

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S. G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

Cons.Exec/4e Sess/SF/1  
MEXICO CITY - 1 November 1947

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Record of the First Meeting held on Saturday 1 November 1947 at 11.00 a.m. at the Escuela Nacional des Maestros, at Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairmen: Professor P. AUGER (France) (Acting Chairman)  
H. E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members: Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER (United States)  
Professor H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P. R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies: Dr. H. F. El DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H. E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey.  
H. E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H. E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ.  
H. E. Mr. S. D. PIERCE (Canada) Deputy for  
M. Victor DORÉ.  
H. E. Mr. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey) Deputy for  
Mr. Resat Nuri GUNTEKIN.  
Mr. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland) Deputy for  
Professor M. FALSKI.

Observers: United Nations  
M. METRAUX

Item 1 of the Provisional Agenda : Opening of the Session

Professor AUGER took the chair and, in the absence of Dr. Martinez Baez and the Director-General, who were visiting the President of Mexico, welcomed the delegates to the American Continent and observed that thirteen members of the Executive Board had been able to come to Mexico. He also welcomed the Deputies of members who had been unable to come. As many members had only arrived that morning, he proposed that they should hold a short meeting from 11.00 to 12.30 and meet again in the afternoon from 4.00 to 6.30. Finally he extended a welcome to M. METRAUX, representative of the United Nations.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to say a word on the various inconveniences which the Board would experience during the first week. Great efforts had been made by the Mexican Government and people to complete the building in which they were working by the time the General Conference met on the following Wednesday. Meetings of the Executive Board and the Finance Committee, however, would have to take place before the building was completed. Another difficulty was that of documents; owing to an aviation strike, no documents had arrived, though most of them had already been located between Mexico and Paris; this would make the meetings of the Executive Board more difficult. The Secretariat was doing its best to produce further copies of the missing documents.

Item 2 of the Provisional Agenda: Adoption of the Agenda

The CHAIRMAN submitted for discussion the provisional agenda which had been communicated to members of the Board in October.

He proposed the addition of a certain number of items. The participation of Republican Spain in the General Conference was to be added as Item 5 (e). A resolution of the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction would be discussed under Item 7 (d). It was proposed to nominate a Chairman for the Appeals Committee of the Secretariat, and this would come under Item 9 (d). The question of travelling and living allowances for members of the Executive Board was to be added as Item 6 (b). The programme of Unesco in Germany was to be inserted as Item 10 (c). A certain number of administrative and financial questions had also to be added to the Agenda, such as a proposal of the Finance Committee concerning the creation of an Advisory Committee; travelling and living allowances for members of the Executive Board attending the General Conference who were not members of delegations; the payment of contributions of Member States in different currencies; the payment of contributions by States who had become members in 1947; and, finally, transfers in the 1947 Budget. He then asked for comments or proposals for further new items to be added to the Agenda. There were no comments and the provisional Agenda was adopted with the additions proposed.

Dr. WALKER had a proposal to make concerning the order in which the items should be taken, but suggested that the Secretariat should give its opinion first.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Session should occupy three days, 1, 3, and 4 November; it was not proposed that they should meet on Sunday, 2 November, but if necessary they could continue work on

5 November. As regards hours, he suggested that they should meet in the mornings from 10.30 a.m. to 1.15 p.m. and in the afternoons from 4.00 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. It was suggested that the order of work should be as follows: Saturday, 1 November: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (a), (b), (c) and (d). Monday, 3 November: Items 6, 7 (a), (b), (c) and (d), 8 (a), (b), 9 (a), (b), (c) and (d). Tuesday, 4 November: Items 10 (a) and (b), 11, 12 and 13 and 5 (e).

Dr. WALKER, referring to the order of items, thought that after the report of the Director-General on developments since the last Session, priority should be given to Item 5 (c) - Proposals regarding the organisation of work for the Second Session of the General Conference. He therefore moved that Item 5 (c) should be taken after Item 4, followed by Item 5 (d), depending on the availability of documents. The proposal was seconded by Mr. ZANIEWICKI and Professor PHOTIADES and agreed.

Dr. MARTINEZ-BAEZ who had just arrived although realising that the members of the Board sat as individuals and not as governmental representatives, wished as a Mexican to extend a most cordial welcome to all delegates and to wish them all possible success in their work.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. Martinez-Baez for his welcome.

Item 3 of the Agenda: Approval of the Minutes of the Last Session

The CHAIRMAN moved the approval of the minutes of the session. Approved.

Item 4 of the Agenda: Report of the Director-General on developments since the last session.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, owing to material difficulties he was unable to submit his report in writing; the text would, however, be circulated later. He proposed to make a brief verbal report on developments during September and October, the months of July and August having been covered in his general report on Unesco's activities in 1947.

In the field of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, a special Appeals leaflet had been prepared and was to be submitted to the Conference. Another leaflet had been prepared on improvised scientific material for demonstration work in schools. A Book of Needs had been drawn up, based on the surveys of educational needs made in war-devastated countries during the year, and would soon be published. Mr. Drzewieski had visited Youth Reconstruction Camp in Poland and the result of his and other visits had been to demonstrate that this was one of the most fertile ways in which Unesco could help in the field of Reconstruction. This view had been confirmed at a meeting of experts on Youth Camps held recently. In addition, a meeting of experts of the T.I.C.E.R. had been held in September, followed by a full Conference of this Council.

In the field of Fundamental Education, the chief event had been the Regional Conference held in Nanking in September. Dr. Kuo and three other members of the Secretariat had attended this Conference, which had been a great success. Eleven countries had been represented

and fifty Chinese educators had attended the conference. This had been well received by the press, and had broken up into several technical committees which had discussed, among other subjects, the proposed Pilot Project in China, which was warmly welcomed by the Chinese Government. Two main principles had emerged: (1) Fundamental Education projects should be designed to promote international understanding; and (2) they should be linked with Rural Reconstruction. A resolution had been adopted containing ten points, among them recommendations that all participating States should set up projects for Fundamental Education, that a generous programme of research should be instituted, and that Unesco Headquarters should be kept informed of all developments in the field of Fundamental Education so that it could build up an international pool of information available to all countries.

Another Regional Study Conference on Fundamental Education was starting in Mexico City on Monday, 3 November, and would be attended by a large number of countries and competent organisations.

As regards Pilot Projects, M. Thomas and Mr. Bowers had just visited Haiti, and the prospects of the proposed project in that country would be discussed during the General Conference. An invitation had been received from the United Kingdom Colonial Office for Unesco to participate in a combined project in Nyasaland and Tanganyika, within British East Africa.

In connection with the Hylean Amazon Project, a Unesco representative had travelled through the region and examined the role of Fundamental Education in the general scheme.

In the field of Education for International Understanding, a first report had been sent to all Member States on teaching about the United Nations in schools. The Secretariat had prepared a leaflet on the work of the Summer Seminar, which it was hoped would prove most valuable. A first draft of a study on the "Effect of War on Children" had been drawn up and submitted to experts for revision.

As regards Exchange of Persons, Mr. William Carter had taken up his duties as Director of this project in September and was putting into operation the plan worked out by Mr. John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation.

A contract was signed in September with the "Common Services" of the International Institute of Administrative Science, the International Union of Local Authorities, and the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, whereby these services agreed to make a survey of administrative conditions in war-devastated Member Countries, with a view to supplying Unesco with a list of administrative personnel in general administration and in the field of education, science and culture in particular, who were in need of "refresher" experience and observation tours in foreign countries. Such a list was basic in the sound planning of recommendations for exchanges in the field of administrative personnel.

In the field of Natural Sciences, considerable work had been done and a report was to be submitted to the General Conference concerning the development of the Hylean Amazon project. Unesco had received a report from the International Council of Scientific Unions

on the use which had been made of grants-in-aid up to the 1st October 1947. Unesco had made grants to the World Federation of Scientific Unions for travel of scientists to congresses, etc; and in collaboration with the World Health Organisation, it had organised a meeting of experts on medical abstracting. A contract had been drawn up with the World Engineering Conference for the preparation of a world survey of technical bodies in this field.

An important project of this Section was on the social and international implications of science and its popularisation; a meeting of European experts on this subject had been held in Paris and experts from Canada and the U.S.A. were at present meeting in New York to discuss the same question. Unesco had participated in the Fifth International Congress of the History of Science. Unesco had continued to send scientific material, such as microscopes, to war-devastated countries, in addition to the sets of workshop tools and equipment purchased earlier in the year.

In the field of Social Sciences, a special consultant had visited a number of countries and collected material on tensions affecting international understanding. Plans had been drawn up, after a definition of respective spheres, in co-operation with the Economic and Social Council's Secretariat, in the field of Home and Community Planning.

A most encouraging meeting of experts on Copyright had recently been held in Paris and agreement had been reached as to how Unesco should handle this problem; the recommendations of the meeting were now in the hands of Member States.



In the field of Arts and Letters, two questionnaires had been sent out to Member States concerning the role of Arts and Letters in general Education and on Government and Community support of the Arts. An enquiry had been started into reproduction techniques, particularly colour reproduction, and how these techniques could be employed to further Unesco's ends.

As regards Museums, much preparatory work had been done during the latter part of the year for the conference of the International Council of Museums which was to be held at the same time as the General Conference in Mexico City.

In the field of Libraries, the libraries bulletin had been expanded and further supplies of books had been sent to war-devastated libraries. Discussions had been held with governments and various organisations concerning the Book Coupon scheme, about which the General Conference was to decide.

A successful meeting of experts on Philosophy and the Humanities had recently been held and a report drawn up on the role of these in Unesco's programme, for submission to the Conference. As regards Human Rights, a further meeting of the Editorial Committee had been held which had recommended publication of a symposium based on contributions already received, and had also outlined further work.

Great activity had been deployed by the Mass Media Section during recent months. An important conference had been held on Technical Needs; its report had been printed and was now available. An earlier report on Newsprint had been submitted to the Economic and Social Council and had been very well received. A plan had been worked out for the production and exchange of films in twelve countries.

1 November 1947

There had also been a meeting of Press experts who had reached a remarkable degree of agreement and had drafted a number of resolutions on the free flow of information, including cheap books. A successful meeting of radio experts had also been held earlier in the year. Much attention had been paid to Unesco's participation in preparing for the Conference on freedom of information, to be held in 1948 under the auspices of the United Nations. A meeting had taken place between radio organisations of France, French-speaking Switzerland and Belgium, who were launching a Pilot Radio Project embodying programme material on Unesco activities.

In the domain of External Relations, the Governments of Cuba, Luxembourg and Colombia had ratified the Constitution, bringing the number of members up to 34. It was anticipated that El Salvador and Uruguay would ratify before the end of the General Conference. Consideration by the Economic and Social Council of the application for membership by the Principality of Monaco had to be delayed until 1948. Following the admission of Pakistan and Yemen to Unesco, these two countries had been invited to send Observers to the General Conference.

As regards travel, the Director-General had recently visited the United Kingdom to discuss Fundamental Education Pilot Projects and to attend a meeting of the United Kingdom Arts Co-operating Body. Dr. Laves had visited Canada as the guest of the Department of External Affairs, and had contacted groups working on educational and cultural relief. He had also visited the U.S.A., where he had attended a meeting of the American National Commission, the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the Co-ordination Committee of the Specialised Agencies. M. Thomas had visited Poland, the Netherlands, and Haiti.

Several new National Commissions had been formed, in Denmark, Australia, China, Venezuela and Mexico, while Secretaries of National Commissions had been invited to visit the Secretariat in Paris for a period of three weeks; four countries had already taken advantage of this invitation.

M. de Blonay and Dr. Zhukova had represented Unesco at the Conference of the WHO and it had been decided to continue relations on the basis of the working arrangements established in April. M. de Blonay had also attended the meeting of the FAO in Geneva, and a draft agreement had been drawn up between Unesco and that Organisation. Conversations of a similar nature had been held with the ILO. The Executive Board's Committee on Relations with International Non-Governmental Organisations had recommended that thirty of these organisations should be admitted to the General Conference as Observers and invitations had accordingly been issued. A number of other organisations were being provided with facilities to follow the Conference unofficially.

In conclusion, the Director-General said that he believed this interim report showed successful activity and a surprising amount of achievement by Unesco in a brief period. As he had said in his printed report for the year, this success was due to the fact that Unesco had concentrated on concrete projects and had advanced over a broad front, carrying out activities in all major fields of Unesco's competence.

Professor PHOTIADES had followed the Director-General's report with much interest, but he desired to respect the Constitution, which laid down that the report should be submitted to the Executive Board before the General Conference and he therefore asked that it

should be submitted in writing under Item 5 (d) of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN thought there was some misunderstanding as this report was not destined for the General Conference and he therefore proposed that they should discuss it at once.

Professor PHOTIADES observed that the Director-General had said that the report would be submitted in writing during the Conference. The Executive Board's report to the Conference would be from November 1946 to August 1947, so that if the Director-General's report for September and October were not included in it, this period would be missing.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded Professor Photiades that he had anticipated this period in his yearly report and he agreed with the Chairman that the yearly report was the one to present to the Conference.

Sir John MAUD remarked that the problem of the Director-General's report being drawn up and printed before the year it covered was over would always arise, but it seemed to him that there was no difference in principle between the interim report and the yearly report. He referred to Item 5 (b) of the Agenda - Consideration of statement to be made by the Chairman of the Executive Board to the General Conference on the Board's activities - and suggested that the Chairman of the Executive Board might be asked to mention to the Conference that they had received an oral report by the Director-General on the months of September and October 1947, thus making the document as humanly up-to-date as it could be.

Professor PHOTIADES entirely agreed with this suggestion.

Mr. ZANIEWICKI also agreed with Sir John Maud. He thanked the Director-General for his report and understood that they would be able to come back to any points they wished to raise, when they were discussing his yearly report.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that they should take Item 5(a) at the beginning of the afternoon meeting and suggested that they should adjourn.

(The meeting rose at 12:40 p.m.)

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to send any corrections to Mr. S.G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Report of the Second Meeting held on Saturday,  
1 November 1947, at 4 p.m., at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros,  
Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairmen: Professor P. AUGER (France)  
H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico) (Acting Chairman)

Members:

Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER (United States)  
Professor H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P.R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli-RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies:

Dr. H.F. EL DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey.

H.E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ.

H.E. Mr. S.D. PIERCE (Canada),  
Deputy for M. Victor DORE

H.E. M. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey)  
Deputy for M. Resat Nuri GUNTEHIN

M. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland)  
Deputy for Professor M. FAJSKI.

Secretaries:

United Nations  
M. METRAUX

Item 5(c) of the Agenda: proposals regarding the organisation of work  
for the Second Session of the General Conference (Doc. 2C/19)

Dr. WALKER made some comments on the draft scheme of work for the Second Session of the General Conference:

(1) Drafting.

Document 2C/19 had been transmitted to Member States at the same time as it was sent to the members of the Executive Board. It stated that "the Director-General has the honour to submit etc....." the responsibility for preparing the Agenda for the Conference, however, rested with the Board and, although it was true that at its last session the Executive Board had taken no decision in this matter, the Programme Committee had approved the draft Agenda and, after discussion with the Secretariat, had agreed to the division into two main Commissions (the Programme and Budget Commission and the Administrative and External Relations Commission) and a number of Working Parties. On another point of detail, the document mentioned "professional peers"; it would be more accurate to speak of "specialists". It was, nevertheless, a fact that the general time-table and the composition of the Working Parties were questions to be considered by the Board and that the Board would have to decide whether they should be kept in their existing form, or changed.

(2) Substance.

(a) The document suggested that Chapters I, II, III and IV should be submitted to the Programme and Budget Commission and that Chapter V should be submitted to the Administrative and External Relations Commission. Dr. Walker said he agreed with this proposal, provided that it was clearly understood that the Programme Commission would be able to express its views on Chapter V.

(b) The form of resolution, appearing as Annex I to the document, would ensure a degree of precision which had been lacking at the First General Conference. This form of resolution had not been seen by the Executive Board or any of its Committees. The Board would have to decide whether or not to approve it. Another question which arose was whether a Conference on such a large scale could go into details of application.

(c) The arrangements for the Working Parties seemed far too rigid and it would be advisable for the Working Parties themselves to be able to fix their own time-tables. It should therefore be clearly stated that the proposed time-table was by no means immutable. The respective parts taken by the Secretariat, Member States and associated organisations in arranging Unesco's work should also be considered, and should not be limited to compiling and answering questionnaires; in this matter also, the Working Parties could be very helpful to Unesco.



The question of the choice of the Chairmen and Rapporteurs for the Working Parties was very important; as the delegates did not know each other at all well at the beginning of the Conference, the Executive Board should appoint a sub-committee to make suggestions to the Nominations Committee, in order to assist the members of the Working Parties in their choice.

Finally, on page 6, in the second paragraph under B: external relations were referred to in connection with the Member States; this phraseology should be avoided as it might cause difficulties.

Prof. SOMMERFELT agreed unreservedly with Dr. Walker's proposals. He added that there was one question which seemed vital to him, that of the total amount of the budget. Many delegates attending the Conference had been given detailed instructions on this question. In order to facilitate matters, it was absolutely necessary that the question of the budget should be considered at the very beginning of the Conference.

Sir John MAUD said he agreed with Dr. Walker and Professor Sommerfelt. He wished to make a few comments:

a) From the point of view of procedure, there was no doubt that it was for the Executive Board to propose the Agenda, but the Executive Board's meetings had been over-burdened and it had been most helpful to give the Member States an idea of what would be done in Mexico. The draft submitted was thus an excellent piece of work and a great step forward in comparison with the previous year; it brought out clearly the two essential objects of the Conference:

1) To serve as a business meeting where the 1948 programme and its corresponding budget would be clearly defined; 2) to proceed

with the study and execution of the programme, taking advantage of the presence of experts at the Conference to form Working Parties.

b) The 1948 Programme had been transmitted to the Member States which had studied it in detail. No doubt the delegations would wish to state their views on this Programme; Sir John Maud, therefore, proposed that the Programme and Budget Commission should begin with a discussion of the programme as a whole in a sort of "second-reading debate"; this would probably require two meetings, and the first item on the draft Agenda could be taken up at the third meeting.

c) The work could be carried on more advantageously if an accurate idea of the amount of the budget were given before the Programme itself was considered; it should not be necessary, as it had been the previous year, to do all the work again after the adoption of a reduced budget. Sir John Maud consequently proposed that the Budget Sub-Commission should meet immediately after the first two meetings of the Programme and Budget Commission.

d) Sir John Maud proposed that the Sub-Committee to be appointed by the Executive Board should take preliminary steps in the election not only of the Chairmen of the Working Parties, but also of the Rapporteurs, as the latter formed a team with their Chairman. Obviously the Board should not impose nominations on the Working Parties; but it could recommend (to the Nominations Committee or the General Committee of the Conference) names which the Working Parties would be free to accept or reject. Each Working Party should determine its own time-table and the subjects as to discuss, more especially as new problems might arise during

the deliberations of the Conference or as a result of suggestions by Working Party members.

To conclude, Sir John Maud proposed the following resolution:

- 1) That a general discussion on the programme proposals for 1948 take place at an early session of the Programme and Budget Commission;
- 2) That the Budget Sub-Commission should meet immediately thereafter to consider a total budget figure and make recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission.
- 3) That a sub-committee of the Executive Board be considered, to name the Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Working Parties and make recommendations to the Nominations Committee of the Conference;
- 4) That the Working Parties should treat their prepared agenda as a provisional agenda, and determine for themselves how best to spend their time in considering the content and means of carrying out the items of the programme.

Professor AUGER agreed with Sir John Maud that there should first be a general discussion on the Programme, the budget being discussed thereafter by the Budget Sub-Commission. He felt, however, that these two meetings should be followed by a plenary meeting of the General Conference, to permit the latter to approve the total budget figure. If such a procedure were not followed, there would certainly be a risk of reversal by the General Conference after the work was done.

it would be advisable for the Executive Board to have an opportunity of giving its opinion on the selection of the Chairmen and Rapporteurs for these Parties. Obviously all the States could not be represented on such Parties and only the General Conference could determine their composition. The Executive Board could, however, make nominations for the positions of Chairman and Rapporteur.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, like Professor Auger, thought that the Budget Sub-Commission's meeting should be followed by a plenary meeting of the Conference. He held a somewhat different opinion, however, from that of Professor Auger on Working Parties. He felt that the Conference should not rigidly determine the composition of the Parties, as this procedure might antagonise the delegations. The composition of the Working Parties should be very flexible, leaving the delegations free to send whomever they wished.

With reference to the comment made by Dr. Walker on Working Parties, the Director-General pointed out - and Dr. Walker agreed - that it would be impossible to consider changing the

number of meetings allowed for these Parties. Within this framework, however, the Parties would, of course, remain free to organise their work as they wished. The Director-General also mentioned that there would be three and a half days at the end of the Conference (the afternoon of 25 and the whole of 26, 27 and 28 November) in which the Working Parties could study any questions which had not been settled.

Referring to Sir John Maud's suggestion regarding the setting of the Budget Sub-Commission at the beginning of the Conference, the Director-General thought it better to have the budget considered in a plenary meeting.

Regarding the general discussion of the Programme which Sir John Maud had suggested placing at the beginning of the Conference, the Director-General mentioned that he had had the same idea, but that he had given it up for two reasons: first, because it would be difficult to prevent the discussion from becoming involved in a mass of detail, and, secondly, because the number of speakers who would wish to be heard, would probably prolong the meeting for several days. The Director-General wondered whether it would not be better, in order to gain time, to postpone this general discussion until the end of the Conference, at which time two half days, the afternoon of 24 and the morning of 25 November would be available.

Returning to the subject of the Working Parties, Professor CARNEIRO stated that it would be helpful in the choice of the Rapporteurs and Chairmen of these Parties if the Executive Board could give its opinion, but that it should do so only after consultation with the delegations.

With regard to the composition of these Parties, Professor Carneiro stressed the difficulties arising from the fact that the delegations were not uniform in size - some delegations included as many as thirty members, while others had only four, and there would sometimes be as many as three Committees meeting on one day.

Mr. S. D. PIERCE thought, as did Sir John Maud, that it would be essential to call a meeting of the Budget Sub-Commission at a very early date but he thought that the purpose of this meeting should not be to fix the total budget figure immediately. Certain delegations would like to have this figure established according to the activities to be undertaken; others would prefer, on the contrary,

It should subsequently be decided which of the projects on the Programme could be carried out with the sums available. It would therefore be desirable that the Budget Sub-Commission should meet as soon as possible, but solely in order to determine its approach to the problem.

At Mr. Eisenhower's suggestion, the CHAIRMAN asked the Board to proceed to the consideration of the resolution submitted by Sir John Maud. The first two paragraphs of this resolution were worded as follows:

"It is moved:

- 1) That a general discussion on the programme proposals for 1948 take place at an early session of the Programme and Budget Commission;
- 2) That the Budget Sub-Commission should meet immediately thereafter to consider a total budget figure and make recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission."

Professor AUGER said that he was prepared to approve these first two paragraphs, on condition that the resolution should likewise provide for a plenary meeting of the General Conference to ratify the decisions taken.

Dr. WALKER asked that the resolution should be submitted in the following form:

"The Executive Board recommends to the General Conference that....."

His modification was adopted.

A vote was then taken on paragraph 1 of the resolution. In response to a request for a definite statement on the length of time to

be given to the above-mentioned general discussion, Dr. Walker, supported by Professor Photiades, pointed out that there was no reason to submit a detailed time-table to the General Conference. The Programme and Budget Commission could decide upon the duration of its meetings for itself.

The first paragraph of Sir John Maud's resolution was adopted.

With reference to the second paragraph, Sir John MAUD stated that he had come over to the opinion of the Director-General: it would be preferable that the budget figure should be fixed by the Programme and Budget Commission meeting in Plenary Session. This Commission, including all the heads of delegations, was, to all intents and purposes, equivalent to the General Conference itself. It would, therefore, not be necessary to hold a Plenary Session of the General Conference to ratify the decisions made. Sir John Maud therefore proposed that the second paragraph of his resolution be completely changed. It would become:

"2) That the Programme and Budget Commission should meet immediately thereafter to consider a total budget figure."

Professor AUGER and the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that they were prepared to agree to Sir John Maud's proposal. The Director-General further reminded the meeting that since the Programme and Budget Commission included all the heads of delegations, there would be no danger of a reversal of its decisions by the General Conference.

Mr. PIERCE and Dr. WALKER thought, however, that the Budget Sub-Commission should meet as soon as possible to draw up its

rules of procedure. They would thus know what method to follow in determining the amount of the budget. As a matter of fact, there were two possible procedures: The figure might be fixed according to the requirements of the Programme, or, conversely, it would be possible to start with a pre-determined figure, even though certain projects provided for in the Programme might possibly have to be eliminated.

Sir John MAUD felt that there was no reason why a vote on the question of a total budget figure should present any such difficulties. The 1948 Programme had been drawn up in detail; the exact cost of each project was known and it was likewise known that a budget of eight million five hundred thousand dollars (\$8,500,000.00) would be necessary to carry out the projects in their entirety. The members of the delegations had had time to look through all the documents relevant to the Programme and the Budget and to obtain from their governments the necessary instructions. The Chairman then put to the vote Mr. PIERCE'S motion, under the terms of which paragraph 2 of the resolution would be worded as follows:

- "2) That the Budget Sub-Commission meet immediately thereafter to decide upon its rules of procedure, and, if necessary, to make recommendations to the Programme and Budget Commission."

This motion was rejected by 9 votes to 7.

The CHAIRMAN thereupon put to the vote paragraph 2 of Mr John Maud's resolution in its original form, with an addition proposed by Professor Carneiro. Paragraph 2 then read:

- "2) That the Budget Sub-Commission should meet immediately thereafter to consider a total budget figure and make



recommendations thereon to the Programme and Budget Commission, provided that the resulting proposals should be submitted at once to the General Conference for its approval."

This motion was seconded by M. KRUYT and Dr. OPOCENSKY, but was rejected by 8 votes to 7.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote paragraph 2 of Sir John Maud's resolution, amended as the latter had himself proposed:

"2) That the Programme and Budget Commission should meet immediately thereafter to consider a total budget figure."

This motion was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6:15 p.m.

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S.G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

Cons.Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./SR/3  
MEXICO CITY, 3 November 1947

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Report of the Third Meeting held on Monday  
3 November 1947 at 10:30 a.m. at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros,  
at Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairman: Professor P. AUGER (France) (Acting Chairman)  
H. E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER (United States)  
Professor H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P.R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies:

Dr. H.F. EL DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey.  
H.E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ.  
H.E. Mr. S.D. PIERCE (Canada) Deputy for  
M. Victor DORÉ.  
H.E. Mr. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey) Deputy  
for Mr. Resat Nuri GUNTEKIN.  
Mr. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland) Deputy for  
Professor M. FALSKI.

Observers:

United Nations; M. MÉTRAUX

Item 5 (c) of the Agenda - Proposals regarding the organisation of work for the Second Session of the General Conference. (Continued)

The Chairman recalled that the Board had already adopted the first two paragraphs of Sir John Maud's resolution:

"1) That a general discussion on the programme proposals for 1948 take place at an early session of the Programme and Budget Commission.

"2) That the Programme and Budget Commission should immediately thereafter consider a total budget figure."

He proposed that they should then discuss the Third Paragraph:

"3) That a Sub-Committee of the Executive Board be constituted to name the Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the working parties and make recommendations to the Nominations Committee of the Conference."

Mr. ZANIEWICKI did not see the necessity of creating the sub-committee, as the Nominations Committee was composed of Heads of Delegations and it would be preferable for each member of the Executive Board to suggest names to the Head of his Delegation.

Professor PHOTIADES observed that it was not a question of creating a new sub-committee but of creating a sub-committee merely to suggest names to the Nominations Committee, thus facilitating its work.

Professor CARNEIRO suggested that the following words should be added to Sir John Maud's text: "After consultation with the Heads of Delegations". This proposal was seconded by Professor PHOTIADES.

Mr. ZANIEWICKI remarked that as the Nominations Committee consisted of Heads of Delegations, they might say: "After consultation with the Nominations Committee". This was supported by Professor CHEN YUAN.

Sir John MAUD hoped that those who were opposing his proposal would change their opinion in the light of the remarks he was about to make. Under the Constitution, the Executive Board was responsible for preparing the General Conference and he thought it could best discharge its duty by creating a small sub-committee from among its members to carry out preliminary work before the Conference started. There was no suggestion that the Executive Board or the Sub-Committee should do more than make suggestions to the Nominations Committee of the General Conference, which consisted of the Heads of all Delegations. He had made his suggestion because it seemed to him that the Nominations Committee, which was a large body, would find its work facilitated if a smaller body, in consultation with the Heads of Delegations, had done some preliminary work. He then proposed a slight amendment to his text: Instead of "to name the Chairmen and Rapporteurs" the following words should be substituted: "To consider names for the positions of Chairman and Rapporteur". Further, he proposed a slight amendment to the text suggested by Prof. Carneiro: The words "if possible" should be inserted after "consultation", so that the sentence would read "after consultation, if possible, with Heads of Delegations". He moved that the Sub-Committee should consist of five members.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN thought it was clear that the intention of the Board was that the Sub-Committee should facilitate the work of the Nominations Committee, and therefore suggested the substitution of the word "suggestions" instead of "recommendations". This suggestion was accepted by Sir John MAUD.

Mr. El DIWANY was in favour of deleting "if possible" and making it obligatory for the Sub-Committee to consult with Heads of Delegations.

Professor PHOTIADES disagreed with this suggestion as they could not be sure that all Heads of Delegations would be present. He proposed that the Sub-Committee of five members of the Executive Board should be chosen from members who were not Heads of Delegations.

Mr. ZANIEWICKI still opposed the creation of the Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be difficult to get a text acceptable to everyone and that it would be better to make the resolution unofficial, letting members of the Executive Board contact the Nominations Committee privately. He was seconded by Dr. El DIWANY.

Professor CARNEIRO observed that the creation of the Sub-Committee presented great technical advantages. There were to be many working parties and the number of Delegates would be irregular, so that the role of the Sub-Committee would be to keep the balance between Delegations in the working parties and to present the views of the Executive Board to the Nominations Committee. He thought the words "if possible" might be deleted as all Heads of Delegations would be present and he therefore supported Sir John Maud's text with the omission of these words, as proposed by Dr. El Diwany.

THE CHAIRMAN proposed that the paragraph should be changed as follows: "That a Sub-Committee of five members of the Executive Board be constituted to contact the Nominations Committee in connection with the appointment of Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Working Committees."

Dr. El DIWANY wondered what Article of the Constitution would justify this. He thought it would be better to leave it unofficial, as in any case there would be informal contacts between the Executive Board and the Nominations Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN put the question to the vote and Members were against an unofficial Resolution. The wording which he himself had proposed was unanimously adopted.

It was agreed that the Chairman should appoint the five members of the Sub-Committee, taking into account Professor PHOTIADES' proposal that the members should not be Heads of Delegations.

THE CHAIRMAN then read the fourth paragraph of Sir John Maud's proposal: "That the Working Parties should treat their proposed agenda as a provisional one and determine for themselves how best to spend their time in considering the content and means of carrying out the items of the Programme."

Professor SOMMERFELT proposed the words "to distribute the time at their disposal" instead of "to spend their time". Approved.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that they should then discuss the two proposals of Dr. Walker.

Dr. WALKER read his proposals;

"The Board recommends to the General Conference that;

1) The Working Parties be invited to give special consideration to ways and means of insuring active participation by Members of the Organisation in the activities under consideration;

2) Although Chapter V of the Programme Proposals should be referred to the Administrative and External Relations Commission, this should not prevent the Programme and Budget Commission from discussing the respective roles of Member States and the Secretariat in the execution of the Programme of the Organisation."

Dr. Walker recalled that he had already referred to these points, which were additional to the recommendations already made by the Board and would therefore become recommendations 5 and 6.

By "Members" in the first proposal, he meant "Member States" and he intended that this proposal should give some lead to the Working Parties who were not to examine only the purely technical aspects of the Programme.

Professor CARNEIRO seconded Dr. Walker's motion on condition that it was made clear that "Members" meant "Member States". The proposal was adopted. The Chairman put Dr. Walker's second proposal to the vote and it was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN then asked for comments on the Resolution contained in Document 2C/19.

Mr. EISENHOWER said that he would like to submit a motion relating to Annex 1 of the Document at the appropriate time.

Dr. WALKER thought that the Document should be transmitted to the Conference, possibly after an Amendment to Annex 1, as mentioned by Mr. Eisenhower, in the form of a Resolution:

"The Executive Board transmits to the General Conference the proposals regarding the organisation of work for the Second Session of the General Conference (Document 2C/19) and recommends it to the Conference, subject to the modifications and additions set out in the following further recommendations of the Board."

This would be followed by the six recommendations already made. Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN remarked that they would now proceed to discuss the Document and then form a Resolution as suggested by Dr. Walker.

There were no comments on the first part of the Document - Organisation of Work: Commissions, Sub-Commissions and Working Parties. Para. 1 - Commissions and Sub-Commissions responsible for examining questions referred to them by the General Conference and Para. 2 - Sessions of the Programme and Budget Commission.

With regard to ~~Part~~ 3 - Working Groups and Technical Sessions, the Chairman wanted an explanation from the Director-General regarding the third paragraph of this section. He wondered whether it meant that the Conference would not see these Documents.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the programme had been complicated by the time factor. It had been realised that it would be better for the discussions of the Working Parties to take place before the Plenary Session of the Programme Commission, but this had not been found feasible. The Programme Commission should receive a summary of the discussions of the Working Parties but should not be asked to vote on them.

~~Professor~~ CARNEIRO was troubled by the question of the authority of the reports of the Working Parties and thought they might be wasting their time, as only the General Conference could impose a programme on Unesco and it was the task of the Executive Board to execute it.

Dr. EL DIWANY agreed with Prof. Carneiro and proposed the deletion of the words "for their guidance" at the end of the paragraph.

Dr. WALKER explained that the Working Parties would discuss the technical aspects of the programme and their discussions would provide technical guidance for the Director-General and the Executive Board in the implementation of the programme. He saw no reason why the Working Parties should not transmit their Resolutions direct to the Programme Commission, although they could not exercise any authority themselves, as they did not represent all Member States. In practice, their Resolutions might not greatly influence the decisions of the Programme Commission, but they would still be available for the guidance of the



Board and the Director-General. They might add a further paragraph in the covering resolution to say that resolutions of the Working Parties were not to go to Delegates, but to the Programme Commission.

At this point, the Mexican Minister of Education arrived and was introduced by Dr. MARTINES BAEZ, who thanked him for coming and spoke of the efforts he had made to make the Conference a success and the great interest he had in its work.

The MEXICAN MINISTER OF EDUCATION said that he was familiar with the work of the Executive Board and that the Mexican Government was very interested in the work of the Conference; a proof of this was that the President of Mexico wished to receive Members of the Board on the following Wednesday morning. He hoped the Conference would find the building appropriate for its work and wished them success.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that they should resume the discussion of Dr. Walker's proposal.

Dr. WALKER recalled his proposal which was that in transmitting Document 20/19 to the Conference, a recommendation should be added that any Resolution passed by the Working Parties, together with a summary report of their discussion should be transmitted to the Programme Commission. The possibility of the Programme Commission's taking into account the Resolutions of the Working Parties would depend on the way in which the work of the Conference was proceeding. If the Programme Commission was unable to consider the Resolutions they would be available for consideration at the appropriate time, by the Executive Board and the Director-General.

Mr. ZANIEWICKI referring to Dr. Walker's resolution thought that this point would decide the success of the entire conference.

He did not think that the French text of the document (2C/19) was quite clear and suggested that a drafting sub-committee should try to re-word certain paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN was afraid that this procedure would be too long. Dr. Walker's proposal should satisfy the Board. To make the best possible use of the Working Parties' findings, reports of their work should go to the Programme and Budget Commission; therefore he recommended that Dr. Walker's amendment should be adopted.

Professor PHOTIADES fully agreed with the Chairman and supported Dr. Walker's resolution.

Concerning Chapter 4 of Document 2C/19, Sir John MAUD presented the following resolution:

"The Budget Sub-Commission may begin its work at any time after any decision has been taken by the Programme and Budget Commission regarding the total budget figure."

In reply to the Chairman, Sir John Maud explained that as soon as the Programme and Budget Commission had taken a decision the Budget Sub-Committee could examine possible economies and the distribution of funds.

WALKER was against the words "at any time" as they might cause embarrassment to the smaller delegations.

Sir John MAUD had foreseen this difficulty but could see no way of avoiding it whilst taking a decision on the matter today. He felt sure that the sub-committee of the General Conference would interpret the decisions of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that the Board was only preparing suggestions for the General Conference.

Chapter B, Commission for Administrative and External Relations and Chapter II, points 1,2,3,4, were accepted without discussion.

In connection with Chapter III, Sir John MAUD thought that some mention of the Executive Board should be included. For example, that the Board would have to meet during the Conference but would not be playing a part in the Conference itself.

Dr. WALKER agreed with him and suggested the following resolution:

"The Executive Board by the transmittal of this document has completed its preparation for the work of the General Conference but the Executive Board may meet during the Conference for business properly to come before it."

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to redraft this sentence.

Point 1 of the second part concerning the Second Session of the General Conference and the working parties was accepted without discussion.

In connection with Point 2, Dr. WALKER thought it desirable for the Secretariat to prepare a new timetable (Doc. 2C/19, Annex 3) to be submitted to the Conference along with the Board's report. He accordingly moved the following resolution, amended by the Director-General:

"The summary reports of the Working Parties with the resolutions adopted by them, if any, should be transmitted to the Programme and Budget Commission which may take any action thereon that the Commission considers appropriate; either taking them into account in the preparation of its own recommendations to the Conference, or merely transmitting them to the Executive Board for its information."

This was unanimously adopted.

The remainder of Document 2C/19 was then adopted without further discussion.

Dr. MARTINEZ PAEZ reminded the Board in connection with paragraph 2 of Point 4 that although there were no meetings during the Mexican National Holiday, the Mexican Government had arranged a reception and a visit of Schools on 21 November.

Dr. DIWANY expressed the opinion that out of respect for the host country all activities of the Conference and of the Secretariat should cease during that holiday period.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with him and explained that those four days were intended to give people who had come from very far away an opportunity to visit and learn more about Mexico. He regretted that some members of the Secretariat would have to work some of the time but the majority would be free.

Sir MAUD pointed out that there was a slight conflict between the last paragraph of Document 2C/19 and point 12 of the provisional agenda.

Dr. WALKER wished to draw attention to the form of paragraph 4 on page 6 of the English text. He thought it should be clearly understood that if after the last conference the Board had only met in April, this was due to the necessary documents not being ready at an earlier date. He felt quite sure that after this conference the Board would no more be able to discharge its work immediately than it had been after the First Session of the General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be sufficient to state briefly that an Executive Board meeting was very desirable immediately after the Conference.

With respect to Annex 1 of 2C/19 Mr. EISENHOWER understood that this resolution was a Programme and Budget Commission recommendation to the General Conference. He thought it should be remembered

authority for other undertakings, (3) it provided a method for co-ordination between the General Conference and the Programme Committee. In this connection he thought it would be best if (1) the resolution was in the form of general conference resolutions as this would do away with any need for subsequent re-drafting, (2) each resolution by Chapter and Section should set forth in toto the matter under discussion and not merely the additions or subtractions to it, (3) the General Conference should not approve a programme merely in principle. At the First Session of the General Conference the programme approved had been three times greater than the budget allowed for and it was left to the discretion of the Secretariat to interpret the Conference's wishes. This time precise legislative co-ordination with the budget was necessary and the form referred back to the most appropriate body for revision. This third point should be divided in three.

- (a) Directives to the Executive Board and the Director-General;
- (b) Recommendations to Member States, National Commissions and other bodies;
- (c) General comments and suggestions.

Professor CARNEIRO fully agreed with Mr. Eisenhower and also thought Annex 1 unacceptable in its present wording.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Programme Committee of the Executive Board should re-draft its text and this proposal was unanimously adopted.

As regards Annex II, Dr. WALKER asked for a clear statement that every Delegation had the right to be represented in all Working Parties.

The CHAIRMAN assured him that that was understood.

In connection with Annex 3, Dr. WALKER moved the following resolution:

"The suggestions submitted above by the Executive Board necessarily affect the detailed distribution of time proposed in Annex 3; if these suggestions are adopted by the General Conference the calendar will need to be modified by the General Committee and the Secretariat should be instructed to prepare a revision of Annex 3 under the direction of the General Committee."

This was adopted.

In connection with the Executive Board meetings during the course of the Conference, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the simplest course was not to close the present session.

Mr. PIERCE suggested deleting entirely the last paragraph after the word "conference" since the Board was free to meet whenever it wanted to.

After Professor Photiades had been assured by the Chairman that the session of the Board would remain open, the following final text was adopted:

"The Executive Board by the transmittal of this document has completed its preparation for the work of the General Conference but the Executive Board may meet during the Conference."

Dr. WALKER referring back to a point made earlier by Sir John Maud thought it very desirable for some mention in Annex 2 to explain that the delay which had occurred between the General Conference in 1946 and the next meeting of the Executive Board had been due to the time necessary to prepare the relevant documents.

Professor PHOTIADES agreed with Dr. Walker but he thought that as the session was not closed it could not be said that the Board would hold a fifth session after the Conference.

Dr. WALKER wanted to correct anything which might give the impression that delay would have been avoided if the Executive Board had decided to hold a programme meeting before the month of April.

Mr. ZANIEWICZ suggested that a sentence to that effect could be included in the comments to avoid the appearance that the Board was fighting for its honour.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that sessions were not meetings. Page 6 mentioned a session and created the impression that delay could have been avoided if the Board had held one immediately after the last General Conference. The Board, as at present constituted, ceased to exist at the end of this session and the fifth session began after the election of the seven new members.

Sir John MAUD drew the attention of the Board to the fact that anything about the new session would modify the previously adopted recommendations and suggested leaving over Dr. Walker's proposal, if he did not insist, until the date and place of the next conference was discussed.

The CHAIRMAN thought that perhaps the second half of Dr. Walker's resolution could be retained as it was a comment on Document 20/19.

Professor PHOTIADES agreed with the Chairman.

Dr. WALKER speaking as a member of the Executive Board said he could not approve a document which said that the Board made a mistake when this was not so. He stated that he would submit another paragraph later.

The CHAIRMAN declared that with the exception of Dr. Walker's amendment the discussion of Document 20/19 was finished.

(The meeting rose at 13.15 hrs.)

Cons. Exec. /4<sup>o</sup> Sess. /SR/4 & 5<sup>1)</sup>  
MEXICO CITY, 4 November 1947

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S. G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Record of the Fifth Meeting held on Tuesday, 4 November 1947 at 10:30 a.m. at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros, Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairman: Professor P. AUGER (France), Chairman of the Meeting  
H. E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members: Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER (United States)  
Professor H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P. R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PROTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies: Dr. H. F. EL DIWANY (Egypt), Deputy for  
H. E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey  
H. E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela),  
Deputy for H. E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ  
H. E. Mr. S. D. PIERCE (Canada), Deputy for  
M. Victor DORÉ  
H. E. M. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey), Deputy for  
M. Resat Nuri GUNTEKIN  
M. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland), Deputy for  
Professor M. FALSKI

Observers: United Nations: M. METRAUX  
International Labour Organisation:  
Dr. E. JIMENEZ

1) As the Fourth Meeting of the Fourth Session of the Executive Board, held on Monday, 3 November 1947 at 3:30 p.m. was a secret meeting, no summary record was drawn up. Hence no SR/4 exists.



Before opening the discussion on the Finance Committee's report, the CHAIRMAN proposed consideration of the possible participation of Republican Spain in the General Conference.

He proposed referring the request formulated by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Spanish Republic to the General Committee of the Conference, together with the opinion of the Executive Board.

M. MARTINEZ BAEZ pointed to a precedent for this course. Republican Spain had been a "distinguished guest" at the First General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to Sir John Maud, explained that the invitation would be couched in exactly the same words as that of last year, and the Board unanimously accepted his proposal.

Item 6a of the Agenda - Amended Draft Rules of Procedure.

Dr. WALKER stated that, according to the Constitution, the Executive Board had the right to adopt its own Rules without previous approval by the Conference; the Board should, however, submit these Rules to the Conference and accept any changes it might make.

Document Cons.Exec./4e Sess./3 (rev.) seemed perfectly satisfactory to him except for Chapter E - Mandate of the Programme Committee. Neither the Board nor the Committee had discussed this mandate, and there were proposals which would give the Executive Board better methods of control. In view of the fact that a fresh edition of the Rules at this stage of the discussion would be very difficult, he proposed the adoption of this document except for Item E.

The CHAIRMAN felt that this document should be discussed, item by item. He was of the opinion that it would be better for the Committees to elect their own Chairmen. He suggested, moreover, that to harmonise the Rules, the Committees might meet whenever two members so requested.

Dr. WALKER doubted the advisability of discussing the document in question, since there were other important questions on the Board's Agenda. He thought that the Rules could be submitted in their present form to the Conference, noting that the mandates for the Committees had still to be studied.

Mr. EISENHOWER supported Dr. Walker's proposal.

The Board then adopted Document Cons.Exec./4e Sess./3 (revising) omitting Chapter E.

Item 6b of the Agenda - Travelling Expenses

The CHAIRMAN then put the following resolution, drawn up by Mr. Pierce and Sir John Mead, to the vote:

IT IS RESOLVED

That the members of the Executive Board or their duly accredited deputies attending the meetings of the Board held immediately before, during and immediately after the Second Session of the General Conference, are entitled, on the usual basis, to their travelling expenses, to and from Mexico City, and to the usual daily allowances for the whole period of the Conference, as well as that of the meetings of the Board.

Members whose term of office expires in the course of the Conference will be entitled to their daily allowances for the whole period of the Conference.

Members who will be elected in the course of the Conference will be entitled to claim as from the date on which their term of office begins.

Professor PHOTIADES seconded this resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

In connection with Item 6 of the Agenda - questions concerning the Executive Board - Mr. EISENHOWER recalled that, according to the Constitution of Unesco, members of the Executive Board sat in a personal capacity, and that they were forbidden to receive instructions from their Governments. In the United States, where the Unesco Constitution was construed literally, it was felt that Board members should be private persons. Long debates had taken place on this matter, both in the National Commission and with members of the State Department. Nevertheless, he was of the opinion that it would be well if the Governments of Member States transmitted their opinions and any other information they deemed useful to the Executive Board and its members without distinction of nationality. Inasmuch as there were problems which could not be solved by private persons, the General Conference should entrust to the Board only those questions which lay within the jurisdiction of its members and reserve for itself all questions outside this framework. He proposed the following resolution:

"The Executive Board resolves: To appoint a committee in the near future to study the whole question of the status of Members of the Board with a view to arriving at a commonly accepted interpretation of the pertinent Constitutional provisions and a commonly approved practice in their regard."

Dr. WALKER, although he did not entirely agree with Mr. Eisenhower's interpretation of the Constitution, nevertheless supported the latter's resolution.

Professor PHOTIADES was of the opinion that, in order to do effective work, the Committee should have at its disposal the summary records of the 1945 London Conference.

Cons.Exec./4e Sess./SR/4 & 5 - page 4  
4 November 1947

Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ said that he had all the Unesco documents and could supply them to the Committee under consideration.

Mr. Eisenhower's resolution was then unanimously adopted.

Professor VERNIEPS suggested that this Committee should be composed of an equal number of representatives of Governments and of the Board.

Professor CARNEIRO thought that this Committee should not be too small to represent a cross-section of the Board's opinion.

Dr. WALKER did not share the opinion of Professor CARNEIRO. The only body which could express the average opinion of the Board was the Board itself. Moreover, selecting members of a large Committee was always a very difficult task. For this reason, he was in favour of a small Committee whose report and recommendations would be submitted to the Board for its approval. He added that this Committee should be authorised to call in legal advisers.

Professor CARNEIRO explained that he had based his suggestion on established precedents.

Professor KRUYT saw no need for precipitating the meeting of this Committee and asked whether it could not be held in Paris in the spring.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee consist of five members, and the Board ruled in favour of this number. He invited the Board to express its opinion regarding the choice of these members.

Professor CHEN YUAN recommended that the choice be postponed until after the election of the seven new members of the next Executive Board, and the Board adopted his point of view.

The Board then adopted a proposal by Sir John Maud providing that, when the question came up for discussion, the Chairman should submit to the Board a list of members suggested for this Committee.

#### Item 8 of the Agenda: Report of the Finance Committee

With reference to Item 8, Dr. WALKER explained that the report of the Finance Committee was not yet completed. The General Conference had placed very heavy responsibilities on the Executive Board and had given certain instructions to the Director-General,

XR

the execution of which should be supervised by the Board. One of the most important of these instructions concerned the straightening out of the accounts, and, in accordance with the terms of the provisional financial regulations, it was for the Finance Committee to look closely into this operation. Thereafter, the Board should prepare for the Conference a general report on the financial administration. The Finance Committee had agreed that this report should express the opinion of the Board on the Auditors' report, in addition to its own activities in the financial domain. Consequently, he was submitting to the Board 1) his report as rapporteur of the Finance Committee and 2) Document 4, which had already been approved by this Committee. He wished to explain that the Finance Committee was not entirely satisfied with certain of the findings, but that it had not wished to make any outright criticism and that it recognised the entire responsibility of the Board for these findings, some of which, however, would have to come up for later discussion.

With reference to the scale of contributions to the Budget by Member States, the Conference had decided to adopt the 1947 administrative scale of the United Nations. Inasmuch as, at the time of the Conference, the United Nations scale had not yet been adopted, the Conference had referred the question to the Executive Board. The space left on page 4 of its report would be filled in as soon as it had had time to draft, with the help of the Secretariat, a sufficiently clear text. With regard to the Revolving Fund, the Board had decided to ask that only one million dollars of the allotted three million be paid. The reply of the governments concerned had not yet been made known. The question of the currencies in which contributions of Member States were to be paid had so far been discussed only by the Standing Committee and should now be considered by the Board itself. China, for example, whose medium of payment had been fixed in dollars or pounds, had asked to be allowed to make her payments in French francs. Table 3 showed the 1948 Budget figures as they stood after the transfers made in the 1947 Budget.

The appointment of new bankers and the question of the Reconstruction Fund had presented no difficulties.

The resolution drafted by Mr. Pierce and Sir John Maud settled the question of the expenses of the Members of the Board.

On the last page, the most important item concerned the Director-General's Representation Allowance, the increase in which, authorised by the Board in proportion to that granted to the Deputy Director-General and the Assistant Director-General had still to be approved by the General Conference. To this end, it would be necessary to amend the text of the resolution concerning the Board.

The document relating to the auditors' report would form an annex, and certain questions concerning some of the transfers would, in his opinion, have to be discussed later in secret session. He recommended that the Members make a close study of Document Cons. Exec./Com.Fin./2nd Sess./4.

Sir John MAUD pointed out that he had submitted a motion relating to the allowances granted to the Director-General, the Deputy Director-General and the Assistant Director-General, in view of the fact that these allowances were no longer adapted to the steadily rising cost of living in France. He asked the Board to approve the last paragraph but one of the draft report submitted by Dr. Walker, providing for a re-adjustment of the allowances granted the three directors.

Dr. WALKER emphasised that the estimated increases corresponded to 18% of the present representation allowances, i.e. \$1,800 a year. On the other hand, if it were agreed that the salaries and allowances of the Deputy Director-General and Assistant Director-General would be included in the personnel budget of the Secretariat, he wondered whether this would apply also to the Director-General, who should enjoy a special status.

Sir John MAUD requested that the text of his motion should not be amended. He thought that the figures indicating salary and allowances of the Director-General should be given along with those relating to the Deputy Director-General and Assistant Director-General.

After being put to a vote, Sir John Maud's motion was adopted.

Though Dr. WALKER agreed that a detailed discussion of the report should be postponed to a later date, he requested that decisions on two points be taken immediately.

First, the paragraph relating to the contributions of the new Members admitted in 1947, which had been left blank in the draft report, had been supplemented by a new proposal, according to which the contributions of these Members for 1947, as well as their possible participation in the expenses of the Preparatory Commission and in the Revolving Fund, should be computed according to the scale to be established for 1948. Even though the Executive Board, at its April session, had established regulations fixing contributions according to the time of the year at which the new Members were admitted, nothing definite had been decided as to the scale to be adopted for these contributions.

Dr. Walker asked, however, that no final decision be taken such a complex question until the Board had met in secret session.

In answer to a question by Mr. PIERCE, Dr. WALKER replied that no basis had yet been fixed upon which the contributions of new Members admitted in 1948 would be determined, but that the same principle might perhaps be applied, namely, to fix the contributions according to the scale to be adopted for 1949.

XR

Dr. OPOCENSKY wanted to know whether the contributions by new Members, for 1947, which would not be paid until 1948, would be credited to the budget or to the Revolving Fund.

Dr. WALKER replied that these payments would, it was hoped, be made before the end of the year. If not, these Members would be in the same category as earlier Members who had not yet paid their contribution for 1947. However, no decision had yet been taken by the Board in the matter of arrears.

Professor PHOTIADES drew the attention of the Board to the question of arrears, which he considered very important. The contributions already received represented wealth and, in particular, movable wealth. It would not be just that this wealth should have been created by only some Members.

Dr. WALKER thought that it was not for the Board to discuss these questions in detail. He asked that his motion be considered with a view to its submission to the General Conference as a recommendation. It would then be the task of the Administrative and External Relations Commission to study the substance of the question.

For the same reason, he did not think that the Board should embark upon a detailed discussion of the Revolving Fund and of possible contributions to it by the new Members. It would be enough to authorise the Director-General to submit to the General Conference a document concerning the possible increase of the Revolving Fund. If the Board agreed, Dr. Walker would himself amend his proposals in that sense.

Dr. Walker's suggestion was adopted.

There was one other question to which Dr. WALKER wished to draw the Board's attention; that of the currency in which contributions would be paid, including China's contribution. He suggested that the decisions on this matter should be reserved for a secret meeting.

Professor CHEN YUAN, in reply to a question by the PRESIDENT, said that it was of no consequence to him whether or not China's particular situation were discussed immediately and, at Professor Photiades' request, the Board embarked upon this matter.

Dr. WALKER considered it a question of a general character and requested the Secretariat to furnish data on the financial situation of the Organisation with regard to foreign currency. He thought it would be wise to allow payment in various currencies according to the convenience of Unesco and its Members.

Dr. LAVES pointed out that the question of China's contribution had been the subject of close study and he suggested that the note contained in the report on this subject be amended so as to fix for that country a payment of its contribution as to

Cons.Exec./4e Sess./SR/4 & 5 - page 8  
4 November 1947

90% in French francs and as to 10% in dollars. That, in his view, was justified by the fact that the expenses incurred by Unesco for the maintenance of scientific co-operation stations in the Far East required dollars.

As to the currency needs of the Organisation, the Secretariat intended to prepare a report. Dr. Laves, however, pointed out that the expenses of the Organisation in the first nine months of 1947 amounted to \$2,400,000 in the following proportion: 62.5% in French francs; 7.4% in sterling; 30.1% in dollars.

These figures could not be used as a basis for future years, but if the General Conference adopted the 1948 programme which provided in particular for an increase in the credits appropriated to fellowships and grants, these latter payable in dollars, it would be prudent to expect the following figures for 1948: French francs, 60%; pounds sterling, 7%; dollars, 33%.

It seemed that the contributions to be expected would be divided as follows: French francs, 23%; pounds sterling, slightly less than 25%; U. S. dollars, about 52%. Special provisions had been made in favour of Mexico because of the expenses of the General Conference.

Reverting to the proposal of the Secretariat regarding China, Professor PHOTIADES requested that it should be adopted without prolonged discussion. However, he asked that the proposal should be presented, not by the Secretariat, but by a Member of the Executive Board.

In this connection, Dr. WALKER pointed out that the Constitution of Unesco authorised the Director-General to make proposals to the Executive Board.

Presenting the point of view of his Government, Dr. CHEN YUAN recalled that in a first draft presented to the Standing Committee, the contribution of China had been provided for entirely in French francs. Why should China be called upon to pay dollars and not francs, when the franc was one of the three currencies accepted in the budget of the Organisation? The Chinese Government was willing to pay its contribution in any currency available to it, but at the present time it was very difficult for it to obtain dollars. If requested to do so, it would try to make payment of the 10% provided for in dollars without, however, understanding the reason why it should.

Professor AUGER considered that the explanation had been given by Dr. Laves when he had referred to the scientific co-operation stations in the Far East.

Mr. EISENHOWER wondered why China should be required to pay dollars when the financial statements showed contributions amounting to 52% and expenditures amounting to only 32% in dollars.

XR

From a more general point of view, Dr. EL DIWANY was of the opinion that it would be possible simply to provide for payment in Chinese currency of the part representing the expenses incurred for scientific co-operation stations in China, basing this procedure on what had just been done for Mexico.

The Deputy Director-General explained that as a matter of fact the contribution of China had originally been arranged in French francs. If, therefore, he said, China agreed to aid Unesco by paying 10% of its contribution in dollars, Unesco would willingly accept. But there was no intention of insisting on this point.

As for the proposal of Dr. El Diwany regarding possible payments in national currency, it would lead to extremely complicated accounting and would open the door to international exchange difficulties which might hamper Unesco's work. The question of exchange raised serious problems and it was important to build up the largest possible reserve in dollars.

Mr. EISENHOWER, maintaining his position, thought it unnecessary to require a difficult operation on the part of China, when the total incomings in dollars greatly exceeded the expenditures in that currency.

The Deputy Director-General explained that the Secretariat wished to avoid the necessity of converting soft currencies into hard currencies, which always involved a loss.

Professor KRUYT proposed that China should finally be authorised to pay its total contribution in French francs.

Professor PHOTIADES withdrew his motion and the proposal of Professor Kruyt was accepted.

Mr. PIERCE wished however to explain that he had agreed to this point because of the original decision providing such a method of payment for China, to which the Deputy Director-General had referred.

According to Dr. WALKER, the question had been badly stated. The Secretariat alone had considered this problem and no decision had originally been submitted to the Board.

Besides, he added, decisions regarding the currencies in which contributions would be paid should no longer be the responsibility of the Executive Board in the future, but should rest with the General Conference.

Dr. WALKER therefore suggested that the Director-General should be requested to present a detailed report to the Conference on;

1. The currency requirements;
2. Conditions under which steps taken in this field for the current year were carried out;



3. Procedure by which officials of the Organisation were authorised to convert into hard currency part of the salaries paid to them in soft currency.

This proposal was adopted.

But Dr. EL DIWANY insisted on careful consideration of the problem of part payment in national currency by governments on whose territory Unesco was to incur expenses. This was the case of Egypt, he said, and that country, which no longer belonged to the sterling block was now experiencing difficulty in obtaining hard currency.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this question should be settled by direct negotiations with the Secretariat.

Dr. WALKER stated that the Finance Committee had approved an amendment to Article 11 of the Financial Regulations, designed to entrust to the Executive Board the task of determining the currencies in which contributions should be paid. This task, which was a function of the General Conference, had in practice fallen to the Executive Board, and it was proposed to entrust it to the Board permanently. But it appeared that this solution would not be satisfactory. Therefore, Dr. Walker proposed that it be recommended that the Conference make no change in Article 11 of the Financial Regulations.

This proposal, supported by Professor PHOTIADES, was adopted.

The Meeting rose at 1:20 p.m.

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S. G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Record of the Sixth Meeting held on Tuesday,  
4 November 1947 at 3:30 p.m. at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros,  
at Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairmen: Professor P. AUGER (France)  
H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico) (Acting Chairman)

Members: Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER (United States)  
(later Dean R. McKEON)  
Professor H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P. R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies: Dr. H. F. EL DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey  
H.E. Colonel J. JONES PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ  
H.E. Mr. S. D. PIERCE (Canada) Deputy for  
M. Victor DORE  
H.E. M. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey) Deputy for  
Mr. Resat Muri GUNTEKIN  
M. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland) Deputy for  
Professor M. FALSKI

Observers: United Nations; Mr. METRAUX

Item 8 of the Agenda: Financial questions (concluded)

Mr. PIERCE brought up the question of contributions, not yet paid. On 31 August, the total amount was \$1,700,000. Was this question proper to the Executive Board?

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that it rested with the Board to decide whether the question should figure on its agenda and whether it could do anything in the matter. The Director-General had already tried everything in his power; the Secretariat had announced its intention to publish the list of countries which had paid their contributions, and of those which had failed to do so. If the Board could back up the action of the Director-General by calling the matter to the attention of the countries concerned, this could only improve matters.

Professor CARNEIRO recalled the difficulties encountered by many countries, which were obliged to have recourse to lengthy procedures in order to obtain special credits, because of the advanced date at which the total amount of the budget, and the participation of each state therein was determined. Thus it came about that this year the Executive Board had fixed this total at a very late date, and the Brazilian Government had been obliged to wait until May before asking Congress to provide special credits. In conclusion, Professor CARNEIRO said that he was happy to announce that, all formalities having been completed, the Brazilian Government was in a position to give orders to pay immediately.

Sir John MAUD remarking that the Conference would not fail to request information from the Board, suggested the insertion -- following the paragraph adopted that morning with respect to currencies -- of a resolution requesting: a) a statement of paid contributions up to what might seem the most suitable date; b) a statement of the contributions which, it was expected, would be paid; and of those which could not be collected. These statements, drawn up by the Secretariat and submitted to the Board before the end of the present session, would serve to disarm the criticisms which would inevitably follow from the absence of any precise information on this point.

Professor SOMMERFELT supported the resolution of Sir John MAUD, and wished to be informed of the proportion of contributions not yet paid.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL announced that a statement made up to 31 October 1947 had been asked for from Paris.

Sir John MAUD's resolution was adopted.

Budget Estimates for the financial year 1948  
(Document 20/2. Annexes D and E)

Dr. WALKER said that this document had not been studied by the Finance Committee, and that the Executive Board need not discuss it, since it was an annex of the Blue Book, which had not

been ready when the "Budget Estimates for the Financial year of 1948" were printed. Such being the case, it was submitted directly to the General Conference by the Director-General.

Professor PHOTIADES asked whether the document in question took account of certain questions put to the Finance Committee on 31 October last.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the budget estimates constituted a statement of accounts submitted by the Director-General, which, as was specified on page 49 of the English text, "in order to give to the General Conference a more accurate picture of the financial situation of Unesco based on the latest figures, Statements D and E (so far as expenditure is concerned) will be circulated on or about 15 October 1947." They would, therefore, have nothing to do with the Finance Committee or with the Executive Board.

Professor PHOTIADES considered that Table X did not agree with the explanations just given.

The CHAIRMAN concluded that Annexes D and E to Document 2C/2 should be forwarded directly to the General Conference.

Committee of five members to make contact with  
the Nominations Committee on the choice of Chairmen and Rapporteurs  
of Working Parties

M. de BLONAY of the Secretariat read the names proposed for the Committee of five members, the establishment of which had been requested by Sir John Maud at the second meeting of the Board: Dr. Martinez Baez, Sir John Maud, Mr. Eisenhower, Professor Chen Yuan, Professor Auger.

The CHAIRMAN stated that this Committee could meet after the close of the session of the Board, probably in the afternoon of Wednesday, 5 November.

Report of the Belem Commission on  
the Hylean Amazon

Professor CARNEIRO, announcing that item 5 of the agenda had not been completed, asked the Chairman to see that the Report of the Belem Commission could be submitted before the end of the present session of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the discussion of this item had been postponed, pending the arrival of documents which had not yet reached Mexico; he would see that the Board had the necessary time to study this question.

Draft Form of Resolution (document 2C/19-Annex 1)

Dr. WALKER recalled that the Programme Committee had been asked to draft a Form of Resolution. As there had been no time to

do this, Dr. Walker asked the Board whether it wished to take cognisance of this Form when it was completed, or whether it thought that it could be submitted directly to the General Conference.

Sir John MAUD thought that the Programme Committee could submit the Form to the General Conference on behalf of the Executive Board, especially since nothing prevented those members of the Board who did not belong to the Programme Committee from bringing their views to the attention of the Chairman of that Committee.

Professor PHOTIADES seconded the proposal of Sir John Maud, but asked that the text adopted for the Form of Resolution be transmitted to the members of the Board before being sent to the General Conference.

The proposal by Sir John MAUD, completed by that of Professor PHOTIADES, was adopted.

After M. ZANIEWICKI recalled that the agenda of the Board was still far from exhausted, the CHAIRMAN remarked that the members of the Board could not be prevented from expressing their views, nor could the time allotted to them for speaking, be limited.

#### Panel of Consultants on Finance and Administration

Dr. WALKER called attention to the fact that the Executive Board and its Finance Committee had borne heavy responsibilities during the past year; their members had had much work to do and they had been obliged to take decisions without having been in a position to consult the experts. Furthermore, Dr. Walker had proposed to the Finance Committee, and was proposing today to the Board, that a Panel of Consultants be established to deal with Finance and Administration. This was the text of his proposed resolution:

#### F. ADVISORY PANEL ON FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

1. The Advisory Panel is instituted in accordance with Article V B-10 of the Constitution, to enable the Board to consult qualified persons concerned with financial and administrative questions within its competence.

2. The Advisory Panel shall consist of not more than five experts on finance and administration nominated by Governments to be determined by special resolution of the Board.

3. The Panel shall elect its own Chairman and determine its own procedure. Its secretariat shall be provided by the Director-General.

4. The Panel shall examine and report to the Executive Board on any financial or administrative matters referred to it by resolution of the Executive Board or any of its Committees.

4 November 1947

5. It shall meet as often as may be required for this purpose, at the discretion of its Chairman, and may also, subject to any directions from the Executive Board or of the Chairman acting on behalf of the Board, undertake such consultations with the Director-General and officials designated by him as the Panel may consider necessary. The Director-General shall supply any information required by the Panel.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that the United Nations had a similar organ, which, however, was much more independent. Still he thought that the Advisory Panel should not "persecute" the Secretariat unnecessarily and that its work should be supervised by the Executive Board and more particularly by the Finance Committee.

Mr. Milton EISENHOWER asked whether it would not be possible, in order to cut down expense, to limit the number of members of this small Panel to three (instead of five). Furthermore, he wanted to be sure that the powers which under paragraph 5 were granted the Chairman of the Panel, could be exercised only following a resolution passed by the Executive Board or by one of its committees.

Dr. WALKER thought that three experts would certainly be sufficient. Furthermore, the Chairman would exercise his authority only within the limits indicated by Mr. Eisenhower.

Professor AUGER having requested some additional explanations with regard to paragraph 2, Dr. WALKER explained that the proposal was this:

The Executive Board would invite three governments to nominate one expert each; in drafting the resolution, it was thought that the Executive Board would then automatically ratify the selection made by the respective governments.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it would be better to request governments to submit several names among whom the Executive Board would then be able to choose.

Experience has shown that governments, in making such nominations, did not always appoint the most competent persons.

On the other hand, the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to draw the attention of the Board to the delays and expenses which the creation of this small Panel would involve. He enumerated the various stages which would be required before the Conference could proceed to a vote on the budget, should such a Panel be created.

- 1) The budget would have to be prepared by the Secretariat.
- 2) It would have to be submitted to the Advisory Panel.
- 3) It would have to be voted upon by the Finance Committee of the Executive Board.
- 4) It would finally have to be submitted to the Budget Subcommittee and eventually to the General Conference.

As for the expenses of creating a Panel, the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL had himself calculated that a sum of about \$20,000 would be needed for a Panel of four members, meeting for about twenty weeks. This sum, however, included neither travelling expenses (to reduce these expenses, the experts should be chosen from the European zone), nor the cost of secretarial work.

Taking account of these factors, the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed the view that in the more or less near future, the Executive Board would be compelled to modify the terms of reference of such an Advisory Panel.

Dr. WALKER expressed his willingness to make the text of his resolution more elastic. He wished, however, to reply to some of the objections put by the Deputy Director-General.

With regard to the delays, the establishment of the Unesco budget already included one stage more than that of the United Nations budget. The United Nations had no Executive Board so that their budget could be submitted directly to the Member States. Unesco's budget, on the other hand, had to be submitted to the Finance Committee and to the Executive Board before being communicated to Member States. It was obvious that the creation of such an Advisory Panel would add another stage to those already existing. Those delays, however, should not be very long. This year, the Finance Committee had not been able to acquaint itself with the budget until the very day it met, and it had had to vote on it without a chance of studying it thoroughly; had this budget been previously considered by a Panel, the Finance Committee would have had much less to worry about; and such an examination would not have taken more than a week.

The analogous panel established within the United Nations had to deal not only with the budget of the United Nations but also with that of other institutions. That was why it had to meet for about twenty weeks. For Unesco, one week would be enough. Dr. Walker reminded the Board that he had agreed to the number of panel members being limited to three. In this way the expenses would be much lower than those mentioned by the Deputy Director-General.

In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Dr. WALKER said that in his view it was not necessary to mention in the resolution that the expenses caused by such a panel would be borne by Unesco. This was self-evident, because it was the usual procedure in cases when groups of experts met at the request of the Executive Board.

The CHAIRMAN then put to a vote paragraph 2 of the resolution, amended by Dr. Walker, which read as follows:

"2. The Advisory Panel shall consist of not more than three experts on finance and administration, selected by the Board from names suggested by Governments, to be determined by special resolution of the Board. The period of appointment of the members of the panel will be determined by the Board."

This amendment was adopted.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that this proposal would have to be ratified by the General Conference. It could be submitted to the Conference with the other draft projects for new committees.

The Board then proceeded to Item 10 of the Agenda - External Relations.

M. de BLONAY of the Secretariat commented on Document Cons.Exec.4e Sess./2B - Draft Agreement with the International Labour Organisation. He explained that the draft had already been accepted by the International Labour Organisation and had been communicated to the Member States of Unesco and to U.N. No comments had been received.

Sir John MAUD, supported by Professor PHOTIADES, proposed that the Executive Board should approve the Draft Agreement.

Document Cons.Exec./4e Sess./2B was unanimously adopted.

M. de BLONAY then commented on Document Cons.Exec.4e Sess./2A - Draft Agreement with the Food and Agriculture Organisation. He explained that the draft had already been accepted by the F.A.O. and that it had been communicated to Member States of Unesco and to U.N. At the request of the F.A.O. paragraph 2 of Article III of this agreement had been worded in a slightly different way from the corresponding paragraph of the agreement with the International Labour Organisation. Since then a comment had been received from the General Secretariat of United Nations indicating that the F.A.O. was now in agreement with U.N. to have this paragraph worded as follows:

"Any such joint committee shall consist of an equal number of representatives of each Organisation; the number of representatives to be designated by each Organisation shall be agreed on between the two Organisations; the United Nations shall be invited to designate a representative to attend the meetings of the Committee; the Committee may also invite other Specialised Agencies to be represented at its meetings as may be found desirable."

This amendment was approved.

Document Cons.Exec.4e Sess./2A was adopted.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL then presented comments on the question of the relations with the Universal Postal Union and the International Refugee Organisation. The Universal Postal Union was now an agency of United Nations. The International Refugee Organisation was about to conclude its preparatory phase.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked the Board whether it agreed to give the Director-General the authority necessary to conclude agreements with these organisations similar to those proposed with the International Labour Organisation and the F.A.O.

The Executive Board indicated its agreement on this matter.



The Board then turned to Item 10b of the Agenda - Relations with Non-Governmental International Organisations. It considered Document Cens. Exec. / Com. Ong / 1<sup>re</sup> Sess / 4, drawn up by the Committee on Relationship with Non-Governmental International Organisations.

Professor AUGER, Chairman of this Committee, presented comments on the Document.

Professor SOMMERFELT pointed out that the list appearing in paragraph D, (page 10 of the English text) had been drawn up for the Second Session of the Executive Board and that it might be necessary to revise it.

Sir John MAUD said that he was willing to approve the Document provided the Board accepted the following amendment:

"It is proposed:

- "1) that contractual arrangements be reviewed each year,
- "2) that formal agreements concluded with the various organisations be individual agreements,
- "3) that all contractual arrangements made by the Director-General be reviewed by the Committee on Relationship with Non-Governmental Organisations."

Sir John explained that his reason for requesting the last clause was that it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between a "contract" and a "grant-in-aid".

Mr. EISENHOWER approved the remarks of Sir John MAUD. He also had amendments which he would like to propose but he abandoned the idea for lack of time.

Professor AUGER wished to reply to certain objections of Sir John Maud. He pointed out that the list appearing in paragraph C was contemplated as being subject to periodic revision. As for the second list, it was valid only for the current year.

In regard to contracts and grants-in-aid, they were planned as remaining in force for only limited periods of time. If the Executive Board so desired, this period could be set at one year and the Board could decide the amount of the grants-in-aid to be appropriate.

Sir John MAUD was not completely satisfied with the explanation of Professor Auger, and he wanted to see the Board adopt the formula which he had proposed.

Professor PHOTIADES proposed, on the other hand, that, in order to make the terms of reference of the Committee on Relationship with Non-Governmental Organisations consistent with the terms of reference of the other Committees, paragraph E of the document should be slightly modified. Instead of "a special meeting of the Committee may be called at the request of any of its members . . .", point 3 of paragraph E

should read: "a special meeting of the Committee may be called at the request of any two of its members.....". In addition, there should be an indication that the Committee elected its own Chairman.

The amendments proposed by Sir Jean MAUD and by Professor PHOTIADES were approved.

The whole document, with its amendments, was approved.

The Board then proceeded to consider Item 10(b)ii - Future policy concerning grants-in-aid.

The Director-General announced that Working Document 2C/75 on this subject was available, and he proposed that it should be transmitted to the General Conference.

The document in question was approved.

The Board then passed to Item 11: Third Session of the General Conference. At the suggestion of the Director-General, supported by Professor Sommerfelt, it was decided to defer consideration of this question to a later meeting of the Board.

The Board then reverted to Item 5(b) of the Agenda: Consideration of statement to be made by the Chairman of the Executive Board to the General Conference on the Board's activities.

Dr. WALKER recalled that it had been previously decided that, in presenting the report of the Director-General to the Conference, the Chairman of the Executive Board would attach a report on the Board's activities.

Dr. Walker had recently been in Brussels where he had seen M. Doré, and following this interview, he had prepared the report in question in its present form. Obviously several additions to this report would be necessary in order to include what had been done today by the Board, particularly the creation of the small Panel of Experts which had been decided upon at the beginning of the meeting.

Dr. Walker proposed that the following paragraph on this subject be inserted in the report:

"At the same time the Board proposes, in the coming year, to take action under Article V B 10 of the Constitution, and to establish a small panel of financial and administrative experts who can be consulted by the Board and its Committees from time to time as may be required."

Further, Dr. Walker explained that it had first been planned to make detailed comments on the report of the Director-General. This plan had now been abandoned. Therefore, Dr. Walker proposed that the end of the report should be modified as follows:

The penultimate paragraph would merely contain the following words:

"In all this work the Board has been greatly assisted by the Secretariat."

And the last paragraph would be replaced by the following:

" These observations on the activities of the Board since the First General Conference are intended to supplement the Director-General's Report, which is now presented to you. The Board has decided not to offer any comments on the contents of the Report on this occasion, except to express the hope that the General Conference will carefully consider the progress made in 1947 and give clear instructions as to the work to be undertaken in the year that lies ahead.

" The Programme proposals drawn up by the Board for consideration by the Conference were formulated in July 1947. They represent a further stage in the definition of Unesco's proper sphere of activities, which was begun by the Preparatory Commission, and continued by the First General Conference and by the Board when it approved the Programme for 1947. The Board does not regard this process, which is one of selecting from among the many things that Unesco could do, those that are most important and most urgent, as being yet completed. Since the Programme proposals for 1947 were drawn up, all peace-loving peoples have been greatly disturbed by the evidences of growing International tension, and the suspicion and mistrust that exist between the nations at this time. With this in mind, the Executive Board invites the General Conference to examine the proposed programme critically, in order that Unesco's resources may be concentrated upon those activities that are most closely related to Unesco's purpose, as laid down in Article I of the Constitution, namely, "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture."

" The Executive Board also expresses the hope that the Conference will find it possible to issue firm and detailed directives relating to the Programme and the Budget, in order that the Board and the Director-General may have the clearest guidance as to the activities which should be pursued in the coming year".

Sir John MAUD thought it a mistake, in paragraph 2 of the above text, to quote a few words from Article I to the exclusion of the rest of the Article. He, therefore, proposed ending the paragraph with the words "...as laid down in the Constitution".

A general discussion on this point took place, and it was finally agreed to delete the quotation and merely to say: "As laid down in Article I of the Constitution".

Dr. WALKER was of the opinion that the report of the Chairman of the Executive Board should be reviewed by several Members of the Board from the point of view of the wording. It was therefore decided to appoint a small committee for this purpose. Upon the proposal of Dr. Walker, it was agreed that it should include Dr. Walker himself and the two Vice-Chairmen.

On a motion of Dr. EL DIWANY, it was decided to include also Sir John Maud. Dean McKEON requested that Mr. Eisenhower, who had been obliged to leave the meeting today, should also be included in this group. This proposal was approved. The Committee, therefore, would consist of five members:

The two Vice-Chairmen,

Mr. Eisenhower,

Sir John Maud,

Dr. Walker.

M. de BLONAY then indicated the items which remained to be dealt with by the Executive Board, namely, items 5(d); 7(a), (b), (c), (d); 8(f); 9(d); 10(c); 12 and 13.

(The Meeting rose at 7:00 p.m.)

Cons.Exec./40 Sess./32/7  
MEXICO CITY, 5 November 1947

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to send any corrections to Mr. S.G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Report of the Seventh Meeting held on  
Wednesday, 5 November 1947, at 11 a.m., at the Escuela  
Nacional de Maestros, Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice Chairmen:

Professor P. AUGER (France) (Acting Chairman)  
H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Professor H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P.R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)  
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies:

Dr. H.F. El DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey  
H.E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. Parra-Peres  
Dean R. McKEON (United States of America)  
Deputy for Mr. Milton S. Eisenhower  
H.E. Mr. S.D. PIERCE (Canada) Deputy for  
M. Victor Doré  
H.E.M. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey) Deputy for  
M. Resat Nuri Guntekin  
M.J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland) Deputy for  
Professor M. Falski

Observers:

United Nations  
M. METRAUX

Item 10(c) of the Agenda - Relations with Germany

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting should begin with the discussion of document 2C/87 on the Implementation of Unesco's Programme in Germany.

Professor SOMMERFELT emphasised the need for Unesco to extend its activities to Germany, in order to combat the influence of Fascist theories. He admitted that the question was complicated and delicate, and expressed some doubt as to the possibility of any very extensive action in this field.

There were some excellent things in document 2C/87, he said, but it would be necessary to draw up a more definite plan. Again, some of the proposals put forward in the document were outside Unesco's scope - for example, the proposals relating to health matters, which were rather within the domain of the World Health Organisation.

As regards exchanges of persons, it was obviously advisable that the Germans should be able to become acquainted with other countries, but the situation might be difficult because of the fact that there were prejudices against the Germans in many countries. In any case, Norway was prepared to take part in the activities proposed by Unesco.

Professor Sommerfelt also thought that it should be possible to apply to other countries the methods which were to be used in Germany.

He drew attention to the work already done, in this connection, by the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education which met in London in 1945, and asked that their work should be borne in mind.

He proposed a motion to concentrate the efforts which Unesco was to make in Germany on a limited number of projects, which should aim at eradicating the influence of Fascist theories and, in particular, at eliminating the idea of the "master race".

He said that he was doubtful about the usefulness of a university set up by Unesco in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his complete agreement with Professor Sommerfelt, and said that document 2C/87 was not satisfactory in its existing form.

It would be very dangerous to set up an International University in German or Austrian territory. A centre of European civilisation would be more suitably situated either in Holland, Switzerland or the United Kingdom.

As Unesco's activities should not over-lap with those of other Agencies such as the World Health Organisation and the Food and Agriculture Organisation, he strongly supported Professor Sommerfelt's motion to limit the scope of the Organisation's activities. In this connection, he also asked that the wording of page 3 of document 20/87, regarding the relations between the Director-General and the members of the Allied Control Council, should be altered.

Professor KRUYT said, in his turn, that he was dissatisfied with the document submitted to the Board.

He stressed the necessity of achieving the re-education of the German people by effective "penetrating" action and not by setting up large institutions. Instead of founding an International University, the introduction of teachers, and even of students, from other countries into the German Universities should be encouraged. The Germans would not attend an International University, whereas they would derive great advantage from contact with others in their own universities. The office which it was proposed to set up in Berlin might be useful as a centre for direct action.

Professor Kruyt said he was in entire agreement with Professor Sommerfelt.

After mentioning that the members of the Board had had a very short time to consider this report on a particularly important subject, M. ZANIEWICKI wondered whether the document would not give the Germans the opportunity of making some undesirable criticisms of Unesco.

He proposed that the Executive Board should appoint a Committee to consider problems connected with Germany and prepare: (1) a report for submission to the Executive Board at its first meeting after the General Conference; (2) a report for all the Member States on the possibilities of activity in Germany and the means of re-educating the German people.

A committee of investigation might also be made responsible for considering how far the Germans were likely to benefit from the proposed action.

Like the previous speakers, M. Zaniewicki considered that document 20/87 could not be submitted to the General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN did not think that the Executive Board could take the responsibility of forming a new committee. He suggested that the matter should be referred to the General Conference for immediate consideration by one of its Committees, with a view to the preparation of a report before the end of the Conference. The activities to be undertaken this year would be determined after consideration of this report.

Still on the subject of document 2C/87, Dr. WALKER said that the matter had not been suitably dealt with.

On the one hand, Unesco could not overlook the problem of the re-education of Germany and the ex-enemy countries. On the other, those countries themselves were interested in Unesco. The General Conference should therefore be asked to consider means of bringing such countries once more into contact with democratic influences.

The activities so far undertaken had been intended mainly to establish contact between Unesco and the Allied authorities in Germany. At the end of the year the Secretariat had thought it necessary to entrust this duty, which had previously been undertaken by the Education Section, to the External Relations Section. This had been a good idea.

To sum up, Unesco had been able to do no more this year than make preliminary enquiries concerning this difficult question. As it was necessary to submit a document to the General Conference, an expert had been asked to prepare it during the past week. The document showed that this expert did not know much about Unesco or about present-day problems connected with education in Germany. Such problems required thorough study. Document 2C/87 could not therefore be submitted to the General Conference.

Dr. Walker proposed that the Director-General should be asked to prepare a very short report stating: (1) that the work undertaken this year had been to establish contacts; (2) that the Secretariat had given preliminary consideration to these problems; (3) that, as the Executive Board was not in a position to submit proposals in this matter, the Conference should refer it to Working Parties for more thorough consideration.

This proposal was supported by M. ZANIEWCKI and Professor VERNIERS.

The latter also pointed out that it was important to determine whether Unesco should act directly or indirectly in Germany. In his opinion, it would be better to arrange for indirect action through the Occupation authorities. For this purpose, it would first be necessary to obtain information about the activities which had already been undertaken by those authorities.

Textbooks could then be provided for German teachers. Some such work had already been undertaken by the Preparatory Commission and there were documents which could be used. Finally, it would be necessary to make German teachers and professors understand that there were other methods than absolute authority in education.



Mr. PIERCE made some comments regarding the form of document 2C/87 and, in particular, criticised the drafting of the first paragraph on page 4 and the last paragraph but one on page 8 (Annex II), the wording of which might be interpreted in an unfortunate way.

Dean McKEON emphasised the necessity for instituting negotiations with the Allied Control Authorities, who were in a position to provide information with regard to the work which could be undertaken in Germany and who were themselves anxious to establish relations with Unesco. In the American Zone, control branches dealing with educational questions and religious matters were already working. The Mass Communication Section would do well to obtain for its use the documentation already assembled by these bodies.

In conclusion, Dean McKeon said he agreed with Dr. Walker and M. Zaniewicki that the problem should be referred to the General Conference, and that the Conference, after discussion, should instruct the Executive Board and the Secretariat to establish relations with the Allied Control Authorities and to draw up a programme.

The CHAIRMAN submitted for the approval of the Board the draft resolution proposed by Dr. Walker.

The draft resolution was supported by Professor PHOTIADES.

Sir John MAUD pointed out that it had been suggested that the matter should be submitted, at the same time, to the Programme Commission and to the Budget Sub-Commission; he asked that the text should be altered so as to avoid causing the two Commissions to do the same work concurrently.

Dean McKEON asked that co-operation with the Allied Control Authorities should be mentioned in the text.

Dr. WALKER agreed to the modification of his draft to give effect to these two suggestions, and the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the following final text:

"That document 2C/87 be not transmitted to the Conference but that the Director-General prepare a brief report for the Conference covering the following points:

1. The Secretariat has taken preliminary steps to establish contact with the Allied Control Authorities and has given some consideration to the problems involved;
2. The Executive Board has not received any concrete proposals which it would feel able, at this stage, to submit to the Conference;

- " 3. The Executive Board recommends that the Conference establish a Working Party to consider the possibility of useful activities by Unesco in this field, in collaboration with the Allied Control Authorities, and to address any recommendations to the appropriate Commission. "

Dr. Walker's resolution was adopted unanimously.

Professor CARNEIRO read the report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, of which he was Chairman.

" As it was impossible for technical reasons to organise a meeting of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction either before or during the Executive Board, I, as Chairman of the Committee, have the honour to submit the resolutions which were suggested at the third meeting of the Cultural Committee as well as the following urgent matters, which, in my opinion, ought to be taken up by the Executive Board or transferred to the General Conference for consideration.

Resolutions:

1. That resident representatives of the Reconstruction Section be appointed during the current year on an experimental basis, in countries such as Poland and China;
2. That proposals be prepared urgently to increase the sum allocated for emergency purchase of scientific equipment and other materials, with the framework of the directives of the First Session of the General Conference, and provided the money can be obligated before the end of 1947, to meet urgent needs of devastated countries;
3. That the documentation published by Unesco should include:
  - (a) A systematic review of war damage to education, science and culture;
  - (b) An appreciation of the comparative needs of different devastated countries which could serve as a guide to voluntary contribution in determining the destination of their assistance;
4. That Unesco, through appropriate channels and in cooperation with Member States, intervene with manufacturers and suppliers of educational, scientific and cultural equipment, with a view to ensuring priority in the fulfilment of orders from devastated countries having regard to the documentation mentioned in paragraph 3 above; that the possibilities be also explored through appropriate channels, of obtaining donations from manufacturers in the form of samples of such equipment for destination to devastated countries;

- "5. That the organisation of the Section be strengthened by the provision of separate sections, with appropriate staff to handle relations with so-called donor countries on the one hand, and war-devastated countries on the other.

.....

I. The First Session of the General Conference provided for an Emergency Fund for the purchase of equipment, mainly scientific. In this connection the following reservation was made: "Pending the collection of donated funds with which to finance such purchases, Unesco should have a limited account with which to buy in the expectation of re-imbusement from subsequent gifts." It should be noted that the experience of the Secretariat in its dealings with voluntary agencies indicates that there is little likelihood that, as anticipated in the above directive the voluntary organisations would refund any emergency expenses incurred by Unesco. In order to facilitate the implementation of the Committee's resolution (2) stated above, and to remove the possibility that funds available for essential emergency purchases provided by the directive of the First Session of the General Conference should be delayed awaiting the repayment of funds, it is recommended that the Second Session of the General Conference amend the above statement by deleting the reference to purchases "in the expectation of re-imbusement from subsequent gifts."

II. Reference Resolutions 3 and 5 and taking into account that the Section is understaffed and therefore inadequate in strength to handle the supplementary work entailed by these two resolutions, I suggest that the existing staff be strengthened and that resident representatives be appointed for Eastern Europe and China.

III. The Committee for Cultural Reconstruction at its last meeting expressed its opinion as to the desirability of transferring from Chapter II - \$23,000; Chapter III - \$12,000 : making a total of \$35,000. This amount to be transferred to Chapter IV, which together with the unexpended \$10,000 already in Chapter IV will provide for a total amount of \$45,000 for the purchase of educational and other equipment to cover reconstruction needs. At the same time an inquiry was made throughout the Sections of the Secretariat as to the state of their respective unexpended balances and it was found that the sum of \$175,000 could be made available for cultural relief in the war-devastated countries. This makes a total of \$210,000 unexpended balance.

IV. As for the relations between Unesco, on the one hand, and ICKF and UNAC, on the other, and in accordance with the documentation prepared by the Unesco Secretariat, it will be seen that Unesco has negotiated and continues negotiations to achieve the co-ordination of the activities of the two agencies of the United Nations. Unfortunately until now it has been impossible to co-ordinate relations on an international level and I therefore submit the following recommendations:

- a. Unesco Member States be urged to consider the cultural needs of children when making contributions to ICEF.
- b. An agreement be drawn up as soon as possible between Unesco and ICEF and UNAC whereby Unesco shall receive a reasonable proportion of all funds raised by the UNAC.
- c. The Canadian Campaign continue through Unesco as planned by the Canadian Council for Reconstruction.
- d. That funds collected through UNAC sponsored campaigns held in respective countries be divided between Unesco and ICEF in accordance with a reasonable and pre-determined ratio.

V. The Committee for Cultural Reconstruction submits the following resolution to the Executive Board with the request that it be forwarded for consideration to the General Conference:

The General Conference invites all Member States, their national Commissions or co-operating bodies, on the one hand, and the Unesco Secretariat, on the other, to study, in close collaboration with the International Postal Union, the possibilities of issuing, simultaneously in all Member States, a special postage stamp bearing a surcharge, the proceeds of the surcharge to be given to the Unesco Reconstruction Fund.

VI. The Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board received from the Minister of Public Instruction of the Spanish Republic a request that the needs of Spanish children and students in exile be included in the reconstruction activities of the Unesco Secretariat. In view of the complexity of this problem I wish to submit this to the Executive Board for their discussion and decision.

He wished Unesco the greatest success in the task allotted to it, and, speaking as a member of the Executive Board, he recommended the Board to take note of this report and send it to the General Conference without comment.

Dr. WALKER asked that the words "and not having had the opportunity to consider the policies involved" should be added to Professor Carneiro's proposal. The Secretariat would have to add clarifications on the financial side of the question.

Professor VERNIERS thought that the sale of an international stamp was an excellent idea, and quoted as an example the Bureau of Education in Geneva, which derived 80% of its income from the

M. ZANIEWICKI asked whether anything had yet been done by the Secretariat regarding the Reconstruction Fund, which had been mentioned during the First Session of the General Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the Conference had only suggested the establishment of such a fund, but had adopted no formal resolution. He requested M. Drzewieski to give a few explanations on the subject.

M. DRZEWIESKI explained that the European Economic Council had asked Professor Moisy to study all the pertinent documents in order to give them greater weight. The book setting forth the needs of the devastated countries would appear the following week; it would be the first document submitted to the European Economic Council.

Professor PHOTIADES asked that Dr. Carneiro's report should be given a number in order to facilitate document classification.

The CHAIRMAN suggested No. 7B, and put to the vote the forwarding of the report to the General Conference. The meeting agreed unanimously to refer the report to the General Conference, with Dr. Walker's amendment.

Speaking on Item 7(c) of the Agenda, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the additions proposed to the 1948 Programme were: (1) a report on copyright, (2) a report on philosophy and the humanities, and (3) the Hylean Amazon Project. He expressed regret that the documents on the first two of the above-mentioned subjects had not yet arrived, and said that Professor Carneiro had an announcement to make regarding the third. As soon as the documents in question arrived, they would be transmitted to the appropriate Working Parties.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the addition of the words "The Executive Board not having had the opportunity to consider the policies involved" whenever a document was forwarded without comments.

In reply to Sir John Maud, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that these projects were included in the Programme and that the documents in question gave details concerning them.

Dean MCKEON asked for the documents to be referred to the Programme and Budget Commission for the necessary modifications.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that, since these projects were not covered by the budget, they would have to be submitted to the General Conference with the annotation suggested by the Chairman.

Professor CARNEIRO, before discussing the substance of the question, wished to raise a point of procedure which, in his opinion, was of

The Hylean Amazon Project was one of the oldest projects of Unesco; it had been adopted unanimously by the First Session of the General Conference after having been discussed as far back as June 1946. Professor Carneiro quoted the relevant resolution of the Science Sub-Committee. The General Conference had instructed the Executive Board to give the Secretariat all the necessary directives for the implementation of this project. The Secretariat, however, prepared a report before receiving these directives.

At the Inter-governmental Conference of Belem, the delegates of the ten governments there represented had asked the Executive Board to consider their report and submit it to the General Conference. These ten Member States wanted the other Member States to be informed of their wish. He therefore thought that the document prepared by the Secretariat should be cancelled.

He raised this question of principle, not to find fault with the Secretariat, with which he always co-operated with pleasure, but because it involved the respect due to the Member States and the authority of the Executive Board.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL apologised to the Board for the omission of this item from the Agenda. The report of the Committee, No.2C/18, had been distributed on 26 September, and it was on the basis of this report that the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Committee, had drawn up document 2C/72, to which the above-mentioned report would be attached. Professor Carneiro had spoken of "accredited delegates", but he seemed to remember that they had not been empowered particularly as regards financial questions, and that they had not given any specific directives concerning the organisation and financing of the Institute.

He thought it would be best to refer the two documents to the Programme and Budget Commission, as well as to the appropriate Working Parties, with a note to the effect that the Executive Board had not had the opportunity to examine their substance.

Professor CARNEIRO noted that the delegates to the Conference of Belem had been appointed by their governments. The task entrusted to them had been to draw up the programme of work of the Institute to be established in accordance with the resolution adopted by the General Conference.

The President of the Belem Conference had laid down in a letter the general lines of the project for the year 1948, and the governments concerned could not assume financial obligations before this project had been approved by the General Conference. It was certain that the South American delegates would protest if the report drawn up by the Secretariat before the Executive Board had been consulted were adopted.

Professor PHOTIADES felt that the delegates to the Belem Conference, even if they had full powers, were not obliged to discuss the financial questions involved, and that the legal aspect of this rather complex problem should be examined thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the rather late hour would not permit such a discussion. He therefore suggested that the Executive Board should refer both the report of the Belem Conference and the report drawn up by the Secretariat - which was obviously based on the former - to the General Conference, without expressing a definite opinion on them.

Professor CARNEIRO stated that such a procedure would not be in conformity with the resolution adopted by the General Conference, which had decided merely to refer its report to the Executive Board. The drafting of a report by the Secretariat before receiving the necessary directives from the Executive Board was, in his opinion, a mistake which needed correcting. This was not a question of the Hylean Amazon Project, nor of any other question of substance; it was a question of form and of the respect due to the resolutions of the General Conference.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ stated that he was in complete agreement with Professor Carneiro on this question of procedure. On the previous day, as Chairman of the meeting, he had promised Professor Carneiro that the Board would find time to discuss the question which he had raised. He therefore asked the Board to fulfil his promise, for he thought it impossible to refuse a request from one of the members particularly concerned for the discussion of such an important question. In such circumstances it would be almost unseemly to claim that the Board had not had time to read the report; this would be an insult to all the South American delegates.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that an evening meeting should be held for this debate.

Dr. El DIWANY, as a member of the Executive Board, deeply regretted the misunderstanding which had provoked such a strong re-action from his South American colleagues. He reminded the meeting that Unesco could do nothing without previous authorisation from the countries concerned. These countries had met at Belem and had promised their help; they should be thanked. In order to solve the question raised by Professor Carneiro he proposed that a plenary meeting of the Executive Board should be held that afternoon, before the Committees met, so as to avoid an evening meeting.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a plenary meeting should be held at 5.30 p.m. and that the secret meeting should be held in the evening.

Dr. WALKER reminded the Board that some of its members would be occupied at the meeting of the Programme Commission, which was to prepare the draft programme for submission to the General Conference.

Cons.Exec./4e Sess./SR/7 - page 12  
5 November 1947

Professor CARNEIRO hoped that all the members of the Board would be present and thought that the Board should have priority over any of the Committees which might be meeting in the evening.

The CHAIRMAN, after consulting the other members of the Board, proposed that a plenary meeting should be held at 5.15 p.m., his proposal was adopted.

(The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.)



Cons. Exec./4e Sess./S.R. 8  
MEXICO CITY, 5 November 1947

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S. G. GEBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Minutes of the Eighth Meeting held on Wednesday, 5 November 1947,  
at 5.45 p.m. at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros, Mexico City,  
Mexico.

Present:

Vice Chairmen: Professor P. AUGER (France), Chairman of the  
Meeting  
H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Professor H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John P. R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies:

Dr. H. F. EL DIWANY (Egypt), Deputy for H.E.  
Shafik GHORBAL Bey  
H.E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ  
Dean McKEON (United States), Deputy for  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER  
H.E. Mr. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey), Deputy for  
Mr. Resat Nuri GUNTEKIN  
M. J. ZANIEWICKI (Poland), Deputy for  
Professor M. FALSKI

Observers:

United Nations: M. METRAUX  
International Labour Organisation:  
Dr. E. JIMENEZ

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Board was now meeting to consider the report of the International Commission for the Hylean Amazon Institute; the Executive Board had to submit to the Conference its comments on this report.

The Chairman then called upon Professor Carneiro.

Professor CARNEIRO wished to explain the attitude he had assumed at the morning meeting. It was obvious that the Hylean Amazon Project could not become the cause of controversy between the Secretariat and the Executive Board. From the outset, the Executive Board had numbered this question among its four big projects. The Secretariat had made every effort to put this project into effect. Continuous collaboration had existed between the Secretariat and the Executive Board; and Professor Carneiro declared that he had not the slightest intention of criticising the Secretariat; he had merely protested against the infringement of the Rules by the latter in claiming to submit Document 20/72 directly to the Conference. He had requested that the Secretariat abandon the idea of submitting this document, and he now asked the Executive Board to study the report of the Belem Commission, so as to allow the comments of the Board on this report to be forwarded to the Conference.

Professor Carneiro next pointed out the importance of the project under discussion. It involved the collaboration of an entire group of nations in developing an immense territory. This did not concern only those countries bordering upon the Hylean Amazon. North America, as well as the three European Countries of South America, namely French Guiana, British Guiana and Dutch Guiana, were also interested in this project. It therefore took on the aspect of an international enterprise, in which the ten countries which had been represented at the meeting recently held at Belem, should be represented.

The speaker pointed out that it was not proposed that Unesco should finance the proposed Institute. Unesco was merely to provide certain sums with a view to creating and launching this Institute, which would then function at the expense of the Governments concerned.

Professor Carneiro recommended that during 1948, this Hylean Amazon project, which had cost Unesco so little during 1947, should continue to hold the same position among the activities of the Organisation as it held when it was first listed among Unesco's four big projects.

It was perhaps premature to fix, here and now, the sum that would have to be expended by Unesco on this project during 1948. He would, however, like a discussion on the sum of \$100,000. He did not consider this sum too great for a project of this scope.

In point of fact, if the three other big projects were considered, it would be found that the following amounts had been provided:

\$147,000 for Fundamental Education  
\$314,000 for Education for International Understanding  
\$427,000 for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation

Moreover, when consideration was given to the fact that for the Bureau of Personnel alone, the budget provided the sum of \$1,855,000, the amount of \$100,000 proposed for the Hylean Amazon Institute could not be deemed excessive.

(The Deputy Director-General, after the meeting, would point out that the sum of \$1,855,000 mentioned by Professor Carneiro did not cover the expenses of Bureau of Personnel alone; it included allowances, travelling expenses, initial recruitment expenses, etc.----- The amount allotted to cover the expense of the Bureau of Personnel, proper, was lower by far.)

In conclusion, Professor Carneiro asked the Executive Board to transmit the report of the Belem Commission (Document 2C/18) to the Conference, with or without comments.

M. J. ZANIEWICKI approved the comments by Professor Carneiro. He stressed the rich resources of the territory comprising the Hylean Amazon. Unesco had the opportunity of creating a new civilisation in that area. It would be a great honour for Unesco to inaugurate such a project. The report of the Belem Commission should therefore certainly be laid before the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the substance of the question should be studied without delay. The Secretariat had drawn up a report on the Hylean Amazon project (Document 2C/72). Should it be decided not to transmit this document to the Conference, it might at least serve as a basis on which to study the report of the Belem Commission.

He considered that there were three main points to be discussed:

1. What will be the exact role of Unesco in the proposed Institute? Shall Unesco exert direct control over the Institute, or shall it merely serve in an advisory capacity?
2. Should a second meeting of the International Commission be recommended?
3. Might a sum of \$100,000 be planned for in the Unesco budget for 1948, to be devoted to this project?

Professor CARNEIRO, in reply to the first point raised by

the Chairman, named the proposal which he wished the Executive Board to approve. It ran as follows:

"The Executive Board recommends that Unesco shall assume the financial administration of the Institute, and that it shall, in that capacity, receive and disburse funds on the latter's behalf."

This proposal, moreover, was modelled upon that adopted by the Pan-American Commission with respect to the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

Further, Professor Carneiro hoped that the Executive Board would study the suggestions contained in the report which he himself had drawn up, rather than the three points outlined by the Chairman. These suggestions were:

- 1) that the Hylean Amazon Institute be retained on the 1948 Unesco programme and that it should remain in the same category as in 1947;
- 2) that Unesco should contribute the sum of \$100,000, to be devoted to preliminary research necessary to the creation of the Hylean Amazon Institute;
- 3) that the Director-General should appoint a Director for the Hylean Amazon Project;
- 4) that the Council of the Institute, which was recommended by the Belem Conference, be established in the early part of 1948, in agreement with the governments and international organisations concerned;
- 5) that the Council prepare in 1948 a draft Convention, codifying the permanent statutes of the Hylean Amazon Institute, which draft would be submitted by Unesco to the governments and international organisations concerned in its creation; and that it should give formal assurances with respect to the minimum contribution to be paid by each such nation and organisation;
- 6) that Unesco should assume the financial administration of the International Hylean Amazon Institute, following its creation; and that, in this capacity it should receive and disburse the Institute's funds.

Finally, in reply to a brief statement by M. El DIWANY, Professor CARNEIRO indicated that the Hylean Amazon project did not emanate from the Secretariat. Initiative in this matter was taken by the Science Committee of the Preparatory Commission, and it was the Executive Board which placed this project among the four big projects of Unesco.

Sir John MAUD was of opinion that the Executive Board was now in a rather difficult position; it had available part of the Belem Report, which had been drawn up very carefully, but which contained no definite proposal on how to obtain the necessary funds, etc.; in addition, it had available the reports of the Secretariat and finally, the document of Professor Carneiro containing very detailed suggestions on certain matters.

Sir John considered it difficult to proceed to a vote on this Hylean Amazon project before the question had been carefully studied by the Conference. He therefore thought that the best procedure would be to take note of the three reports in question and transmit them to the General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if it merely forwarded the three documents to the Conference without changing their wording, the Executive Board would, in view of the way in which the texts were worded, appear to have approved a number of points on which, in reality, it had taken no decision. He was therefore of the opinion that there were two possible procedures: either to transmit the three documents to the Conference with comments attached, or to appoint a small committee to review these documents from the standpoint of wording.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL began by apologising for the mistake made by the Secretariat in preparing Document 2C/72 for the Conference instead of for the Executive Board.

He considered that the best procedure to follow would be to set up a small committee to review the three documents which it was proposed to submit to the Conference.

The Director-General then recalled what had been said regarding the Hylean Amazon in Document Unesco/Prog.1/1947 (Rev.). This document contained the following paragraph:

"Unesco will invite the governments of the countries of the region (Brazil, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, French Guiana, British Guiana and Surinam) and the United States, together with other Specialised Agencies of UN, to form an International Scientific Commission to investigate on the spot the setting up of an International Institute of the Hylean Amazon, i.e., a centre for co-operative work on all scientific aspects of the equatorial forest zone; including both immediate and long-term plans, the site of the centre, financial arrangements, and the

framing of a draft agreement between the co-operating governments and Unesco."

The Director-General said that, as provided in the above text, an International Scientific Commission had met in Belem in 1947. But in his opinion a second meeting of this Commission would be necessary.

Finally, he said that the Executive Board must decide on the role to be played by Unesco in the Hylean Amazon Institute. Would Unesco really direct this Institute? Would it merely undertake to set it up? Or -- and this was the solution which the Director-General would like to see adopted -- would Unesco's role be to encourage the establishment of a semi-autonomous Institute, over which it would retain a certain measure of control? If this last solution were adopted, Unesco would have to assume certain responsibilities, and the Institute would have to submit to it periodic reports on its activities.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Board that two suggestions had been offered. It had been proposed:

- that the Board transmit to the Conference the three documents referred to, with its comments attached,
- or that the Board have these documents reviewed by a Committee and then forward them to the General Conference.

Professor PHOTIADES favoured the second proposal.

On the contrary, Dean McKEON was in favour of the first proposal. He believed that setting up a committee would take a great deal of time, especially as this committee could not itself take decisions on certain questions of general policy, and could only make proposals which would then have to be ratified by the Executive Board.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that ratification by the Executive Board would be necessary. But perhaps this was one of the questions which could be settled during the meetings which the Executive Board planned to hold during the Conference.

If this procedure were not adopted, the Working Party of the Conference would have to make the decisions in question. This might involve a certain danger.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ also supported the idea of a committee. It was his opinion that, after deciding to place the Hylean Amazon scheme among the four big Unesco projects, the Executive Board could not dissociate itself from the question to the point of referring the documents to the Conference without having taken the trouble to study, co-ordinate and review them.

Dr. WALKER favoured the first proposal. According to the

Constitution of Unesco, the General Conference had sole authority to determine the general policy of the organisation and to make decisions on any programme prepared by the Executive Board.

In view of the fact that the Hylean Amazon project had been one of the big Unesco projects in 1947 and since Professor Carneiro had done a lot of work in connection with this project on behalf of the Executive Board, Dr. Walker considered that the Board might adopt a resolution worded as follows:

"That the report of the Hylean Amazon Commission regarding one of the big Unesco projects for 1947 be transmitted to the Conference by the Executive Board with the documents submitted to the Board by Professor Carneiro.

"The Board recommends that the Conference attach the same importance to the study of the proposals formulated in these texts as to the programme drawn up by the Board and the budget proposed by the Director-General.

"In addition, the Board authorises the Director-General to present his point of view regarding these proposals to the Conference."

Professor CARNEIRO seconded Dr. Walker's proposal.

H.E. Mr S.D. PIERCE pointed out that in transmitting to the Conference the three documents referred to in the resolution of Dr. Walker, it might be necessary to indicate that the Executive Board had not had time to consider them and therefore could not express any opinion regarding the proposals they contained.

Professor PHOTIADES still favoured setting up a committee to review the documents. In this connection he recalled what was said in the programme of Unesco in 1948 (Chapter II.D.5.b., page 18 of the English text):

"In 1948 Unesco proposes to .... take appropriate action to support the creation of a research centre or institute for tropical life and resources in the Hylean Amazon, in the light of a supplementary report to be submitted to the Second Session of the General Conference upon the meetings of the International Commission at Belem, Brazil, in August, 1947."

According to this text the Executive Board should, in the opinion of Professor Photiades, submit to the Conference a finished report.

Sir John MAUD pointed out that the text cited was contained in the programme of Unesco in 1948, which had not yet been accepted by the Conference. He was of the opinion that, in order to avoid all ambiguity, the Board could, in the resolution of Dr. Walker, add after the words "...by Professor Carneiro", the phrase "without any expression of opinion by the Board regarding these documents".

For the sake of greater clearness still, Dr. WALKER proposed that the second paragraph of his resolution should be replaced by the following:

"The Executive Board has been unable to make a detailed study of the proposals contained in this document, but it recommends that the Conference consider them on a par with the programme drawn up by the Board and the budget proposed by the Director-General."

Sir John MAUD withdrew the amendment he had proposed and supported the text suggested by Dr. Walker.

The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Board of the two proposals before them: on the one hand the resolution proposed by Dr. Walker, on the other hand, the proposal to appoint a committee. The second proposal would be discussed if Dr. Walker's resolution were not adopted.

The Chairman put Dr. Walker's resolution to a vote, with the amendment just made by Dr. Walker himself.

This resolution, with the amendment, was adopted.

(The Meeting rose at 7:15 p.m.)



Cons. Exec. / 4th Sess. / 1947  
MEXICO CITY, 9 November 1947

(The members of the Executive Board are requested to send any corrections to Mr. S. G. GIBELT, Room 14, as soon as possible.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional Summary Report of the Ninth Meeting held on Wednesday, 5 November 1947, at 9:30 p.m. at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros, Mexico City, Mexico.

Present:

Vice-Chairmen: Professor P. AUGER (France)  
H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)  
(Acting Chairman)

Members: Professor P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)  
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)  
Sir John P. R. MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)  
Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)  
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)  
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies: Dr. H. F. EL DIWANY (Egypt) Deputy for  
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey  
  
M. P. N. KIRPAL (India) Deputy for  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN  
  
Dean R. McKEON (United States) Deputy for  
Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER  
  
H.E. Colonel J. JONES-PARRA (Venezuela)  
Deputy for H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PARRA  
  
H.E. M. Vedit UZGOREN (Turkey)  
Deputy for H. R. N. GUNTEHIN

Item 7(a) of the Agenda: Report of the Programme Committee

(Doc. Cons. Exec./Com. Prog./2<sup>o</sup> Sess./16)

Dr. WALKER submitted the Report of the Committee, and on the proposal of Sir John MAUD, seconded by Professor SOMMERFELT, the Report was adopted.

Item 7(d) of the Agenda: Report of the Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction (T.I.C.E.R.)

Mr. de BLONAY (Secretariat) submitted to the Board the resolutions adopted last September by T.I.C.E.R.

On the proposal of Dean McKEON the Report was referred to the Conference without the Board having had the time to pronounce on its contents.

Item 8(f) of the Agenda: transfers within the 1947 budget

(Doc. Cons. Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./20)

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL submitted the document, pointing out that it contained only two items (Reconstruction and Exchange of Persons); exact documentation not yet being available on the remaining items, they would be submitted to the Board at its next sitting, after the close of the General Conference. The Board was thus called upon to decide whether the two transfers for Reconstruction and Exchange of Persons were in accordance with the directives laid down for 1947 and whether the Director-General should be authorised to effect them.

a) Reconstruction. The matter under consideration was the application of inactive funds to reconstruction. The details of these transfers were given on page 3 of the document Cons. Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./20.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there did not exist a proposed distribution for supplies to be purchased, similar to that given in the second part for Fellowships.

Professor PHOTIADES felt that the proposals of the Secretariat were very wise because they put order into the Organisation's budget. He requested once more that the term "Rehabilitation" be deleted in the "Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Committee" in order to avoid any confusion between the Committee for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation in Education, Science and Culture mentioned on page 1 and the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction mentioned on page 3.

Dr. WALKER felt that the document as a whole was interesting; but it had not been submitted to the Board for approval. However, Dr. Walker wanted to point out, with reference to the remark made at the top of page 2, that the Board had not been

5 November 1947

submitted to the Board for approval. However, Dr. Walker wanted to point out, with reference to the remark made at the top of page 2, that the Board had never been requested to consider the possible refunding of purchases effected. Furthermore, he did not recall that the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction had "widened the concept of scientific and technological equipment" as it had been specified at the end of paragraph 2 on page 2.

Dr. Walker believed that the Board could only draw the attention of the General Conference to the possibility of allocating available funds for such purchases, on the assumption that all contributions for 1947 could be collected; a decision on this matter should be taken by the General Conference and not by the Executive Board.

Sir John MAUD disagreed; he stated that it was a question of a transfer within a budget appropriated by the Executive Board and that it was therefore within the competence of the latter to modify appropriations within that budget. For this reason Document 20 should not be referred to the General Conference, which was not concerned with the question of transfers within the budget. Therefore, Sir John Maud suggested the Board should decide that the object of the proposed transfer was in accordance with the directives laid down for 1947.

Dean McKEON pointed out that the Board had already submitted to the Conference two Reports (Committee for Cultural Reconstruction and T.I.C.E.R.), containing a reference to "directives" without clarifying the precise meaning of those "directives". It had been established that Unesco was not a distribution agency but that it acted through the intermediary of existing organisations. Therefore, Dean McKeon suggested that the Board should refer the three documents (Report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, Report of the T.I.C.E.R. and Cons.Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./20) to the General Conference, drawing the attention of the Conference to the fact that refundable purchases represented a departure from previous policy. Contrary to Sir John Maud's liberal interpretation, Dean McKeon felt that it was rather difficult to adopt a new attitude on the eve of the General Conference.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the Report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, which Professor Brasiro had read to the Board at its afternoon meeting, dealt with the programme for 1947, as well as with that of 1948, while the measure envisaged by Document 20 referred to 1947 only.

The CHAIRMAN, stating that they were dealing with a financial statement for 1947, for which a transfer was proposed to balance the budget, felt that the argument of the Deputy Director-General was somewhat weak.

Professor PHOTIADES pointed out that during the preparatory period Unesco had done nothing for the war-devastated countries. The hour was a very grave one and the eyes of the world were on Unesco. It was high time that Unesco introduced something like

the Marshall plan in the field of intellectual culture; otherwise it would have failed in its mission.

Professor CARNEIRO, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, pointed out that this was an exceptional measure and that Unesco's policy would by no means be changed if action were taken in favour of war-devastated countries. The use of a sum made available in 1947, as a result of savings made and of certain plans not being put into effect, did not create a precedent, because such a possibility was not likely to repeat itself in the future. Professor Carneiro was wondering whether the Board could not take into account the exceptional character of the measure proposed in order to accept the transfer in favour of war-devastated countries whose doubts with regard to Unesco's contribution toward the restoration of their education were growing every day; this transfer would justify the sacrifices which the war-devastated countries had accepted to become members of Unesco.

The CHAIRMAN put to a vote Sir John Maud's proposal, which was seconded by Dr. Opocensky.

Dr. WALKER agreed to this proposal but requested that a paragraph be inserted in the Financial Report explaining the reasons for using up those funds.

Sir John MAUD therefore added the following words to his Resolution: "this transfer should be mentioned in the Board's Report on financial and administrative matters to be submitted to the Conference".

The proposal thus amended was adopted.

Professor PHOTIADES pointed out that he had abstained from voting, because he did not want to appear importunate.

(b) Exchange of Persons

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL presented the part of document Cons. Exec./20 concerning the transfer of funds for the Exchange of Persons.

Dr. WALKER proposed that the Board should approve the proposed transfer on condition that mention was made of the matter in the Report on Financial and Administrative questions and that the scale of fellowships should be settled by joint agreement, in view of the varying cost of living in different countries.

This proposition was adopted unanimously.

Dr. WALKER requested that the documents prepared and submitted by the Director-General for the Working Parties should be considered as "working documents", since the Board had not had time to examine them, still less to approve them.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL raised the question whether these documents would also be submitted to the Commissions of the General Conference.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that the documents transmitted to Working Parties were transmitted as technical documents; but the forwarding of these documents to the Commissions of the Conference would engage Unesco's responsibility. It would therefore be useful to have details about the documents which it was intended to submit to the Commissions.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL gave information on this point and promised to supply the members of the Board with a list of the documents to be put before the Commissions.

Dr. WALKER had no objection to the documents being transmitted by the Director-General provided it was made quite clear that the Board had not had time to pronounce on their contents.

The meeting then went into secret session to examine certain financial questions.

Dr. WALKER submitted to the Executive Board the Report of the Finance Committee on the Auditors' Report concerning the accounts of the Preparatory Commission (document Cons.Exec./Com. Fin./2<sup>e</sup> Sess./4). Speaking for himself, Dr. Walker wished to make reservations concerning two points to which attention had not been drawn by the Auditors:

(1) The Secretariat had applied the exchange rate of 1=120 French francs, without the authorisation of the Board; but this was not the exact exchange rate and consequently there was a total difference of \$60,000 in the accounts. The Secretariat said that the purchase of conversion tables would have cost more than the saving they would have made possible, which Dr. Walker doubted.

(2) A sum of \$70,000 had been employed to make good the Restaurant deficit; for this, the precedent of the Preparatory Commission had been followed without reference to the Board. Dr. Walker wished to know whether this transfer had any connection with the Cashier's defalcations.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that full information on the two points mentioned by Dr. Walker was in course of preparation. Part of the \$70,000 had served to make good the Cashier's defalcations (1,200,000 French francs) and the remainder to repay the loans made to the Restaurant during the period of the Preparatory Commission. He could give an assurance that in future the Financial Regulations would be strictly applied.

Professor PHOTIADES wished to pay a tribute to the Deputy Director-General, M. Peissel and Mr. Gagliotti who had succeeded in restoring partial order to a chaotic financial situation; without their untiring efforts the situation would have

been very much worse than it now was. Professor Photiades hoped that the reports in question would not get into the hands of either the Press or Unesco's enemies.

Sir John MAUD supported the previous remarks and proposed that document Cons.Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./4 should be adopted as the conclusion of the Board's Report to the General Conference on Finance and Administration.

This proposal, seconded by Professor CARNEIRO, was adopted.

Sir John MAUD reminded the Board that the Report on Finance and Administration should also include:

- (1) a statement of contributions received from Member States;
- (2) the revised text of the Financial Regulations, which the Board had not yet had time to consider (document 7, with the amendments proposed by Dr. Walker).

Document 7 so amended was adopted.

Dr. WALKER proposed that States becoming Members of Unesco during the course of the year should pay a percentage contribution in accordance with the scale fixed for 1948.

Adopted.

"Proposals regarding the organisation of the work of the Second Session of the General Conference submitted by the Secretariat" (Doc.2C/19A).

The text previously proposed by Dr. Walker was approved with several modifications of detail.

Dr. WALKER asked if the Draft Form of Resolution given in Annex 1, page 2 and revised in accordance with the ideas expressed by Mr. Eisenhower could be submitted to the Conference. He also wished to insert a few words of explanation before the penultimate paragraph of Doc. 2C/19A.

Sir John MAUD proposed that, since the Board had not time to discuss them, Dr. Walker's suggestions should be accepted; any members of the Board who might have improvements to propose would be able to do so in the General Conference without destroying the Board's unanimity.

Adopted.

Dr. OPOCENSKY having asked if the Auditors' Report would be forwarded to the General Conference, the CHAIRMAN said that it would be attached to the Final Report of the Finance Committee (Cons.Exec./Com. Fin/4<sup>e</sup> Sess./4).

The Agenda having been exhausted, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Session was not however closed and that it would be continued at a date to be fixed later.

The Meeting rose at 11:40 p.m.

Cons. Rec./4<sup>e</sup> Sess./SR/10  
MEXICO CITY, 15 November 1947

(Members of the Executive Board are asked to send any corrections, as soon as possible, to Mr. G. G. ROBERTS, Room 14.)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fourth Session

Provisional summary report of the Tenth Meeting held at 3 p.m. on Saturday 15 November 1947 at the Escuela Nacional de Maestros, Mexico City.

NOTE:

Vice-Chairman:

M. P. AUGER (France)  
Dr. M. MARTINEZ BALDI (Mexico)  
(Chairman of the Meeting)

Members:

Prof. P. de BEAUCOURT BRANCO (Brazil)  
Dr. Yuan CHEN (China)  
Mr. Milton S. Eisenhower (United States of America)  
Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)  
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)  
H.E. Dr. Jan CROSTSKY (Czechoslovakia)  
Prof. A. FHOPIADES (Greece)  
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)  
Dr. SCHJERFELT (Norway)  
M. L. VERNIER (Belgium)  
Dr. E. R. MALKIN (Australia)

Deputies:

H.E. Dr. J. JONAS FARFA (Venezuela)  
(Deputy for H.E. Dr. Farfa)  
H.E. Mr. S. D. HURGE (Canada)  
(Deputy for H.E. Mr. Victor)  
H.E. M. Vedit JOGREN (Turkey)  
(Deputy for M. A. N. GUNTERIN)  
M. J. PANIEMICKI (Poland)  
(Deputy for Professor M. PANIEMICKI)

Observer:

M. METRAUX (United Nations)



In the absence of M. UJAL, who should have acted as Chairman, Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ took the chair and opened the meeting.

He conveyed the apologies of M. UJAL, who was unable to be present at the meeting as he was confined to bed, and proposed that a message of sympathy should be sent to him. This suggestion was unanimously approved.

The Secretary read a letter from Professor Falaki, who had been detained in Paris, and had appointed M. Falaki as his deputy on the Executive Board. M. Falaki said how well pleased he had been when reading the documents published by Unesco for the General Conference, and how interesting he thought the programme proposed for 1948: he asked to be kept informed of the progress of Unesco's work, especially in the field of education.

The CHAIRMAN also announced that Sir John Radhakrishnan would be obliged to leave Mexico City in the near future, and would delegate his duties to Professor Brown, and said how sorry all the members would be at his departure.

He then introduced discussion of the first item on the agenda: Opinion of the Executive Board on the proposals in the Programme for 1948.

Several members of the delegations had been anxious to have details about the part played by the Executive Board in the preparation of Unesco's programme for 1948, and had asked Dr. Martinez Baez to make a statement on this matter. He had thought it advisable to consult the members of the Executive Board, meeting together.

Professor (HUTCHINSON) was surprised that such a question had been raised, as the terms of the Constitution seemed to him perfectly clear on this subject, particularly Article IV.B.2, where it was specified that the programme should be prepared by the Executive Board.

He added that the fact that the Board had been criticised for making no comments on the programme, was a fact that it was held to be responsible for the programme.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ also expressed surprise, because, from Article IV.B.2, of the Unesco Constitution, it seemed to embody the comments of the Chairman of the Executive Board in the Director-General's report for 1947, clearly inviting the General Conference to consider and discuss the programme proposed for 1948. It, therefore, seemed to him that the question had been settled.

Sir John RADHAKRISHNAN thought that the discussion showed that the Executive Board should continue to act as it had done in the past. He added, however, that, the following year it would be necessary to ensure that the nature of the reports submitted to the General Conference was more clearly defined.

as well as the way in which the Conference had been organised and the reasons for its organisation on those lines. It would, also, be preferable that the last meeting of the Executive Board before the Conference, should not be held immediately before the opening.

He proposed a resolution in the following terms:

"The Executive Board does not consider that any further statement need be made on its behalf to the General Conference, regarding its responsibility for the 1948 Programme proposals."

This resolution was supported by Professor CARNEIRO.

Dr. SOMMERFELT also agreed with this resolution. He asked further that a time-table of work for the Executive Board should be drawn up in advance, in 1948; this would make it easier for the members of the Board to be present at the meetings.

Professor PHOTIADES considered that the resolution submitted by Sir John Maud was very diplomatic and well-phrased, but inadequate.

He was insistent that the Programme proposed for 1948 (the green book) should be used as the basis for discussion by the General Conference, and that it should not be treated as on a par with the various proposals from the Working Parties, as the Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission had appeared to wish. This document was the result of an entire year's work by the Secretariat and the Executive Board.

In answer to the CHAIRMAN, who pointed out that the Working Parties were appointed by the delegations and that their work should not be under-valued, Professor PHOTIADES explained that he had had no intention of criticising them.

Professor CARNEIRO thought that the whole General Conference seemed to have adopted the green book as their basic working document - witness the Working Party on Education at its meeting, the previous day. He thought it logical that the proposals from the Working Parties should supplement those set forth in the green book.

Professor PHOTIADES stated that at an earlier meeting it had been said that the green book would be considered only as a subsidiary document.

The meeting resumed consideration of Sir John Maud's resolution; Dr. WALKER asked for it to be drafted in more precise terms, and in particular, that mention should be made of document 20/89.

Sir John MAUD agreed, and proposed, in addition, that a reference should be made to the wording on the cover of the green book: "Proposed by the Executive Board for Consideration.....".

Dr. OPOCENSKY considered that the new wording was rather complicated. He would prefer it to be stated simply that the Executive Board, in the exercise of the responsibilities imposed by the Constitution of Unesco, had submitted this Programme to the Conference.

Professor PHOTIADIS shared this opinion and mentioned a remark made by M. Seydoux, that the programme had not been formally submitted to the Conference by the Executive Board.

M. AUGER explained later in the discussion, that M. Seydoux had not understood how the Programme had been submitted to the Conference; that he had given him a full explanation on this point and that no further attention should be paid to the remark.

Mr. PIERCE did not understand the reason for submitting a resolution. He, himself, had heard no criticism of the Executive Board, and considered that it had carried out its duties and could rest content.

Mentioning that Dr. Opocensky's criticism had concerned the wording of his resolution alone, Sir John MAUD submitted a new draft, in the following terms:

"The Executive Board, in the course of the tenth meeting of its Fourth Session, held on Saturday, 15 November, passed the following resolution:

The title page of the Programme of Unesco for 1948 (20/3) states that the programme has been 'proposed by the Executive Board for consideration at the Second Session of the General Conference in Mexico City, November - December 1947. The comments, made on behalf of the Chairman of the Executive Board, on the report of the Director-General to the General Conference for 1947 (20/89) contains the following words: 'The Programme proposals, drawn up by the Board for consideration by the Conference, were formulated in July, 1947. They represent a further stage in the definition of Unesco's proper sphere of activities, which was begun by the Preparatory Commission, and continued by the First General Conference and by the Board, when it approved the Programme for 1947. The Board does not regard this process, which is one of selecting from among the many things that Unesco could do, those that are most important and most urgent, as being yet completed. Since the Programme proposals for 1947 were drawn up, all peace-loving peoples have been greatly disturbed by the evidences of growing international tension, and the suspicion and mistrust that exist between the nations at this time. With this in mind, the Executive Board invites the General Conference to examine and discuss the proposed Programme, in order that Unesco's resources may be concentrated

upon those activities that are most closely related to Unesco's purpose, as laid down in Article I of the Constitution."

Therefore, the Executive Board does not consider that any further statement need be made on its behalf to the General Conference, regarding its responsibility for the 1948 Programme proposals."

Dr. OPOCENSKY and M. AUGER agreed to this new wording.

The resolution was adopted in that form and the CHAIRMAN stated that it would be published in the Journal of the Conference.

The Board then considered the second item on the agenda: Report of the Finance Committee of the Executive Board.

Dr. WALKER explained that he had been anxious for this question to appear on the agenda, because of a discussion which had arisen at the Second meeting of the Administrative and External Relations Commission on part of the financial report and, in particular, on the question of auditing the accounts. Some members of the Commission had wished to have additional information and a report from the Director-General concerning the members of the staff who had misused Unesco's funds. The Commission had appointed a committee of three, consisting of the delegates of India, Cuba and Czechoslovakia, to examine the Auditors' Reports in detail and, if necessary, to ask for additional information.

Dr. Walker had thought it advisable to mention these facts to the Executive Board, so that it might be prepared to provide explanations if so requested.

Mr. Milton S. EISENHOWER asked that explanatory documents on this matter should be provided and that the questions which had given rise to the discussion should be considered at a subsequent meeting.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the documents were being prepared but that, in view of the pressure of work on the translating and duplicating services, they would not be issued until the end of the General Conference.

Dr. WALKER pressed for reconsideration of these arrangements, for it seemed to him essential that the Executive Board should be in a position to provide any explanations which might be requested, in the shortest possible time.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL promised to expedite the publication of the documents.

The CHAIRMAN opened discussion of the third item on the agenda: Third Session of the General Conference.

M. AUGER asked the meeting to consider the resolution which he had drafted on this matter, the text of which had been circulated to the members of the Board.

It had seemed to him that the work of the present session of the General Conference was too heavy, since several Working Parties had to hold meetings simultaneously. For that reason he had thought it necessary to suggest that, in the future, the work of the General Conference should be divided into two parts, to be dealt with in separate sessions.

(1) An Expert Committee, including delegates from all the Member States, would be responsible for considering the programme and, if necessary, adding comments and instructions for the Secretariat, and for arranging Working Parties if, in their opinion, the need arose.

(2) The statutory General Conference would meet subsequently to take final decisions.

The work, divided in this way, would be distributed over a longer period, but the time during which the delegates belonging to each of the two groups (who would be of different types) were required to be present would be shorter. Furthermore, the first group would be able to meet at the headquarters of the Secretariat and this would avoid the necessity for transporting large numbers of documents. The work of each of the groups would last a fortnight, which would make it possible for full delegations to attend throughout the period, in both cases.

M. Auger asked for his proposal to be considered with particular reference to the Third General Conference.

The CHAIRMAN considered that the problem was very difficult and extremely important. He therefore proposed that a sub-committee of three should be appointed from the Executive Board to consider the question and discuss it with the Secretariat.

Dr. SOMMERFELT agreed with this proposal but expressed some doubt regarding the efficacy of the proposed procedure.

Dr. KRUYT was of the same opinion.

Dr. WALKER asked that the terms of reference of the Working Party should specify that it was to consider the whole question of the organisation of the General Conference for future years.

Dr. CHEN Yuan pointed out that M. Auger's proposal was excellent from the French point of view but that, so far as China and India were concerned, it would be twice as expensive to send one delegation to Paris and another to the place where the General Conference was held.

At Dr. SOMMERFELT's request, the Board decided to appoint five members instead of three to the proposed Working Party.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Auger, Dr. Sommerfelt, Mr. Eisenhower, Dr. Chen Yuan and Dr. Walker to serve on this Committee, and they agreed.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned that the place for the Third Session of the General Conference would be discussed later, but that the Lebanon was prepared to act as host.

Dr. SOMMERFELT announced that Norway would prefer to postpone until 1949 the invitation which had been issued for 1948, in view of the present economic difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Executive Board should meet again on 25 November, when the new members would have been elected, to consider this matter.

This proposal was approved.

Sir John MAUD asked the meeting to consider the fourth item on the agenda: Status of Members of the Executive Board.

He considered it important to decide before the next meeting of the Nominations Committee whether only members of delegations or their deputies could be appointed as members of the Executive Board.

In the opinion of Dr. CHEN Yuan, the regulations in force provided for the appointment of deputies as well as delegates.

Mr. EISENHOWER mentioned that the question had been raised as the result of a discussion which he had had with Sir John Maud and that he thought he had found a means of solving the problem; Sir John MAUD then said he was prepared to withdraw his proposal.

Dr. WALKER stated that this matter seemed to him to be one for the Committee on Constitution and Procedure of the General Conference. It was laid down in the Constitution of Unesco that the members of the Executive Board should be elected for a period of three years and should be eligible for re-election, but it was for the General Conference to decide whether they should be members of delegations at the time of election.

Prof. PHOTIADES considered it essential that an interpretation of the provisions concerning this matter should be given as soon as possible. Under the terms of the Unesco Constitution, the members of the Executive Board exercised the powers delegated to them on behalf of the Conference as a whole, and not as representatives of their respective governments. If, in the exercise of his duties, a member of the Board should adopt an attitude which was not approved by his government, the government could refrain from asking him to serve on the delegation.

Cons. Exec./4<sup>th</sup> Sess./SR/10 - page 8  
15 November 1947

Dr. WALKER considered that it was also important to specify in what circumstances a member of the Executive Board could be replaced by a deputy.

The Secretary explained that the document dealing with the rules of procedure of the Executive Board would very shortly be available to members.

At the CHAIRMAN'S suggestion, discussion of the fourth item on the agenda was postponed until the meeting to be held on 25 November.

(The meeting rose at 5:30 p.m.)