, 403, 411, 418, 420.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Blanco y Sánchez, p. 670.

Delegation of CZECHOSLOVAKIA

China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Hoffmeister, pp. 44, 47, 48, 176, 183-184.

Delegation of DENMARK

Basic programme - cultural activities
Nielsen, p. 300.
Basic programme - education
Pedersen, p. 307.
Ross, p. 275.
Basic programme - mass communications
Pedersen, p. 308.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Nielsen, p. 285.
Budget 1951
Nielsen, pp. 325, 567, 568.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Nielsen, pp. 73-75.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Nielsen, p. 454.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Nielsen, p. 216.
Germany -programme 1951
Pedersen, pp. 472-473, 474, 475.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Pedersen, p. 588.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Nielsen, p. 241.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Nielsen, pp. 391, 396.
Pedersen, p. 402.
Programme 1951 - education
Ross, p. 333.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Nielsen, pp. 357, 362, 367, 368, 572.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Ross, p. 379.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Pedersen, pp. 667-668.
Technical assistance
Nielsen, p. 312.

Delegation of DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Basic programme - cultural activities
Troncoso Sánchez, pp. 293, 295, 296.
Basic programme - education
Troncoso Sánchez, p. 282.
Basic programme - social sciences
Troncoso Sánchez, p. 287.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Troncoso Sánchez, pp. 115-117.

Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Troncoso Sánchez, pp. 394, 396.
Programme 1951 - education
Troncoso Sánchez, pp. 337, 350.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Troncoso Sánchez, p. 362.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Troncoso Sánchez, pp. 384, 385, 386.

Delegation of ECUADOR

Basic programme - cultural activities
Larrea, pp. 295, 302.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Alvarado, pp. 167-168.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Larrea, p. 450.
National Commissions - annual meetings of representatives
Alvarado, p. 685.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Larrea, p. 465.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Larrea, pp. 393, 413.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Alvarado, p. 436.

Delegation of EGYPT

Associate Members of Unesco
Hussein, pp. 254, 256.
Zaki, p. 672.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Fawzi, pp. 294, 300.
Ghorbal, p. 303.
Budget 1951
Ghorbal, p. 344.
Closing address
Fawzi, pp. 247-248.
Commemoration tributes 1950
Awad, p. 193.
Fawzi, pp. 193-194.
Contributions - arrears
Diwany, p. 612.
Contributions - currency
Diwany, pp. 616, 618.
Contributions - scale 1951
Diwany, pp. 620, 623.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Hussein, pp. 130-133.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Diwany, p. 664.
Headquarters of Unesco
Diwany, pp. 642, 643.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Awad, p. 592.
Non-self-governing territories
Awad, pp. 442, 443.
Ghorbal, p. 398.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Fawzi, p. 464.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Awad, p. 422.
Fawzi, p. 405.
Programme 1951 - education
Fawzi, p. 340, 351.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Fawzi, pp. 363, 370.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Awad, pp. 384, 385.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Diwany, p. 637.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Diwany, p. 628.
Working Capital Fund
Diwany, p. 619.

Delegation of FRANCE

Associate Members of Unesco
Delbos, p. 256.
Mauriac, p. 254.
Wahab, pp. 672-673, 674.
Basic Programme
Cain, p. 320.
Mauriac, p. 319.
Sedar Senghor, p. 274.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Cain, pp. 292, 293, 294, 296, 298, 299-301, 302, 303.
Basic programme - education
Abraham, pp. 275, 276, 279, 281, 284.
Sedar Senghor, p. 307.
Basic programme - mass communications
Sedar Senghor, pp. 305, 309.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Abraham, p. 286.
Cain, p. 285.
Basic programme - preamble
Sedar Senghor, pp. 309-310.
Basic programme - relief assistance services
François : p. 306.
Basic programme - social sciences
Cain, pp. 289, 290, 291.
François, pp. 287, 288.
Budget - Supervisory Commission
Guignolet, p. 639.
Budget 1951
Guignolet, pp. 625, 635, 649.
Lacharrière, p. 568.
Sedar Senghor, pp. 322-323, 326, 344, 346.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Joxe, pp. 691, 692, 693.
Closing address
Montel, pp. 244-245.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Jaume, pp. 682, 683, 684.
Lacharrière, p. 218.
Contributions - arrears
Guignolet, pp. 612-613.
Contributions - currency
Guignolet, pp. 615-616, 617, 618.
Contributions - scale 1951
Guignolet, pp. 621, 622, 623.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Brunswick, p. 586.

Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Delbos, pp. 150-152.
Educational, scientific and cultural material - importation - agreement
Semini, p. 459.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Jaume, p. 455.
General Committee
Delbos, p. 651.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Cain, p. 660.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Cain, p. 665.
Lacharrière, p. 662.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Jaume, p. 675.
Le Bras, pp. 676, 677.
Germany - programme 1951
Delbos, p. 472.
Headquarters of Unesco
Brunswick, p. 523.
Guignolet, pp. 642, 644.
Lacharrière, p. 644.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
Lacharrière, p. 645.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Kayser, p. 450.
International Bureau of Education - agreement
Abraham, p. 575.
Montel, p. 587.
International Studies Conference - agreement
Montel, p. 603.
Junior Red Cross
Montel, p. 606.
Member States - reports
Lacharrière, pp. 574, 608.
National Commissions - annual meetings of delegates
Jaume, p. 685.
National Commissions - membership
Lacharrière, pp. 608-609.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Montel, pp. 588, 589.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Lacharrière, pp. 578-579, 581, 592, 593, 602.
Montel, pp. 597, 599, 603.
Non-self-governing territories
Abraham, pp. 399, 442-443.
Wahab, p. 399.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Delbos, pp. 462-463.
Montel, pp. 241, 445.
Programme 1951
Abraham, pp. 314-315.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Brunswick, pp. 516, 517, 518, 519, 550, 551.
Cain, pp. 391, 392, 393, 394, 396, 401, 402, 403, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 412, 414, 415, 416, 417, 419.
Fèbvre, p. 397.
Lacharrière, p. 422.
Sedar Senghor, pp. 491, 493.
Programme 1951 - education
Abraham, pp. 329, 330, 333, 334, 339-340, 341, 347, 348.
Brunswick, pp. 513, 534, 539, 540, 552.
François, pp. 335, 336, 339, 340, 341, 352, 353, 528, 532, 533.
Guignolet, p. 510.
Jaume, pp. 327, 456.
Montel, p. 350.
Sedar Senghor, pp. 336, 339, 347, 480, 482, 483-484.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Abraham, pp. 423, 424, 441.
Brunswick, pp. 499, 551-552.
Guignolet, p. 499.
Programme 1951 - mass communcations
Guignolet, p. 498.
Kayser, pp. 425, 426, 427, 428, 429-430, 431, 432, 434, 553, 554.
Sedar Senghor, pp. 497-498.
Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
Brunswick, p. 542.
Guignolet, p. 509.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Brunswick, pp. 514, 534, 535.
Montel, pp. 354, 356, 359, 363, 366, 368, 373.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Abraham, pp. 438, 439-440, 441.
Brunswick, pp. 501, 521.
Kayser, p. 555.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Aron, p. 382.
Brunswick, p. 539.
Fèbvre, pp. 384, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390.
Le Bras, pp. 377, 378, 379, 382.
Sedar Senghor, p. 488.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Lacharrière, pp. 231, 234, 242-243.
Publications and documents of Unesco
Brunswick, pp. 559-560.
Cain, pp. 558, 559.
Guignolet, p. 502.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Brunswick, p. 522.
Lacharrière, pp. 582-584, 585, 669, 671.
Refugees and displaced persons - Middle East
Brunswick, p. 565.
Lacharrière, p. 564.
Secretariat - common service costs
Brunswick, pp. 542, 543.
Secretariat - external relations service
Lacharrière, pp. 556, 557, 558.
Secretariat - general administration
Guignolet, pp. 505, 506, 544-546.
Secretariat - general policy
Guignolet, pp. 504, 505.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Brunswick, pp. 526, 560, 561.
Guignolet, p. 629.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Guignolet, p. 625.
Specialized Agencies - programmes and budgets
Guignolet, p. 647.

Delegation of GREECE

Basic programme
Photiades, p. 274.
Budget 1951
Photiades, pp. 344, 635.
Contributions - arrears
Photiades pp. 612, 637.
Contributions - currency
Photiades, p. 616.
Contributions - scale 1951
Photiades, pp. 615, 623.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Photiades, pp. 77-79.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Photiades, p. 449.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Photiades, p. 444.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Photiades, p. 425.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Ghikas, p. 362.
Photiades, p. 356.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Photiades, pp. 436, 437.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Photiades, p. 632.

Delegation of GUATEMALA

Basic programme - cultural activities
Martínez Durán, p. 295.
Zambrano, p. 305.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Martínez Durán, pp. 125-126,
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Zambrano, p. 395.

Delegation of HASHEMITE JORDAN

Admission of new Members
Roch, p. 158.

Delegation of HONDURAS

General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Drago, p. 661.

Delegation of HUNGARY

China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Fay, pp. 48, 181-182.
Tolnai, pp. 45, 183.

Delegation of INDIA

Admission of new Members
Majumdar, p. 157.
Basic programme
Majumdar, p. 467.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Khushwant Singh, pp. 294, 295.
Majumdar, p. 300.
Basic Programme - mass communications
Majumdar, p. 304.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Krishnan, p. 284.
Budget 1951
Radhakrishnan, p. 344.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Radhakrishnan, pp. 178-180, 689-690, 692, 693-694.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Radhakrishnan, pp. 651, 653-654.
Contributions - currency
Kirpal, p. 616.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Radhakrishnan, pp. 94-97.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Majumdar, p. 664.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Chand, p. 656.
Non-governmental organizations-relations with Unesco
Chandiramani, pp. 597, 598.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Bhabha, p. 421.
Kirpal, pp. 490, 493.
Majumdar, p. 406.
Radhakrishnan, pp. 394, 395, 400.
Programme 1951 - education
Kirpal, pp. 481, 510, 527.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Bhabha, pp. 423, 424.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Singh, pp. 431, 432-433.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Bhabha, pp. 355-356.
Krishnan, p. 369.
Majumdar, p. 367.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Radhakrishnan, p. 438.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Kirpal, p. 488.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Kirpal, p. 637.
Secretariat-statistical service
Kirpal, p. 504.

Delegation of INDONESIA

Admission of new Members
Hanifah, pp. 159-160.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Soerachman, p. 638.

Delegation of IRAQ

Admission of new Members
Jamali, p. 157.
Basic programme
Jamali, pp. 319, 465.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Jamali, pp. 293, 294, 295, 298, 302.
Basic programme - education
Jamali, pp. 279, 280, 281.

Basic programme - natural sciences
Jamali, p. 286.
Basic programme - social sciences
Jamali, p. 288.
Budget 1951
Jamali, pp. 323, 344.
Closing address
Kadhim, p. 248.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Jamali, p. 653.
Constitution - Article IV, paragraph 9 - amendments
Kadhim, p. 683.
Contributions- currency
Jawad, p. 616.
Contributions - scale 1951
Jawad, p. 622.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Jamali, pp. 90-92.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Jamali, p. 654.
General Conference - rule 22 amendments
Kadhim, p. 660.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Kadhim, p. 664.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Jamali, pp. 450-451.
Jawad, p. 461.
Junior Red Cross
Kadhim, p. 606.
National Commissions - annual meetings of representatives
Kadhim, p. 685.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Kadhim, p. 588.
Non-governmental organizations-relations with Unesco
Kadhim, pp. 592, 596.
Non-self-governing territories
Jamali, pp. 399, 443.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Jamali, pp. 444. 465-466.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Jamali, pp. 401, 405, 420, 421.
Programme 1951 - education
Jamali, pp. 339, 341, 347, 349, 352.
Jawad, p. 482.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Jamali, p. 423.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Jamali, p. 431.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Jamali, pp. 353, 355, 356, 357, 361-362, 364, 368-369, 370, 372.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Jamali, pp. 435, 436, 437-438, 440, 572.
Jawad, pp. 501, 521, 554.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Jamali, pp. 380, 384, 386, 388.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Jamali, p. 344.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Kadhim, p. 670.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Jamali, pp. 221-222, 467-468, 469, 572.
Jawad, pp. 564, 565.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Jawad, p. 637.
Secretariat - organization
Jawad, p. 641.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Jawad, p. 632.

Delegation of ISRAEL

Basic programme - cultural activities
Dushkin, p. 302.
Commemoration tributes, 1950
Kohn, pp. 192-193.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Sambursky, p. 653.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Ginossar, p. 129.
Germany - programme 1951
Kohn, pp. 473, 474.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Sambursky, pp. 404, 517.
Programme 1951 - education
Sambursky, p. 351.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Dushkin, p. 361.
Sambursky, pp. 369, 536.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Kohn, p. 221.
Secretariat - external relations service
Sambursky, p. 556.
Secretariat - general administration
Sambursky, p. 506.

Delegation of ITALY

Basic Programme
Branca, p. 318.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Branca, p. 295.
Vago, p. 303.
Basic programme - educaton
Calò, pp. 277, 278, 279, 281, 307, 308, 348, 349. 350, 352, 353.
Basic programme - mass communications
Mameli, pp. 308, 309.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Fantappié, p. 285.
Basic programme - preamble
Calò, p. 310.
Basic programme - relief assistance services
Calò, p. 306.
Basic programme - social sciences
Vito, pp. 287, 288, 290-291, 292.
Budget 1951
Calò, p. 324.
Severi, pp. 344-345, 346.
Childhood
Montessori, pp. 195-197, 264.
Closing address
Casati, p. 245.
Collection for the benefit of war invalids
Calò, p. 204.

Constitution - Article IV, paragraph 9 - amendments
Clementi, pp. 681, 684.
Contributions - scale 1951
Clementi, pp. 621, 623.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Gonella, pp. 77-82.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Napolitano, p. 458.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Mameli, pp. 654-655.
General Committee - establishment
Gonella, p. 651.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Pilotti, p. 677.
National Commissions - annual meetings of representatives
Clementi, pp. 681, 684.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Ago, pp. 578, 591-592.
Opening address
Einaudi, p. 42.
Fabiani, pp. 43-44.
Gonella, pp. 42-43.
Programme 1951.
Calò, p. 315.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Ciasca, pp. 400, 403-404.
Castelli, pp. 391, 392.
Fantappié, pp. 517, 519, 520.
Maggiora, p. 408.
Mameli, p. 222.
Pilotti, pp. 406, 407, 409-410, 411, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419.
Sapori, pp. 392, 393.
Programme 1951 - education
Branca, pp. 327, 328.
Calò, pp. 329, 330, 331, 333, 336, 337, 338, 348, 349, 350, 352, 353.
Fantappié, pp. 482, 534.
Fossi, pp. 455-456.
Vito, pp. 354-355.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Vedovato, p. 423.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Napolitano, p. 429.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Colonnetti, pp. 365, 390.
Fantappié, pp. 486, 515, 535.
Severi, pp. 362, 363, 365, 366, 367, 373, 374.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Fantappié, pp. 521, 565.
Mameli, pp. 440, 441.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Fantappié, p. 488.
Gini, p. 377.
Vito, pp. 378-379, 380, 385.
Programmes and Budgets - methods of discussion
Fantappié, p. 508.
Publications and documents of Unesco
Sapori, p. 503.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Pilotti, pp. 669, 679.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Fantappié, p. 565.
Secretariat - external relations service
Fantappié, p. 556.

Delegation of KOREA

Admission of new Members
Hang Gong, p. 160.

Delegation of LEBANON

Basic programme - cultural activities
Maroun, p. 296.
Basic programme - education
Maroun, pp. 281-282.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Khoury, pp. 691, 692, 695.
Constitution - Article IV, paragraph 9 - amendments
Mahmassani, p. 681.
Contributions - currency
Mahmassani, p. 616.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Maroun, pp. 92-94.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Mahmassani, p. 660.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Mahmassani, p. 671.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Mahmassani, p. 664.
Non-self-governing territories
Maroun, p. 443.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Maroun, pp. 394-395, 420.
Programme 1951 - education
Maroun, pp. 348, 350.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Maroun, p. 437.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Maroun, p. 378.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Mahmassani, p. 679.
Technical assistance
Khoury, pp. 311-312.

Delegation of LIBERIA

Basic programme
Massaquoi, p. 317.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Massaquoi, pp. 299, 393.
Basic programme - education
Massaquoi, p. 275.
Basic programme - mass communicatons
Massaquoi, pp. 304-305, 308.
Basic programme - social sciences
Massaquoi, pp. 291-292.
Budget 1951
Massaquoi, pp. 322, 346,

Executive Board - members - election 1950
Sommaruga, p. 655.
Programme 1951 - education
Massaquoi, pp. 279, 334.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Massaquoi, p. 423.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Massaquoi, p. 372.
Technical assistance
Massaquoi, p. 312.

Delegation of MEXICO

Basic programme - cultural activities
Castro Leal, pp. 294, 296.
Basic programme - preamble
Castro Leal, pp. 318-319.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Castro Leal, p. 653.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Icaza, p. 683.
Constitution - scale 1951
Caso, p. 622.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Castro Leal, pp. 120-122.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Gorostiza, p. 458.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Castro Leal, p. 655.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Castro Leal, pp. 217-218, 523, 661, 663, 665.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Gorostiza, p. 445.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Gorostiza, pp. 412, 442.
Icaza, p. 413.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Gorostiza, pp. 435, 436.
Secretariat - external relations service
Castro Leal, p. 556.

Delegation of MONACO

Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Rueff, pp. 163-166.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Bocca, p. 409.

Delegation of the NETHERLANDS

Admission of new Members
Rutten, p. 157.
Budget 1951
Bender, p. 635.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Kruyt, p. 653.
Contributions - currency
Bender, p. 616.
Contributions - scale 1951
Bender, p. 622.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Rutten, pp. 82-84.
Germany - programme 1951
Kruyt, p. 472.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
Bender, p. 645.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Kruyt, pp. 578, 601, 603.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Poelhekke, pp. 400, 401, 407, 410.
Verhoeven, pp. 414, 415.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Verhoeven, pp. 422-423.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Verhoeven, p. 434.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Kruyt, pp. 356, 365, 366-367.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Verhoeven, pp. 387, 389.
Secretariat - organization
Bender, p. 638.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Bender, p. 629.
Technical assistance
Kruyt, p. 311.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Kruyt, p. 600.

Delegation of NEW ZEALAND

Basic programme
Beaglehole, pp. 274, 319.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Beaglehole, pp. 293, 294, 301, 302.
Basic programme - education
Beaglehole, pp. 277, 278, 283.
Basic programme - mass communications
Beaglehole, pp. 304, 308-309.
Basic programme - social sciences
Beaglehole, pp. 287, 288.
Budget 1951
Beeby, pp. 237, 345.
Mason, pp. 624-625, 635, 647.
Constitution - Article IV - Paragraph 9 - amendments
Beaglehole, p. 683.
Contribution - currency
Mason, p. 617.
Cultural agreements and Conventions
Beaglehole, p. 586.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Beeby, pp. 137-140.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Beeby, p. 654.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Beaglehole, pp. 675, 676, 685, 686.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Beaglehole, p. 656.
Headquarters of Unesco
Mason, p. 644.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Beaglehole, p. 461.

Member States - periodic reports
Beaglehole, p. 574.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Beeby, pp. 445, 465.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Beaglehole, pp. 393, 395, 404, 407.
Beeby, p. 402.
Programme 1951 - education
Beaglehole, pp. 347, 348.
Beeby, p. 340.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Beaglehole, pp. 373, 374, 375.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Beeby, pp. 232, 233, 237.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Beaglehole, pp. 582, 668.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Mason, p. 632.

Delegation of NORWAY

Basic programme - education
Mohr, pp. 280-281.
Budget 1951
Gleditsch, pp. 345-346.
Sommerfelt, p. 635.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Mohr, p. 119.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Gleditsch, p. 661.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Sommerfelt, p. 656.
Germany - programme 1951
Nansen, pp. 471-472.
International understanding - duties of the State
Sommelfelt, pp. 238-239.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Mohr, p. 416.
Sommerfelt, p. 393.
Programme 1951 - education
Mohr, p. 351.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Sommerfelt, p. 371.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Mohr, p. 438.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Sommerfelt, pp. 379, 388.
Secretariat - organization
Sommerfelt, pp. 638, 641.

Delegation of PAKISTAN

Admission of new Members
Hasan, p. 158.
Basic programme - education
Siddiqui, pp. 278, 279, 283.
Basic programme - social sciences
Siddiqui, p. 291.
Commemoration tributes 1950
Hasan, pp. 256-257.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Hasan, p. 101.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Hasan, p. 459.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Hasan, p. 410.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Siddiqui, pp. 356, 357, 369.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Siddiqui, pp. 436-437.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership
Ghani, p. 637.

Delegation of PERSIA

Basic programme - education
Sadighi, pp. 280, 282.
Basic programme - social sciences
Sadighi, p. 289.
Closing address
Hekmat, p. 246.
Commemoration tributes 1950
Hekmat, pp. 191-192.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Hekmat, pp. 103-105.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Hekmat, pp. 188-189, 655.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Hekmat, p. 656.
Non-governmental organizations - grants-in-aid 1951
Sadighi, pp. 399-400.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Sadighi, pp. 409, 410.
Programme 1951 - education
Sadighi, p. 352.

Delegation of PERU

General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Calderón, p. 661.

Delegation of PHILIPPINES

Admission of new Members
Sebastián, p. 157.
Associate Members of Unesco
Sebastián, p. 672.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Pecson, p. 295.
Basic programme - education
Pecson, pp. 275-276, 281, 282.
Basic programme - social sciences
Pecson, p. 291.
Budget 1951
Flores, p. 346.
Putong, p. 649.
Closing address
Pecson, pp. 246-247.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendements
Sebastián, p. 683.
Contributions - arrears
Putong, p. 611.
Contributions - scale 1951
Putong, pp. 620, 623.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Sebastián, pp. 152-155.

Executive Board - members - election 1950
Sebastián, p. 655.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Flores, pp. 454-455.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Sebastián, p. 675.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendements
Sebastián, p. 663.
Japan - programme 1951
Flores, p. 476.
Sebastián, p. 468.
Junior Red Cross
Putong, p. 606.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Pecson, pp. 393, 394, 401, 418.

Delegation of SALVADOR

Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Barón Castro, p. 682.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Barón Castro, p. 654.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Barón Castro, p. 391.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Barón Castro, p. 381.

Delegation of SWEDEN

Basic programme - cultural activities
Düring, p. 295.
Contributions - currency
Garde-Widemar, p. 618.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Düring, pp. 117-119.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Düring, pp. 215-216, 661, 664.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Düring, pp. 444-445.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Düring, pp. 405, 414, 415, 418-419.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Düring, pp. 370-371, 372.

Delegation of SWITZERLAND

Basic programme
Piaget, p. 319.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Bourgeois, pp. 298-299, 300, 301, 302, 303.
Piaget, pp. 296, 297.
Basic programme - education
Piaget, pp. 275, 276, 277, 280, 281, 282, 284, 308.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Piaget, p. 286.
Basic programme - preamble
Piaget, p. 309.
Basic programme - relief assistance services
Bourgeois, p. 306.
Piaget, pp. 435, 438, 439.
Basic programme - social sciences
Piaget, pp. 287-288, 291.
Budget 1951
Piaget, pp. 322, 324, 326, 345.
Contributions - scale 1951
Oprecht, p. 620.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Piaget, pp. 84-86.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Bolla, p. 664.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Piaget, pp. 211, 656.
Germany - programme 1951
Oprecht, p. 473.
Human Rights - covenant (draft)
Piaget, p. 452.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Piaget, pp. 448-449, 461.
International Bureau of Education - agreement (draft)
Bolla, p. 575.
Non-governmental Organizations - agreements
Muralt, p. 209.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Muralt, pp. 579, 591, 593, 595, 596-597, 599.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Piaget, p. 466.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Bolla, pp. 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419.
Piaget, pp. 395, 400, 401, 421.
Programme 1951 - education
Piaget, pp. 327, 328, 338-339, 340, 341, 347, 350, 351, 353.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Muralt, p. 429.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Muralt, pp. 365, 367.
Piaget, pp. 371, 372.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Piaget, pp. 223, 377, 379, 385, 386, 388.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Piaget, pp. 448-449.

Delegation of THAILAND

Basic programme - cultural activities
Jumsai, pp. 296, 297-298, 303.
Basic programme -education
Jumsai, pp. 280, 281.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Sastrabuddhi, pp. 162-163.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Jumsai, p. 656.
Programme 1951 - education
Jumsai, p. 339.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Jumsai, p. 422.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Jumsai, p. 426.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Jumsai, p. 361.

Delegation of TURKEY

Contributions - scale 1951
Tecer, p. 622.

Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Baydur, pp. 97-98.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Saglam, p. 661.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Saglam, p. 421.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Akverdi, p. 361.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Akverdi, p. 381.

Delegation of UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Basic programme
Stewart, p. 317.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Stewart, pp. 293, 295.
Budget 1951
Hewitson, p. 346.
Stewart, p. 322.
Villiers, pp. 635, 647-648, 648-649.
Constitution - Article V - amendments
Hewitson, p. 659.
Contributions - arrears
Villiers, pp. 611, 613.
Contributions - currency
Villiers, p. 617.
Contributions - scale 1951
Villiers, p. 621.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Bosman, p. 166.
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials - importation - agreement
Stewart, p. 459.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Hewitson, p. 663.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Villiers, p. 677.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Hewitson, p. 599.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Bosman, p. 393.
Programme 1951 - education
Stewart, p. 339.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Stewart, p. 369.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Stewart, p. 384.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Villiers, p. 231.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Villiers, p. 631.

Delegation of UNITED KINGDOM

Associate Members of Unesco
Hardman, pp. 254, 256.
Ollennu, p. 674.
Ward, p. 672.
Basic programme
Hardman, pp. 316, 318, 319-320.
Huxley p, 274.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Huxley, pp. 293, 294.
Thomson, pp. 292, 294, 296, 299, 301, 302.
Basic programme - education
Adam, p. 307.
Charlesworth, p. 307.
Parkinson, p. 275.
Thomson, p. 280.
Basic programme - exchange of persons
Adam, p. 304.
Basic programme - mass communications
Moorehead, p. 305.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Huxley, pp. 284, 285, 286-287.
Basic programme - preamble
Huxley, p. 310.
Basic programme - relief assistance services
Thomson, p. 306.
Basic programme - social sciences
Huxley, pp. 288, 289, 290, 291.
Budget 1951
Cowell, p. 568.
French, pp. 634, 635.
Hardman, pp. 324, 326, 345.
Thomas, p. 649.
Budget 1951 - appropriations
Adam, p. 563.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Hardman, pp. 690, 692.
Commissions and Committees - officers - election
Hardman, pp. 651, 653.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Cowell, p. 683.
Contributions - arrears
French, pp. 611, 612.
Contributions - currency
French, pp. 618, 622, 641.
Contributions - scale 1951
French, pp. 615, 622, 623.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Cowell, p. 605.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Hardman, pp. 133-137.
Documents and publications of Unesco
Adam, pp. 503, 559.
Cowell, pp. 452-453.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Ashford, pp. 223-224, 458.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Thomas, p. 655.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Cowell, pp. 454.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Huxley, p. 660.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Huxley, pp. 658, 660, 661, 664-665.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Cowell, pp. 671, 675, 677, 685-686.
Germany - programme 1951
Cowell, p. 474.

Headquarters of Unesco
Adam, pp. 522-523.
French, pp. 642, 643, 644.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
French, p. 644.
Honorary Councillors of Unesco
Adam, p. 244.
Human Rights - covenant (draft)
Thomson, p. 452.
International Studies Conference - agreement
Thomson, p. 603.
Junior Red Cross
Cowell, p. 606.
Member States - periodic reports
Cowell, p. 574.
Webster, p. 590.
National Commissions - annual meetings of delegates
Cowell, pp. 684-685.
National Commissions - membership
Cowell, p. 607.
National Commissions - recommendations of Member States
Thomson, p. 604.
Webster, pp. 587, 589.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Cowell, pp. 578, 579, 607.
Thomson, pp. 602, 603.
Webster, pp. 592, 594, 595, 596, 598, 599.
Non-self-governing territories
Ward, p. 443.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Thomson, pp. 445, 446.
Programme 1951
Huxley, p. 314.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Adam, pp. 489-490, 490-491, 492-493, 494, 517, 518, 551.
Cowell, p. 570.
Syme, pp. 391, 392, 394, 395, 396, 403, 404, 405, 406, 408-409, 415.
Thomson, pp. 401-402, 403, 416, 417, 418, 419-420.
Webster, pp. 397, 401.
Programme 1951 - education
Adam, pp. 331, 333, 479, 480, 483, 512, 527, 528, 529, 530, 532, 533-534, 539, 540.
Armfelt, pp. 348, 349-350, 351.
Charlesworth, pp. 327, 335-336, 338-339, 340, 341-342.
Cowell, pp. 456, 568, 569, 572.
Huxley, pp. 328, 329.
Ward, p. 441.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Adam, p. 499.
Thomson, pp. 422, 424-425.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Adam, pp. 495, 496, 497, 498, 520.
Moorehead, pp. 426, 427, 430.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Adam, pp. 485, 534, 535.
Cowell, p. 570.
Huxley, pp. 361, 362, 364, 365.
Thomson, pp. 355, 368, 372, 374.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Adam, pp. 500, 501, 521, 554-555.
Ward, p. 435.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Adam, pp. 487, 516, 538, 539.
Webster, pp. 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 382, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389-390.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Thomas, pp. 229, 232-233, 237.
Programmes and budget - methods of discussion
Adam, pp. 509, 526, 541, 542.
Cowell, p. 455.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Adam, p. 522.
Cowell, pp. 583, 585, 667, 680.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Adam, pp. 564, 565.
Secretariat - external relations service
Adam, pp. 556-557.
Cowell, pp. 571-572.
Secretariat - general administration
Adam, pp. 505, 506, 545.
Secretariat - general policy
Adam, p. 524.
Secretariat - organization
French, pp. 638, 641.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Adam, p. 561.
French, pp. 629, 630, 631, 633.
Thomas, p. 646.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
French, pp. 627, 628.
Technical assistance
Ward, p. 311.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Webster, p. 600.

Delegation of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Budget - Supervisory Commission
Roseman, p. 639.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Sargeant, pp. 689, 693.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Brunauer, pp. 658, 681, 683-684.
Contributions - arrears
Roseman, pp. 610-611, 612, 646.
Contributions - currency
Roseman, p. 617.
Contributions - scale 1951
Roseman, pp. 620-621, 622-623.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Sargeant, pp. 108-113.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Taylor, pp. 458-459.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Sargeant, p. 654.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Brunauer, p. 660.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Brunauer, pp. 663-664.

General Conference - rules - interpretation
Brunauer, pp. 675, 677.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Compton, p. 657.
Germany - programme 1951
Sargeant, p. 471.
Zook, pp. 473-474.
Headquarters of Unesco
Laise, pp. 522, 523.
Roseman, p. 643.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations
Roseman, p. 645.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Hochwalt, pp. 447, 461-462.
Zook, pp. 447-448, 451.
International Bureau of Education - agreement
Abraham, p. 587.
Mulliken, p. 575.
International Committee of Weights and Measures - agreement
Mulliken, p. 576.
Japan - programme 1951
Stoddard, pp. 476, 477.
Junior Red Cross
Howell, p. 606.
Member States - periodic reports
Abraham, p. 589.
Mulliken, pp. 573, 574, 604.
National Commissions - annual meetings of representatives
Brunauer, p. 685.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Abraham, pp. 588, 589.
Howell, p. 587.
Mulliken, p. 604.
Non-governmental organizations - agreements
Mulliken, p. 209.
Non-governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Mulliken, pp. 209, 578, 590-591, 592, 593-594, 595, 602-603, 606, 607-608.
Non-self-governing territories
Odegaard, p. 398.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Hochwalt, p. 445.
Sargeant, pp. 240, 463-464, 466.
Zook, p. 446.
Programme 1951
Stoddard, p. 314.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Baxter, pp. 402-403.
Laise, pp. 516-517, 519, 546, 547, 550.
Odegaard, pp. 392-393, 393-394, 400.
Roseman, pp. 489, 490, 491, 492, 493.
Russell, pp. 404, 406, 407, 408, 410, 411.
Stoddard, pp. 415, 416.
Programme 1951 - education
Baxter, pp. 335, 336, 338, 340.
Laise, pp. 528-529, 530, 533, 539, 540.
Roseman, pp. 479, 481, 482, 483, 484, 510, 511-512.
Stoddard, pp. 328, 331.
Zook, pp. 326, 327-328, 330, 331, 341, 348, 349, 353, 568.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Baxter, p. 423.
Zook, pp. 424, 467.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Laise, pp. 553-554.
Loy, p. 433.
Pearson, p. 431.
Roseman, pp. 495, 496, 497.
Taylor, pp. 426, 427, 429, 434.
Zook, pp. 425, 429.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Laise, pp. 535, 537.
Marshall, p. 515.
Rabi, pp. 355, 356, 357-358, 360, 364-365, 367, 369, 370, 372, 374.
Roseman, pp. 485, 486.
Starkman, p. 353.
Zook, p. 568.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Laise, p. 521.
Roseman, pp. 500, 501.
Zook, pp. 435, 437, 438, 439, 440, 568.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Herring, pp. 379, 382, 384, 389, 390.
Laise, p. 539.
Marshall, p. 515.
Roseman, pp. 487, 488.
Programme 1951 - special projects
Benton, pp. 342-343.
Sargeant, pp. 229-230, 233, 235-236.
Zook, pp. 447-448.
Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
Laise, p. 525.
Roseman, pp. 508, 509, 541.
Publications and documents of Unesco
Laise, pp. 559, 560.
Roseman, p. 502.
Zook, p. 453.
Recommendations to Member States and International Conventions
Brunauer, pp. 668, 680.
Mulliken, pp. 582, 584, 585.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Laise, p. 469.
Secretariat - external relations service
Laise, pp. 507, 555-556, 558, 571.
Roseman, p. 503.
Secretariat - common service costs
Laise, p. 543.
Secretariat - general administration
Laise, p. 505.
Secretariat - general policy
Roseman, p. 504.
Secretariat - organization
Roseman, pp. 638, 641.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Laise, pp. 525, 567.
Roseman, pp. 510, 629, 630, 631, 632, 646.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Roseman, pp. 626, 627, 646.
Secretariat - statistical service
Laise, p. 530.
Roseman, p. 504.

Specialized Agencies - programmes and budgets
Mulliken, pp. 601, 605.
Statement of methods
Stoddard, p. 311.
United Nations Joint Staff Pension Scheme
Roseman, p. 646.
Working Capital Fund
Roseman, pp. 619-620.

Delegation of URUGUAY

Basic programme
Giambruno, p. 316.
Basic programme - social sciences
Giambruno, p. 289.
Budget - Supervisory Commission
Rodriguez, p. 639.
Contributions - currency
Rodriguez, pp. 618, 642.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Giambruno, pp. 89-90.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Barcia, p. 663.
General Conference, 6th Session - Budget Committee
Giambruno, p. 656.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Giordano, pp. 391, 395, 413.

Delegation of VENEZUELA

Basic programme - education
Plaza, pp. 275, 276.
Budget - Supervisory Commission
Parra Perez, p. 638.
Contributions - currency
Parra Perez, p. 617.
Cuzco - destruction
Parra Perez, p. 115.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Parra Perez, pp. 113-115.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Zerega Fombona, p. 655.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Zerega Fombona, p. 660.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Plaza, p. 451.
Programme 1951 - education
Arvelo Torrealba, p. 332.
Plaza, p. 336
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Arvelo Torrealba, p. 432.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Arvelo Torrealba, pp. 361, 363.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Plaza, p. 435.
Secretariat-geographical distribution of membership
Parra Perez, p. 638.

Delegation of YUGOSLAVIA

Admission of new Members
Uvalič, p. 157.
Basic programme
Ribnikar, p. 319.
Basic programme - cultural activities
Bogdanovič, pp. 300, 302.
Basic programme - mass communications
Bogdanovič, pp. 304, 305, 309.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Uvalič, pp. 284, 285.
Basic programme - preamble
Bogdanovič, p. 311.
Basic programme - relief assistance services
Marič, p. 306.
Basic programme - social sciences
Uvalič, pp. 288, 290, 291.
China - representation to the General Conference, 5th Session
Bogdanovič, pp. 687, 690.
Ribnikar, pp. 177-178, 692, 693, 694.
Constitution - Article IV, Paragraph 9 - amendments
Kušej, p. 683.
Contributions - currency
Kušej, p. 616.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Kušej, p. 686.
Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
Ribnikar, pp. 220-221.
Executive Board - members - election 1950
Bogdanovič, p. 190.
Ribnikar, p. 220.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Kušej, pp. 659, 660.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Kušej, p. 665.
Germany - programme 1951
Sarajčič, p. 473.
Ideologies
Ribnikar, p. 220.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Bogdanovič, pp. 444, 462, 464.
Programme 1951
Ribnikar, pp. 220-221.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Bogdanovič, pp. 403, 404, 407.
Uvalič, pp. 415, 417.
Programme 1951 - education
Bogdanovič, pp. 340, 341.
Ribnikar, p. 332.
Uvalič, p. 350.
Programme 1951 - mass communications
Joka, p. 429.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Marič, p. 375.
Uvalič, p. 358.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Marič, pp. 383, 384, 386, 387.
Uvalič, pp. 381, 382.

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER STATES

Allied High Commission for GERMANY

Germany - programme 1951
Marshall, representative of U.K., p. 471.
Reed, representative of U.S.A., p. 471.
Schmitlein, representative of France, p. 471.

Supreme Commander for the Allied POWERS

Japan - Programme 1951
Bunce, pp. 475-476

VATICAN

Basic programme - education
Borgongini-Duca, p. 27.
Religion in education
Borgongini-Duca, pp. 225-226.

REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS

Basic rogramme - social sciences
Laugier, p. 289.
Human Rghts - Universal Declaration
Durán, p. 451.
Non-Governmental Organizations - grants-in-aid 1951
Durán, p. 399.
Opening speech
Laugier, pp. 52-55.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized agencies
Durán, p. 240.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Durán, pp. 366, 370.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Durán, pp. 377-378, 389.

REPRESENTATIVES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Director-General - report on the activities of the Organization
International Labour Organisation (*Gallone*), pp. 126-128.
Opening speech
World Health Organization (Grzegorzewski), p. 56.
Programme 1951 - education
World Health Organization (*Montus*), p. 336.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
World Health Organization (*Montus*), p. 356.

REPRESENTATIVES OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

International Bureau of Education - agreement
International Bureau of Education (*Piaget*), pp. 575-576, 587.
Programme 1951 - education
International Bureau of Education (*Rossello*), p. 326.

OBSERVERS OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Commissions - recommendation of representatives
World Federation of United Nations Associations (*Ennals*), p. 604.
Non-governmental Organizations - recommendation of representatives
Conference of observers of Non-governmental Organizations (*Ennals*), pp. 580-582.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
World Federation of United Nations Associations (*Ennals*), pp. 594, 595.
Programme 1951 - education
World Federation of United Nations Associations (*Ennals*), p. 352.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
World Students Relief (*Smith*), pp. 423-424.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (*Ennals*), p. 601
(*Lowrie*), p. 600.
World Federation of United Nations Associations
World Federation of United Nations Associations (*Ennals*), p. 603.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Admission of new members
Maud, p. 156.
Agenda of the Conference
Maud, p. 49.
Auditors report 1949
Walker, p. 670.
Basic programme
Maud, p. 273.

Basic programme - education
Maud, p. 279.
Budget 1950 - currency devaluation
Evans, p. 562.
Budget 1951
Maud, pp. 324-325, 346.
Contributions - arrears
Walker, pp. 611-612, 613.
Director-General - report on the activities of the organization
Maud, pp. 58-62.
General Conference - 6th session - seat
Maud, pp. 189-190.
Germany - programme 1951
Maud, pp. 470-471, 475.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Verniers, p. 448.
International Bureau of Education - agreement
Sommerfelt, p. 575.
Japan - programme 1951
Maud, p. 477.
Non-governmental Organizations - observers to the General Conference, 5th session
Maud, p. 57.
Non-governmental Organizations - relations with Unesco
Sommerfelt, p. 577.
Non-self govenring territories
Maud, p. 399.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies
Maud, pp. 443-444, 466,
Programme 1951
Maud, pp. 312-313.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Evans, pp. 518-519, 550.
Maud, pp. 392, 402, 408, 409, 410, 411, 413, 414, 417, 418, 420-421.
Radhakrishnan, pp. 406, 408.
Programme 1951 - education
Evans, pp. 529, 530, 540.
Maud, pp. 329, 330, 331, 332, 335, 336, 337, 338, 341, 347-348, 349, 350, 352-353, 354, 483, 570.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Maud, pp. 423, 424.
Programme 1951 - mass communication
Maud, pp. 426, 427, 428-429, 431, 432, 433-434.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Maud, pp. 354, 355, 362, 365, 366, 370, 371, 375-376, 390, 485, 572.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Maud, pp. 436, 438, 439, 440, 572.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Evans, p. 539.
Maud, pp. 376, 377, 379, 380, 387.
Photiades, p. 386.
Programmes and budgets - method of discussion
Evans, pp. 525, 542.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Maud, p. 468.
Secretariat - External Relations Service
Maud, p. 572.
Secretariat - general administration
Evans, p. 545.
Secretariat - general policy
Evans, p. 544.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances
Evans, p. 526.
Statement of methods
Maud, p. 310.
Technical assistance
Maud, p. 311.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL (*J. Torres-Bodet*)

Associate Members of Unesco, p. 256.
Basic programme, pp. 274, 317, 318, 320, 466.
Basic programme - cultural activities, pp. 292, 293, 294, 295, 298, 299, 301, 302.
Basic programme - education, pp. 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 284.
Basic programme - mass communications, pp. 304, 309.
Basic programme - natural sciences, pp. 285, 286, 287.
Basic programme - preamble, p. 310.
Basic programme - relief assistance services, pp. 305, 306.
Basic programme - social sciences, pp. 287, 288, 289, 291.
Budget 1951, pp. 313, 314, 321, 324, 633.
Closing speech, p. 242.
Commemoration tributes 1950, p. 267.
Constitution - Article IV, paragraph 9 - amendments, pp. 681, 682.
Cuzco destruction, p. 115.
Director-General - report on the activities of the organization, p. 168.
Educational, scientific and cultural material - importation - agreement, p. 224.
General Conference, 7th session - seat, p. 267.
Germany - programme 1951, p. 475.
Honorary Councillors of Unesco - nomination of Dr. Laves, p. 244.
Non-governmental organizations - grants-in-aid in 1951, p. 399.
Opening speech, p. 62.
Peace through the United Nations and Specialized Agencies, p. 445.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities, pp. 222, 392, 394, 396, 401, 403, 407, 410, 414, 416, 417, 419, 420, 421, 442.
Programme 1951 - education, pp. 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 336, 338, 339, 340, 341, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353.
Programme 1951 - mass communications, pp. 425, 427, 429, 430, 431, 433, 434, 441.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences, pp. 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 366, 367, 369, 371, 373, 374, 375, 390.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services, p. 430.
Programme 1951 - social sciences, pp. 223, 379, 381, 383, 384, 385, 387.
Programme 1951 - special project, p. 333.
Secretariat - organization, pp. 639, 640.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances, pp. 227, 263.
Submission of resignation, pp. 197, 445.
Technical assistance, p. 311.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL (*W. H. C. Laves*)

Budget 1951, p. 568.
Contributions - arrears, pp. 610, 611, 612, 613, 636, 647.
Contributions - currency, p. 619.
Contributions - scale 1951, pp. 620, 623.
Headquarters of Unesco, pp. 642, 643.
Headquarters of Unesco - facilities granted to Member States and International Organizations, pp. 644, 645.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration, p. 448.
Programme 1951 - education, pp. 479, 480, 481.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services, p. 568.
Programme 1951 - special projects, p. 448.
Secretariat - geographical distribution of membership, p. 638.
Secretariat organization, p. 638.
Secretariat - salaries and allowances, pp. 628, 630, 631, 646.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations, pp. 627, 628, 646.
Specialized Agencies - programmes and budgets, p. 624.

MEMBERS OF SECRETARIAT

Associate Members of Unesco
Saba, pp. 673, 674.
Auditors - report 1949
Harper-Smith, p. 610.
Basic programmes - cultural activities
Thomas, pp. 293, 294, 297, 301, 303.
Basic programme - education
Elvin, p. 277.
Guiton, p. 281.
Basic programme - exchange of persons
Carter, W., p. 304.
Basic programme - natural sciences
Auger, p. 285.
Basic programme - social sciences
Angell, pp. 288, 290.
Budget 1950 - currency devaluation
Weitz, pp. 561, 562.
Budget 1951 - appropriations
Weitz, p. 563.
China - representation tho the General Conference, 5th session
Saba, p. 694.
Contributions - currency
Harper-Smith, pp. 615, 617, 618, 619, 642.
Contributions - scale 1951
Harper-Smith, pp. 615, 620, 621.
Cultural agreements and conventions
Blonay, pp. 586, 605.
Garcin, pp. 585, 605.
Educational, scientific and cultural materials - importation - agreement
Behrstock, p. 460.
Schneider, p. 460.
Friendship Flag and Postage Stamp
Elvin, p. 454.
General Conference - rule 22 - amendments
Saba, p. 659.
General Conference - rules 52, 55 - amendments
Delavenay, p. 523.
Montagnier, p. 523.
Saba, p. 658.
General Conference - rules 95, 96, 97 - amendments
Saba, p. 659.
General Conference - rules - interpretation
Saba, pp. 676, 677.
Germany - programme 1951
Thompson, p. 475.
Headquarters of Unesco
Almeida, p. 622.
Montagnier, p. 622.
Human Rights - covenant (draft)
Saba, p. 452.
Human Rights - Universal Declaration
Schneider, p. 462.
Weitz, p. 567.
International Bureau of Education - agreement
Blonay, pp. 575, 587.
International Committee on Weights and Measures - agreement
Blonay, p. 476.
Japan - programme 1951
Blonay, p. 477.
Member States - periodic reports
Blonay, pp. 573, 574.
Dard, p. 604.
Montagnier, p. 259.
National Commissions - recommendations of representatives
Blonay, pp. 587, 589, 604.
Non governmental organizations - relations with Unesco
Auger, p. 598.
Blonay, pp. 579, 581, 593, 595, 597, 599, 602, 607.
Non-self-governing territories
Berkeley, p. 574.
Blonay, p. 605.
Elvin, p. 398.
Organization of American States - agreement
Blonay, p. 576.
Programme 1951 - cultural activities
Carter, pp. 417, 493.
Delavenay, p. 406.
Thomas, pp. 391, 392, 395, 402, 403, 405, 406, 414 415, 416, 418, 419, 442, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 516, 517, 519, 520, 546, 547, 549, 550, 551, 570.
Weitz, pp. 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 512, 518, 547, 550, 551.
Programme 1951 - education
Bowers, p. 483.
Elvin, pp. 326, 327, 328, 329, 334, 347, 349, 350, 351, 479, 480, 483, 484, 511, 527, 528, 529, 532, 533, 539, 540, 569, 570.
Guiton, pp. 327, 341, 481, 482, 484, 513, 527, 529, 530, 532, 533, 540, 552.

Liu, pp. 529, 530.
Thomas, p. 456.
Weitz, pp. 479, 480, 482, 512, 513, 526, 530, 533, 534, 537, 567, 570, 572.
Programme 1951 - exchange of persons
Behrstock, p. 460.
Carter, pp. 425, 499, 551, 552.
Schneider, p. 460.
Weitz, p. 552.
Programme 1951- mass communications
Behrstock, p. 497.
Desjardins, p. 496.
Schneider, pp. 495, 496, 497, 498, 521, 553, 554, 571.
Weitz, pp. 495, 497, 498, 521, 553.
Programme 1951 - natural sciences
Auger, pp. 353, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 372, 373, 374, 376, 485, 487, 514, 515, 534, 536, 537.
Schneider, p. 374.
Weitz, pp. 485, 486, 514, 534, 536, 537, 567.
Programme 1951 - relief assistance services
Barger, pp. 554, 555.
Drzewieski, pp. 435, 437, 439, 440, 500, 501, 554, 555.
Weitz, pp. 500, 555, 571.
Programme 1951 - social sciences
Angell, pp. 377, 378, 379, 381, 382, 385, 386, 387, 389, 487, 488, 489, 515, 516, 537, 538, 539.
Liu, p. 376.
Sharp, pp. 516, 538, 539.
Weitz, pp. 488, 489, 515, 538, 539.
Programmes and budgets - methods of discussion
Montagnier, p. 525.
Weitz, pp. 525, 542.
Publications and documents of Unesco
Delavenay, pp. 502, 503, 558, 559, 560.
Weitz, pp. 502, 503, 563.
Recommendation to Member States and International Conventions
Blonay, p. 584.
Saba, pp. 582, 583, 584, 585, 668, 670, 671, 678, 679, 680.
Refugees and displaced persons - Near and Middle East
Weitz, pp. 564, 565.
Secretariat - common service costs
Weitz, pp. 507, 542, 543, 572.
Secretariat - external relations service
Blonay, p. 507.
Saba, pp. 503, 522, 548.
Thompson, p. 557.
Weitz, pp. 503, 556, 557, 558, 571.
Secretariat - general administration
Harper-Smith, p. 506.
Leguen, p. 545.
Pym, pp. 506, 507.
Weitz, pp. 505, 506, 544, 546.
Secretariat - general policy
Leguen, pp. 504, 505, 544.
Weitz, pp. 504, 544.
Secretariat - Medical Benefit Scheme
Harper-Smith, p. 633.
Pym, p. 633.
Secretariat - privileges and immunities
Weitz, p. 633.
Secretariat-salaries and allowances
Weitz, pp. 525, 526, 560, 561, 567, 630, 632.
Secretariat - staff rules and regulations
Pym, p. 625.
Weitz, pp. 625, 626, 628.
Secretariat - statistical services
Liu, pp. 529, 530.
Weitz, pp. 504, 530.
Specialized Agencies
Montagnier, p. 255.
Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction
Barger, p. 600.
Blonay, p. 601.
Drzewieski, p. 601.
Working Capital Fund
Harper-Smith, p. 619.

Printed in Belgium

Printed in Belgium