

PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the First Meeting held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris, 16e, on Thursday 12 February 1948 at 10.30 a.m.

Present:

- Chairmen: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)
- Vice-Chairman: Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)
- Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor Benjamin CARRION (Ecuador)
Professor CHEN Yuan (China)
H.E.M. Victor DORE (Canada)
Resat Nuri GÜNTEKIN (Turkey)
Sir John MAUL, K.C.B. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan ČIPOENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. O. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
- Deputies: M.H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor Stanislaw
Arnold.
Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik Ghorbal
Bay.
Dr. Manuel CABRERA MACÍA (Mexico) for H.E.
Dr. M. Martínez Baez.
- Observers: M. Louis GROS (United Nations)
Mae. MOREL (International Labour Organization)
M. GREGORZEWSKI (World Health Organization)
M. VEILLET-LAVALLEE (Food & Agriculture
Organization)
- Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W.H.C. LAVES (Deputy Director-General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. S.G. GIBBELT (Secretary)

Item I of the Agenda - Opening of Session

The CHAIRMAN recalled that since the last session of the Executive Board, the whole world had been shocked by the death of Mahatma Gandhi. On behalf of Unesco, the Director-General had at once despatched an expression of sympathy to Pandit Nehru and had received the following reply: "On behalf of the Government and people of India, I thank you very much for your expression of sympathy". The Chairman was sure the Board would like him to express a profound sense of loss and sympathy with the Government and people of India. He called upon the meeting to rise and observe a minute of silence.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN was sure his Government and people would appreciate the Board's resolution and expression of sympathy.

The CHAIRMAN had the pleasant duty of welcoming to the Sixth Session of the Executive Board its new members who had been elected in Mexico. Dr. Stoddard filled the place originally held by the Honorable Mr. MacLeish and later by Mr. Milton Eisenhower; Dr. Carrion had been chosen from the delegation of Ecuador and was a distinguished writer in his own country; Professor Arnold was unfortunately ill and had been unable to come to Paris. This was a great disappointment to members of the Board, who looked forward to his early recovery and hoped to see him soon in Paris. He had pleasure in welcoming Mr. Birecki who had been designated by Professor Arnold as his alternate. He also had pleasure in welcoming two other alternates, Dr. El Diwany and Dr. Manuel Cabera-Macia and the representatives of the U.N., I.L.O., W.E.O. and F.A.O.

Members would have noticed that the meeting was being held in a different room and that a special new table had been constructed. This had been done in accordance with a wish expressed by members of the Board that their discussions might be facilitated by being arranged in a less formal setting. A lounge had been provided for members on the first floor and the Secretariat of the Board was established conveniently near it. He expressed the thanks of the Executive Board to the Director-General and his staff, and especially to the Secretary, Mr. Gebelt, for having made these arrangements. He had to apologise, however, to the public and the representatives of the press for whom the place allowed was not as extensive as could have been wished. If the place provided for the public proved too small, the Board might have to consider moving to another room.

Although one of the principal functions of the Chairman was not to speak too much, he felt it necessary, for the sake of new members, members of the press and the general public, to make the following comments on the role of the Executive Board:

"1. This is the first session of the Board since the conclusion of the Mexico City Conference. Our special tasks on this occasion relate to carrying out the decisions of that Conference. But already we have to give preliminary consideration to the next General

Conference which will be held in Beirut, in the autumn of this year.

2. The Executive Board is one of the three organs of this International Organization. The supreme organ is the General Conference consisting of delegations appointed by Member Governments, and meeting in regular session once a year. It is the General Conference that determines the policies and the main lines of work of the Organization.

The Executive Board, consisting of eighteen persons elected by the Conference from eighteen delegations, is responsible on the one hand for the preparation of the Agenda and programme of work for each General Conference and for the execution of the programme adopted by each General Conference. In carrying out this task and other duties entrusted to the Board by the General Conference the Members of the Board operate on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective Governments.

The main burden of the day-to-day work of the Organization falls upon the third organ, namely the Secretariat. The Director-General, who is the chief administrative officer, participates in all meetings of the General Conference and of this Executive Board, though he does not exercise a vote. On the one hand he formulates proposals for appropriate action by the Conferences and by the Executive Board, and on the other hand he gives effect to the decisions of the Conference and the Board. In this onerous task he is assisted by the staff of the Secretariat who are appointed by the Director-General in accordance with regulations approved by the Conference. Under the regulations at present in force the Executive Board is required to exercise a certain supervision over the procedures and principles by which staff are selected and, pending the approval of the General Conference, the Executive Board has the responsibility of approving salary scales. But the Management of the staff is the responsibility of the Director-General.

3. Unesco is still a new organization. We have only just held our second annual Conference, and we are beginning only the Sixth Session of the Executive Board. It has naturally taken a little time for the respective responsibilities of the different parts of the Organization to be clearly defined and for the implications of the Constitution to be clearly understood by Member States, by the Secretariat, and by the Executive Board itself. In fact this process may not yet be complete. But it is quite clear that when the General Conference is not in session the principal authority and responsibility rest with the Executive Board, which has among its exclusive powers that of summoning an extraordinary session of the General Conference if the Board considers such a step necessary. Between sessions of the General Conference, the Director-General is responsible to the Executive Board, both for the execution of the Board's decisions and for the official actions of all members of the Secretariat. At the same time, those who observe the work of the Board will notice that our decisions are taken largely on proposals submitted to us by the Secretariat.

4. The Mexico Conference also recognized, more explicitly than did the first conference in Paris, the important role of Member States in the activities of the Organization. The resolutions on the

programme set out on the one hand the action to be taken by the Secretariat and in some cases specifically by this Board, and on the other the action which the Conference recommends to Member States. Unesco, like the United Nations, is an organization of States, and action by Member States within their own territories and in collaboration with each other is at least as vital as action by the Executive Board or the Secretariat, and even more vital, for it is the Member States which actually constitute the organization. In contrast with the United Nations, the Constitution of Unesco provides for the establishment within Member States of National Commissions or co-operating bodies to serve as agencies of liaison and advice to governments on matters of interest to the organization.

5. In the first year of Unesco's life there was a natural tendency to concentrate upon the problem of organizing the Secretariat and setting it to work on such parts of our programme as can be handled by an international civil service. The Mexico City Conference has clearly recognized that a major organizational task for 1948 is to develop the role of Member States as provided for in the Constitution, and to encourage and assist Member States to supplement their existing machinery by establishing National Commissions or National Co-operating Bodies. One of the tasks of the Board, in its preparation of its programme of work for the Beirut Conference this year, is to ensure that time and facilities are provided for adequate consideration of the Reports which Member States are required to furnish to the Conference and which the Conference is required, by the terms of the Constitution, to receive and consider.

6. The decision of the Mexico Conference that the 1948 Conference should be held in Beirut has several important implications of which I shall mention only two. In the first place it represents our recognition that the General Conference is itself part of the programme of Unesco; one of the methods by which this Organization can advance the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, and give fresh impulse to popular education and the spread of culture. Our Constitution provides that the place of the Conference shall vary from year to year. The experience of our Conference in Mexico, with all the contacts that it provided for delegates and Secretariat (many of whom had never visited Latin-America), convinced us that a move to yet another cultural region in 1948 would bring benefits that would more than offset the obvious advantages of returning to our Paris headquarters. In the second place, Unesco's choice of Beirut represents a recognition of the cultural importance of the Arab world, and a desire to practise the art of international understanding in a region where there are acute and political and social tensions at the present time. I am sure I am expressing the views of all members of the Executive Board when I say that we hope that the holding of our next General Conference in the Lebanon will, in addition to fulfilling the usual functions of the Conference, achieve three special objectives, namely to make all our Member States better informed on the educational, scientific and cultural problems and achievements of Lebanon and her neighbours, to develop the role of the Arab world in the work of Unesco and to bring such contribution as Unesco can to the preservation of peace and security in the Middle East.

We must already, in this session of the Board, begin our preparations for the Beirut Conference, and I hope we shall keep these three special objectives in view.

7. Meanwhile, in the months that remain before the Beirut Conference we have to carry out as much as possible of the ambitious programme of work for 1948 approved by the Mexico Conference. The Director-General will be reporting to us on the steps already taken within the Secretariat to set this work in train, and the Committees of the Board have already had an opportunity to consider some of the problems that lie before us in the execution of the programme. We also have some important decisions to make in relation to the remuneration of the staff of the Secretariat, in the light of the continued rise in the cost of living on the one hand, and the recent devaluation of the French franc on the other.

8. Many of us feel that the main work of the Executive Board, consisting as it does of members chosen, in accordance with the Constitution for their competence "in the arts, the humanities, the sciences, education and the diffusion of ideas" should lie in the field of creative ideas rather than in questions of finance and organization. But in this as in other respects, the members of the Board are the servants of the Conference and of all the Member States together; and the Conference seems determined in these early years of the Organization to test our "experience and capacity to fulfil the administrative and executive duties of the Board", by adding considerably to those duties. If we sometimes feel that we are giving our time to administrative questions that seem remote from the noble purpose and ideas of Unesco, we may find comfort in two reflections. The first is the absolute necessity of ensuring that the money which the tax-payers of Member States contribute towards the noble purpose of Unesco is spent to the best advantage. The second is the fact that our consideration of these so-called "housekeeping" matters in this international Board is also an essay in international understanding".

The CHAIRMAN welcomed M. Veillet-Lavallée, the representative of the F.A.O., who had just arrived.

Item 2. "Adoption of Agenda".

The CHAIRMAN stated that he had been asked to add the following points to the Agenda (1) Relations with the W.H.O. (2) Relations with the International Bureau of Education (3) Appointment of Advisory Panel on Finance and Administration (4) Publication Policy of the Organization.

With these additions the Agenda was unanimously adopted.

Item 3. "Approval of the minutes of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Executive Board."

After the CHAIRMAN had explained that the provisional minutes had been distributed and corrected, and that the final text would be

ready shortly, the minutes were unanimously approved.

Item 4. "Report of the Director-General on Developments since the last Session including the steps taken to implement the Resolutions of the Second Session of the General Conference."

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL had very little to add orally to the document submitted, except (1) that he hoped the Executive Board would agree as to the definite progress made especially in view of the short time which had been available; (2) that document INT./PPO/3 was a working document circulated for information only and not finally decided upon. He wished to draw the Board's attention to the excellent meeting in Geneva of the Co-ordination Committee which grouped the heads of all the Specialized Agencies. Real progress had been made not only in creating a sort of clearing-house for information, but also in setting up a policy-making body.

Concerning title 1 of document 6 EX/7, the CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the delay mentioned in it did not mean that the Director-General's freedom of action had been limited in any way.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the Executive Board that he had used his prerogative to go ahead whenever it was necessary and that no work had been held up.

The CHAIRMAN was very glad of this assurance and stated that the Executive Board was very anxious to help the Director-General and avoid any procedural steps which might hinder him.

Professor VERNIERS stressed that there was no mention in the document submitted of the international stamp with a surtax for cultural reconstruction. However, since the idea had been adopted by the Reconstruction Committee, he would not press the point at the present stage.

At the Chairman's suggestion, the Executive Board decided to discuss the matter later.

Pages 1 and 2 of 6 EX/7 were accepted without comment.

Referring to the International Ideas Bureau on Page 3, Sir John MAUD congratulated the Director-General on the idea and asked how soon he would be able to appoint the necessary staff. He felt sure that the members of the Board would agree with him that this experiment, decided by the Mexico Conference, should get under way as soon as possible, without waiting for exactly the right personnel to be found. In addition, he wished to extend his congratulations to the Secretariat for getting its teeth so quickly into the decisions of the Mexico Conference.

Dr. STODDARD was very favourably impressed by the document. He would like to suggest that in choosing the four persons referred to in Paragraph 4, all cultural groups should be represented. A good way of

getting started would be to call a conference at which the Member States could submit their ideas and projects.

The CHAIRMAN stated that this interesting suggestion would be considered under Item 10 "Questions concerning the Programme for 1948". The Director-General had tables Document Int./EPC/3 but had not asked for its discussion as it was only a Working Document for the E.S.C.

Professor VERNIERS asked if Unesco would send an Observer to the projected International Conference on Copyright to be held in Brussels for the revision of the Berne Convention.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that there had been no change in Unesco's intentions in that respect.

Sir John MAUD drew the attention of the Executive Board to the last two lines of Page 4. The relevant resolution of the General Conference said that 80% of the funds would have to be found from non-Unesco sources, but did not mention 20% as being the Haiti Government's share. In its present form the paragraph might lead to a misunderstanding.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the sum mentioned was the result of a private arrangement between Unesco and the Haiti Government and agreed to the deletion of the 20%.

Sir John MAUD speaking about the plan outlined on page 4, thought it was very important that in the field of Fundamental Education a less ambitious and more precise programme should be adopted in the light of the experience of the Second Conference.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Union of South Africa was missing on the list of States represented at the Mexico Regional Conference on Fundamental Education. The leader of the delegation of that State had complained in Mexico that his country had not been invited and had criticized the Executive Board for not seeing that the Union of South Africa was invited. In his opinion the Secretariat should pay more attention in establishing contact with any country as vitally interested in Fundamental Education as the Union of South Africa.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the Executive Board that it was only through a regrettable oversight that the Union of South Africa had not been invited. Replying to Sir John he stated that in conformity with Resolution 3.4.10.1. all the experience of the Mexico and Nanjing Conferences would be used in shaping future plans.

Professor PHOTIADES pointed out that all the Middle East countries were missing at this Conference.

Dr. EL DIWANY explained that his country had received an invitation but circumstances had prevented its representatives from taking part in it.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stressed that the Conference was more especially a Latin-American; if other regional conferences were held, they would be still more restricted in order to make them more efficient.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ, whilst rejoicing at the presence of Australia, New Zealand etc., did not understand why they had been invited to a Regional Latin-American Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the primary reason for the Conference had been to enable the members belonging to that region to pool their experience. Other countries had been invited for either of the following two reasons:

- a) to give them the benefit of the experience, and
- b) because their advice and experience might be useful to others.

He pointed out that the list contained those who had accepted the invitation - not those who had been invited.

The CHAIRMAN wished to know if in future the Executive Board or an appropriate Commission would be consulted before sending out invitations.

Sir Sarvepalli RADAKRISHNAN pointed out that the Conference took place at the same time as the General Conference, and many people who had been interested had joined in, despite the absence of invitations. India had not received an invitation but had attended the Conference.

Professor SOMMERFELT declared that Norway had been invited.

The CHAIRMAN wanted to know if when the stage was reached when the Secretariat knew whom it wished to invite, the Board or Programme Committee would be consulted by the Director-General.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL had not intended doing so as the number of meetings was large and such consultation with the members of the Board - who were not always available - would slow down their organization.

Professor PHOTIADES agreed in principle with the Director-General. He emphasized however, that when too many invitations were received the delegates could not possibly accept them all.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the General Conference the leader of the South African delegation had criticized the Executive Board for leaving his country out. He had had to reply that the Board had not had the opportunity to decide who should be invited. The question now was whether the responsibility for the invitations should be left to the Director-General in which case the Board could not accept any reproaches. He understood that in the ILO, which also held regional conferences, it was its Governing Body which took decisions as to invitations.

Professor CARNEIRO felt that regional conferences involved Unesco's policy: he realized the justice of the Director-General's argument as to the administrative difficulties connected with such consultations but he thought they should take place. Perhaps a communication to the Chairman might simplify the procedure while ensuring that responsibility was shared.

Professor PHOTIADES supported the speaker's suggestion.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that all the Western Hemisphere countries had been asked to send delegates and all the others to send observers. Therefore, it must have been a most unfortunate omission that India and South Africa had not received invitations.

Professor PHOTIADES pointed out that in consequence the list needed correcting.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked whether the Board wished an immediate correction to be made or in the yearly report.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ was for the latter course of action, since the correction would appear in the minutes.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Board for a clear indication as to whether it wanted the responsibility for invitations to be delegated to the Director-General or not.

Dr. STODDARD referring to the Director-General's statement that all countries had been invited, pointed out that all Member States could have taken part in the Conference. The criteria contained in the word "Regional" made it immediately evident that the Director-General could leave some countries out. He suggested that this type of decision had best be made by the Director-General and only the plan of the Conference supervised by the Executive Board.

Dr. EL DIWANY stressed the difference between delegates and observers. The former had the right to vote and took responsibilities. He thought therefore, that States asked to send a delegate should be determined by the Executive Board.

Dr. OPOCINSKY was in favour of consultation with the Executive Board. There had been a conference of experts to which Czechoslovakia was sorry not to have been invited.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Prof. Carneiro, Dr. El Diwany and Dr. Opcensky were in favour of invitations to regional conferences being sent after consultation with the Executive Board, whilst Dr. Stoddard and Sir John Maud held the opposite view. He stressed that the Director-General did not wish all the countries invited to the Middle East Conference.

Dr. STODDARD was not quite clear as to the nature of regional conferences. If he understood aright, they were working parties called together with a definite purpose, and not corollaries

of the General Conference. In which case, the distinction between delegates and observers was not quite right; workers and learners would be a better terminology.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, said the speaker, was perfectly correct. The conferences referred to were working ones and there was no question of passing conventions or voting resolutions, but only of contributing and sharing experience. In a real sense they were work study groups, even though the delegates were those who would come to Unesco's General Conference.

Professor PHOTIADES suggested that some other name than "regional conference" should be used to avoid confusion with "Unesco Conference."

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN recalled that the Chairman thought the Director-General might be inconvenienced by preliminary consultation. Could not a formula be adopted asking the Director-General to consult the Executive Board in case of doubt while leaving the initiative with him.

Professor CARNEIRO stressed that regional conferences were concerned with the preparation and submission of recommendations with respect to local problems. The delegates responsibilities were therefore not academic but practical, and, he thought the Board should be consulted through its Chairman.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ pointed out that in delimiting regions difficulties of a political character would be encountered. For this reason he supported Professor Carneiro's proposal and his object in doing so was his wish that the Board should give the Director-General all possible help.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the suggestion made by Professor Photiades was very good. Fundamental Education Regional Meetings were meant to study specific problems and make preliminary recommendations, but not to adopt binding resolutions. Besides, they were always arranged by a host Government which bore the cost so that its wishes should also be taken into consideration.

Dr. EL DIWANY agreed with Professor Carneiro as to the distinction between delegates and observers. He stressed the importance of the delimiting of a region, particularly if the invitations were sent jointly by Unesco and the host country.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized that the only question was whether in the case of a Regional Conference the list of invitations should be approved by the Board or should the latter delegate this power to the Director-General. There was, of course, no intention to limit the Director-General's initiative as regards invitations to experts.

Professor Carneiro's motion was then adopted by 13 votes to 1.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wanted to be quite clear if the Board want to be consulted when Governments were asked to send experts as, for instance, to the High Altitude Conference.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that in his opinion the motion related only to Regional Study Conferences. Altitude was not regional and had no political implication. Furthermore, the "Regional" concept was quite clear; Fundamental Education or Science or anything else could be the subject of a regional conference; the motion applied to all regional conferences.

Dr. STODDARD suggested an editorial revision "special" was better than regional where altitude was concerned. In the United States, namely, at the Chicago University, it had been found easier to reproduce high altitude conditions artificially in a laboratory than to send people into the mountains.

Professor PHOTIADES asked for information as to the form in which powers would be given to these delegates.

The CHAIRMAN thought that an official Government communication to the Director-General would be sufficient.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ did not think the distinction between delegates who were the representatives of a Government and experts who were persons asked by the Director-General for information, had been sufficiently stressed. He held that in the case of the latter the Director-General did not need the Board's advice. He wanted to emphasize that all the conferences to which delegates were sent should be open to all Member States if they wished to take part.

The CHAIRMAN corrected the speaker: the Executive Board would decide which country was invited to take part.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ explained that he had wished to stress that no country could be excluded.

Before suggesting an adjournment, the CHAIRMAN said he was very impressed and gratified by the report on the Sevres Seminar supplied by Dr. Wilson.

Sir John MAUD declared that the debate in the course of which he had found himself in a minority of one, had been fascinating. As regards the time for discussion on particular items, he wished to put on record his full confidence in the Chairman to close the debate and take a vote to accelerate the work of the Executive Board.

(The meeting rose at 1.p.m.)



6 EX/SR 2 & 3 (rev) (1)

PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the Third Meeting held
at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris XVIIe.,
on Friday, 13 February 1948 at 10.30 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)

Vice-Chairman: Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)

Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor Benjamin CARRION (Ecuador)
Professor CHEN Yuan (China)
H.E.M. Victor DORE (Canada)
Reşat Nuri GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Sir John MAJID, K.O.B. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Deputies:

M. H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor
Stanislaw Arnold
Dr. Manuel CABRERA MACIA (Mexico) for
H.E. Dr. M. Martinez Baez
Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik
Ghorbal Bey
M. GUY DORGET (France) : Observer for
Professor Auger

Observers:

M. Louis GROS (United Nations)
Mme. MOREL (International Labour Organization)
M. GREGOREZEWSKI (World Health Organization)

Secretariat:

Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W. H. O. LAVES (Deputy Director-
General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. S. G. GEBELT (Secretary)

(1) The Second Meeting was held in secret session.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Board had been meeting in secret session in order to consult with the Director-General regarding high appointments in the Secretariat. Certain decisions had been taken which he would at present announce publicly.

The Board had received from the Director-General a proposal for a new position of Assistant Director-General. The Director-General had explained that if the post were created, the appointment would be made in order to enable one of the Assistant Director-Generals, in addition to aiding the Director-General with work of a general character, to take on special responsibilities in the field of education. The Natural Sciences had a high representation in the Organization, with the Director-General being such a renowned scientist himself while the Deputy Director-General was a Social Scientist and the Assistant Director-General had special responsibilities in the field of culture. The Executive Board had been impressed with the need for providing a special status for the three great divisions of Unesco's work, education, science and culture, and had therefore thought that education should also have a high representation. Further, a decision of the General Conference had stipulated that the Director-General should try to bring together the work in various fields of education. In the light of the above consideration, the Executive Board had adopted the following resolution:

"the Board approve the proposal of the Director-General that a second post of Assistant Director-General be created."

The Board had then considered a proposal of the Director-General for the appointment of a new Assistant Director-General. Members had been happy to learn that the Director-General had been able to propose for the post Dr. C. E. Beeby (New Zealand), who led the New Zealand Delegation both at the Paris Conference in 1946 and the Mexico Conference in 1947. He was very familiar with the work of the organization, as he had been Chairman of the Administrative and Financial Sub-Commission at the Paris Conference and Chairman of the Programme and Budget Commission in Mexico City. The Board was much impressed by the fact that Unesco had made such considerable progress that it was able to attract men of Dr. Beeby's calibre. It had been realized, however, that there might be objections to the appointment on grounds of unequal geographical distribution in the highest posts. It would be true to say that the Board regretted that it had not yet been found possible to provide a better representation of the separate cultural regions of the world in the highest posts. It had, nevertheless, approved the Director-General's proposal, and Dr. Beeby was to have special responsibilities in the field of education. Members of the Board looked forward to his arrival in Unesco and were sure that his appointment would be of great value to the Secretariat.

The Board had also received from the Director-General a report that Dr. Joseph Needham, F.R.S., Head of the Natural Sciences Section, since the time of the Preparatory Commission, would be leaving Unesco to return to his academic duties in Cambridge. His work had been very much appreciated and the Board greatly regretted his departure which would mean a considerable loss to Unesco. The feeling had sometimes been expressed that the Natural Sciences Section had rushed ahead of other

parts of the Programme; this was true and was due mainly to the energy and capabilities of Dr. Needham.

The Board had been informed by the Director-General that Professor Auger was being considered to replace Dr. Needham. The Chairman had recently received his formal resignation from the Executive Board, which would have been a catastrophe if the Board had not been able to accept it in order to approve his appointment as Head of the Natural Sciences Section. It would be unnecessary and presumptuous to refer to his scientific achievements and to his great administrative capacities. These last two appointments and the ones which were to follow testified to the growing prestige of Unesco.

It would be necessary for the Board, in accordance with the Constitution, to proceed to the election of a member of the French Delegation to the Mexico Conference to replace Professor Auger until the next General Conference, which would elect a new French member to the Executive Board. In the meantime, the Chairman had invited M. Dorget to attend meetings of the Board as an observer until the Board had elected Professor Auger's successor.

The Executive Board had also approved the Director-General's proposal that Dr. Bosch Gimpera (Mexico) should be appointed Head of the Philosophy and Humanities Section. Dr. Bosch Gimpera was a person of great distinction.

The Board had also approved the Director-General's proposal to appoint Mr. Gordon Menzies (Australia) as Director of Central Administrative Services; he would be responsible for the upkeep of the building, procurement of equipment, etc. The Board had been very satisfied to make this appointment.

The Chairman then called upon the Director-General to say a word regarding the length of the foregoing persons' appointments.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed his satisfaction, as the Chairman had done, that such distinguished men were now being attracted to Unesco. It was less than two years since he had been appointed Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission and he was happy to note the enormous progress which had been made since that time.

Dr. Beeby was to be appointed for 18 months, during which time he would be on leave from the New Zealand Government. Here, the Director-General wished to clear up a misunderstanding evinced in the words of Dr. Chen Yuan and others. Dr. Beeby was to be Assistant Director-General with special responsibilities in the field of education and not Head of the Education Section. He would perform work of a general nature like any other Assistant Director-General, but would have special responsibilities in the educational activities of the Organization, and would co-ordinate Education, Fundamental Education, and Education for International Understanding, in accordance with the instruction of the General Conference. Dr. Beeby's character was a unique combination of qualities; he was trained as a social scientist; was an eminent administrator in the field of education, including fundamental education, and

also possessed an unrivalled knowledge of Unesco's work. At the Paris and Mexico Conferences, he had won the respect and affection of all his fellow delegates.

Before speaking of Professor Auger's appointment, the Director-General expressed his deep personal regret at Dr. Needham's departure. For several years Dr. Needham had been obliged to leave his academic work in Cambridge and had first, during the war, done distinguished work in promoting British-Chinese scientific relations, then after the war served Unesco with great credit. He was therefore the only non-Asiatic member of the staff of Unesco with a profound knowledge of China. The Director-General's first act upon his appointment two years ago, had been to cable to Dr. Needham to request him to join the staff of Unesco.

Professor Auger was to be appointed for three years. The Director-General had known him for several years before Unesco had been constituted and was personally delighted that he was to join the staff. Professor Auger was not only a distinguished physicist but had great experience in educational and scientific administration, was Director of Higher Education in France and a member both of the United Nations and French Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Bosch Gimpera's appointment was of two years' duration. He was an archaeologist and pre-historian of great eminence, with a humanistic approach to history. He also had much administrative experience, having been Rector of the University of Barcelona and Minister of Justice in Catalonia. He left Spain after the Civil War and had acquired Mexican nationality.

Mr. Menzies was to be appointed for one year as head of Administrative Services and the Director-General was sure that his appointment would facilitate the work of the Organization.

Furthermore, the Secretariat had obtained the services, for six months, of a distinguished sociologist, Professor Hadley Cantrill of Princeton University.

Professor CARNEIRO, in view of his special connections with the scientific work of Unesco, wished to add a personal tribute to the remarks which had been made concerning Professor Auger and Dr. Needham.

For two years he had followed the incessant work of Dr. Needham and, like all men of science connected with the Organization, felt deep gratitude for the work he had done for Unesco. His departure meant a great loss and Professor Carneiro wondered whether it might not be envisaged giving an honorary title to Dr. Needham and asking him to undertake the mission of acting as adviser to Unesco whether at Cambridge or wherever his duties might take him. In this manner he might watch over Unesco's work from afar, as he had done near at hand, and whether in the universities of England or the Far East, be asked to participate in whatever manner desired in the execution of the programme of Unesco and, would always be a valuable liaison officer and distinguished ambassador of Unesco.

Professor Carneiro then expressed his personal pleasure that Professor Auger should be taking over the direction of the Natural Sciences Section, where he would be able to continue the work accomplished by Dr. Needham and imprint French culture upon it, adding to the already existing British culture stamped upon it by Dr. Needham.

He also welcomed the announcement that Dr. Bosch Gimpera was to enter the Organization. The latter would have special authority as a representative of Spanish culture which had been paramount for many centuries. Professor Carneiro was glad to hear the M. Mayoux would continue his association with Unesco as director of certain projects of the programme. A standing proof of the excellence of his work was that all his proposals had been ratified by the Mexico Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL welcomed this reference to M. Mayoux who had agreed to stay on as Director of Philosophical and Humanistic Projects. He was also grateful for the suggestion (an idea he had himself had in mind) of giving to Dr. Needham some honorary title.

Professor CHEN Yuan associated himself most heartily with everything Professor Carneiro had said about Dr. Needham. Whilst welcoming the nomination of Professor Auger he regretted the departure of Dr. Needham and hoped that it would not sever his connections with the Organization.

Professor PHOTIADES warmly endorsed the previous speaker's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN stated that he felt sure all the members of the Executive Board did likewise. He suggested that when the discussion of item 4 of the Agenda was finished, the Board should go on to Point 14(a) "Report on Conditions and Material Facilities available at Beirut", then to Point 13 "Questions concerning the Programme for 1948", and finally return to Point 14 to consider the other aspects of the Organization of the Third Conference. The final decisions in that respect must wait for the report of the Programme Committee.

The CHAIRMAN then asked Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan to take the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN suggested a resumption of the study of Document 6 EX/7.

Sir John MAUD said he was delighted with the news contained in Paragraph 1 of Point 4 on page 6. He wished to ask if the Director-General was satisfied that the Budget Allocation in connection with the Prague Conference was sufficient for Unesco to play its part. If not, he felt sure that a few more dollars could be found for the purpose.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that he had had no bitter laments from the Theatre Section on that score, but he would bear in mind the views of the Executive Board and would ask for a transfer if it proved necessary.

Professor VERNIERS felt sure that the Board would learn with satisfaction that a National Section of the International Theatre Institute had been created in Belgium and endowed with adequate funds.

Dr. OPOJENSKY drew the attention of the Board to the very large number of international Congresses to be held in Prague in 1948. The proposed Conference needed the approval of the Inter-ministerial Committee of the Czechoslovak Government, but he did not anticipate any difficulty in that connection.

Professor CARNEIRO, in connection with the Human Rights Conference which had taken place in Geneva at the end of last year, asked the Director-General what part Unesco was going to play in finding solutions to the problems raised.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL assured the speaker that full details on this point would be available when the programme was being discussed. Meanwhile, Unesco's relation with the Human Rights Commission had been put on an excellent basis by M. Havet. Speaking about page 7, paragraph 5, he explained that Professor William Ebenstein was in charge of methods in political science only. He hoped to find shortly a suitable person to take charge of the study of International Collaboration.

Sir John MAUD wished for more information about the April Conference (Page 7, Paragraph 6) and if its members would be able to commit their Governments, he stressed that at such a Conference scientists were particularly needed and not merely administratives.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that invitations had gone and were going out and it had been made clear in them that Unesco wanted plenipotentiaries and scientists. The Mexico Conference had decided that the following States and Organizations should be invited: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Netherlands, Peru, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, the United Nations, the F.A.O., the W.H.O., the I.L.O., the Pan-American Union and the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau. Thus, this list comprised all those who had taken part in the Belém Conference, plus the representatives - or perhaps observers would be the better word - of all other States and Institutions interested in the project.

Professor CARNEIRO concurred with Sir John in asking that when the programme was being discussed information should be submitted as to the preparations made for the April Conference on the Hylean Amazon. He assumed that it was due merely to a typing slip that there was no mention of Unesco in the last line on page 7 and the Director-General agreed with him.

M. GROS, referring to the last paragraph on Page 7, on the Conference on the Preservation of Nature, asked for information as to the character of the new Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the most urgent preparatory task had been to get the International Union into existence so as to be able to get ready for the 1949 Conference. This year's Conference, which was being convened in conjunction with the French Government, was

described as semi-governmental because it would include plenipotentiary delegates and the representatives of International Bodies interested. The second half of the Conference would be a discussion meeting to pave the way for 1949 with special consideration of the European and African aspects of the problem.

M. DORGET understood that the French Government had been asked to organize one Conference only and assumed that the plural in the last line of Page 7 was accidental.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that there was only one Conference but it was divided in two distinct parts, one official and one unofficial.

M. DORGET asked for clarification of the words "semi-governmental". He had understood that the Conference was going to be inter-governmental to establish an International Union.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that it would be inter-governmental because official delegates of Governments would be invited, but private professional organizations in this field would also be represented.

Professor CHEN Yuan referring to paragraph 2 on page 8, wished to know where it was proposed to establish the Fourth Field Science Co-operation Office.

The CHAIRMAN, with whom the Director-General concurred, said it would certainly be in India, probably in New Delhi.

There was no further comment about page 8.

Referring to page 9, Professor SOMMERFELT, speaking as a Norwegian, was very regretful that Sweden was not yet a member of Unesco and that there was no hope that it would join in 1948.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ associated himself warmly with the speaker, and asked the Director-General how far negotiations had progressed with the South American States who were not yet members of Unesco, and whose absence everyone regretted.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that negotiations were being pursued but that none of them had joined since the Mexico Conference.

Professor PHOTIADES drew the Director-General's attention to the word "bloc" which described Italy, Hungary and Austria in the French text, and thought its use should be avoided.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this word had not been used in the English text.

There was no comment about page 10.

2 June 1948

Speaking about Page 11, Sir John MAUD welcomed anything which could be done to provide the Member States with a better service and illustrations of Unesco in action with photographs.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the administration had groped at a solution in 1947. It had now decided to publish a monitor intended specially for the Member States as well as the courier which had already come out.

Sir John MAUD explained that he had had in mind a service to Member States to help them publicize Unesco in conformity with the wish of the Mexico Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the Budget of the Information Service had been out at Mexico by 50,000 dollars.

The CHAIRMAN then opened the discussion on Item 14(a) of the Agenda "A Report on Conditions and Material Facilities available in Beirut".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that since the decision of the last Conference, M. Montagnier and Mr. Mathews had been sent to Beirut and they were back with their report: material facilities would be perfectly adequate; the Lebanese Government was constructing two large halls; ample hotel accommodation within reasonable distance would be available; a much larger fleet of cars than in Mexico would be provided; the local recruitment of staff would not present worse problems than had been the case in Mexico. The Lebanese Authorities were most anxious that the Conference should take place in Beirut, and should be a success, because they wanted Lebanon to play an active role in the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies. Distinguished foreign residents in that country had emphasized the political importance of holding the conference there, as it would give Unesco an opportunity to make a very concrete contribution towards International Understanding.

The CHAIRMAN specified that the Programme Committee and the Temporary Committee on the Conference had recommended the opening of the Conference for Thursday, 14 October, and it was to last 3 weeks and 2 days.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL hoped the date was not too definitely fixed, as it might be found convenient to alter it by a day or two, which was agreed.

The CHAIRMAN initiated the discussion on Item 10 of the Agenda "Questions Concerning the Programme for 1948", and pointed out that the Terms of Reference of the Programme Committee would be discussed under Item 9. The Resolution submitted to the Executive Board by the Director-General at the request of the Programme Committee read as follows:

"The Executive Board

RECOGNIZES that many of the activities enjoined upon the Director-General by the programme resolutions adopted at the Second Session of the General Conference are by their nature continuing and cannot be completed within the year 1948;

RECOGNIZES that the financial resources and staff made available to the Secretariat by the appropriations voted by the Second Session of the General Conference do not permit the prosecution of all elements of the programme with equal intensity or the initiation of all of them at the same time;

AFFIRMS the principle that a limited number of urgent projects should be accorded first priority for intensive prosecution during 1948 and that as many as possible of the remainder should be the subject of limited preparatory work, looking towards a more intensive prosecution after 1948".

Seconded by Professor PHOTIADES it was unanimously adopted by the Executive Board.

The CHAIRMAN then pointed out that Unesco would proceed with the Fourth Pilot Project in Fundamental Education only if it was accepted by Peru, and read Resolution 8A which concerned it:

"The Executive Board

CONSIDERING that the Second Session of the General Conference by Resolution 3.4.11.3. authorized the initiation of a fourth Pilot Project in Fundamental Education,

RECOGNIZING the condition expressed by the General Conference in resolution 3.4.11.4.1. that in each Pilot Project new techniques or methods in Fundamental Education should be tried in the field,

CONSIDERING the unusual basis for a Pilot Project in the Cuzco area in Peru, in view of the steps already initiated for the development of native arts and crafts as a means of raising the standard of living, the Executive Board

APPROVES the negotiations of the Director-General with the Peruvian Government for the undertaking of a fourth Pilot Project in that area if an invitation is received from the Peruvian Government, and

INSTRUCTS the Director-General if no appropriate invitation is received from the Peruvian Government not to undertake a fourth Pilot Project elsewhere in 1948"

At the suggestion of Dr. PARRA-PEREZ the Executive Board adopted this Resolution without discussion.

Dr. E. Ronald Walker returned and took the chair.

The CHAIRMAN suggested adjourning until 3 p.m. and asked the members of the Board to stay behind for a few minutes to discuss some matters connected with the election of Professor Augar's successor.

(The meeting rose at 1 p.m.)



PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONEXECUTIVE BOARDSixth Session

Summary Report of the Fourth Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e.,
on Friday, 13 February 1948 at 3.30 p.m.

Present:

- Chairman: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)
- Vice-Chairmen: Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)
- Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor Benjamin CARRION (Ecuador)
Professor CHEN Yuan (China)
H.E. M. Victor DORE (Canada)
Reşat Nuri GÜNTEKİN (Turkey)
Sir John MAUD, K.C.B. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. C. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
- Deputies: M. H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor
Stanislaw Arnold
Dr. Manuel CABRERA MACÍA (Mexico) for
H.E. Dr. M. Martínez Baez
Dr. ÉL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik
Ghorbal Bey
M. Guy DORGET (France); Observer for
Professor Auger
- Observers: M. Louis GROS (United Nations)
Mme. MOREL (International Labour Organization)
M. GREGOREZEWSKI (World Health Organization)
M. VEILLET-LAVALLÉE (Food and Agriculture
Organization)
- Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W.H.C. LIVES (Deputy Director-General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. S. G. GEBELT (Secretary)

Election of substitute for Professor Auger

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in view of the resignation of Professor Auger, to which reference had already been made in the course of the morning's meeting, the Executive Board had to provide for his successor, by choosing, from among the French delegates to the Mexico Conference, a temporary member whose term of office would continue until the next session of the General Conference, when the Conference would elect a substitute for the term of one year still to run.

Following a vote by secret ballot, M. Roger Seydoux was declared unanimously elected, having obtained 17 votes.

Item 10 (a) of the Agenda (continuation): Examination of the Report of the Director-General to the Executive Board on the Implementation of the Programme for 1948 (Document 6 EX/8).

Professor CARNEIRO pointed out that the Report of the Programme Committee which had been examined during the morning's meeting only covered points 1 to 9 of the Director-General's Report.

Before proceeding to consider points 10 to 23 of the Report (Document 6 EX/8), Professor CHEN Yuan wished to obtain further information on certain points covered by the Programme Committee's Report. With regard to point 9 C (Document 6 EX/8, page 5), he would like to be given some idea of the meetings which were planned in connexion with University Development.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew attention to the text of Resolution 3,6 adopted by the Mexico Conference (Document 20/129 (rev.), page 22).

Professor CHEN Yuan asked for further details of the contacts made by Unesco with the Congress of Universities of the British Empire, to be held in London in July, and with the meeting of the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers scheduled for the end of March in Paris.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the Secretariat was already in touch with the organizers of the Paris meeting, and Unesco would be represented at both this and the London Congress; in addition, Unesco proposed to take advantage of the presence in London of many representatives of British and foreign universities to organize for July the meeting of university representatives called for by Resolution 3.6. of the Mexico Conference.

Professor VERNIERS remarked that, in the last paragraph but one of page 6 of the English text of Document 6 EX/8, the organization in question was the International Bureau of Education (I.B.E.).

Professor SOMMERFELT having commented that nowhere was there a direct reference to music, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that music was included by implication in the part of the programme relating to the Arts in General Education. He also pointed out that Document Int./PFC/3, which outlined what was planned within the Organization, had been distributed to members of the Executive Board for information.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Programme Committee should give close attention to questions concerning this important point, and he requested the Secretariat to submit a report to the next meeting of the Programme Committee.

Professor PHOTIADES emphasized that physical education must not be forgotten either.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the Board should resume the consideration of Document 6 EX/8 at the point where the Programme Committee had left off, i.e. point 10.

10. MASS COMMUNICATION

With regard to point B (Survey of Technical Needs), the CHAIRMAN asked for details of the practical measures which the Secretariat proposed to take in order to meet the needs revealed by the survey.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the Secretariat proposed (1) the granting of fellowships to technicians in needy countries; (2) an appeal to establish a fund to help needy countries develop or reconstruct their technical equipment.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned the Board's keen desire that the very valuable surveys made by Unesco should result in practical and tangible measures to meet the needs revealed. He thought that, in addition to the points mentioned by the Director-General, it would be desirable for the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction to examine at its next meeting the possibilities of constructive action.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL indicated that this question involved the wider problem of foreign exchange; it was hoped that, thanks to the advice of an expert on international finance whose services Unesco would

secure, Unesco might otherwise overcome the difficulties presented by this problem of foreign exchange, and in that case it would be able to call upon considerable resources to meet the urgent needs referred to by the Chairman; for example, Unesco could procure newsprint for countries in great need of it.

The CHAIRMAN was sure that Professor Carneiro would not fail to point out the importance of these practical questions to the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction, of which he was Chairman.

Professor CARNEIRO said he would revert to this point when his Committee's Report came before the Board.

With regard to point C (Free Flow of Information) M. Louis GROS (United Nations) requested information about the "liaison officer at Lake Success" mentioned in the first paragraph.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the reference was to M. Fradier, who was on a temporary liaison mission with the Information Division of the United Nations, and not to Unesco's New York Office, which was permanent.

11. FIELD SCIENCE CO-OPERATION OFFICES

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL having announced that the Report on this question was in course of reproduction, the CHAIRMAN decided to postpone its study.

12. HYLEAN AMAZON

Professor CARNEIRO made the remarks which he had withheld at the morning's meeting. In his opinion, the Hylean Amazon project had

6 EX/SR 4 (rev) - page 6
2 June 1948

reached the crucial point when it was to be submitted for approval by the Governments which had been invited to sign an International Convention concerning it. The Secretariat had prepared excellent material which would be communicated to the delegates of some ten countries; the project was directly concerned with natural science, social science and education questions, but it also had political implications; it was something altogether new for scientists of different countries to collaborate in the common study of problems hitherto approached only from the national angle. The very novelty of the idea risked offending certain sections of opinion, and the Executive Board must be prepared for difficulties. Already at the Mexico Conference, two different points of view had become apparent: one, that the creation of an independent body to undertake a series of enquiries, researches and studies under Unesco's auspices should precede the submission of a Convention to the States concerned who would be required to adhere to it for example, about the end of the year; the other, that the Institute should be officially constituted before any work at all was undertaken. In the end, the latter view had prevailed, and Professor Carneiro himself had given it his support, although he foresaw possible difficulties. For this reason, he was anxious that, at this critical juncture, the Executive Board should demonstrate its direct concern for the success of the meeting to be held in Peru by sending there one of its members - the Chairman for example - whose presence would be a proof of the continuing interest of the General Conference of Unesco in this task.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ wished to associate himself with Professor Carneiro's remarks and to support his last suggestion.

Dr. STODDARD agreed with the principle that the Board should be represented by one of its members.

The principle was adopted.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL suggested another way of helping. About the same time there was to be a Conference at the Pan-American Union on cultural questions at Bogotá; the same member of the Board appointed to attend the first meeting could also be present for part of the Bogotá Conference.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Professor Carneiro's proposal was an innovation as far as the Executive Board of Unesco was concerned, although other bodies sent representatives of their Governing Bodies or Executive Boards to certain important Conferences. Unesco would in the present case be represented of course by the Secretariat; the representation of the Executive Board in addition would constitute an important development. He added that he did not know whether it would be possible for him to represent the Board as Professor Carneiro had proposed; he asked them to wait until he had had an opportunity of discussing the matter at leisure with Professor Carneiro before proceeding to a definite appointment in the light of all relevant factors. This was agreed.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that in accordance with the decision reached to have the Board separately represented at some Unesco meetings, an opportunity might be found for Dr. Arnold to visit Paris and to attend a Unesco meeting even before the next meeting of the Board. This was agreed.

13. TENSIONS AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Dr. STODDARD wished to repeat the announcement already made to the Programme Committee; Professor Hadley Cantrill, who had just been given a six months appointment to direct this project, was a specialist with a very high reputation in the United States, and he (Dr. Stoddard) was delighted with the Director-General's selection.

With regard to the questions to be examined by the International Studies Conference, the CHAIRMAN hoped that the "other contributions to this series" in prospect would cover cultural regions other than those comprised in the first project (Switzerland, Norway, France, and Poland). The question of fees raised in paragraph 3 would be resumed in connexion with the examination of the Budget.

14. EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

Professor CARNEIRO gave notice that he would revert to Item B (Co-ordination of International Fellowships, Policy and Activities) when the report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction came under review.

15. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

With reference to Item B (copyright), Professor CARNEIRO wished to know whether anything had been arranged about the Brussels Meeting.

Professor VERNIERS recalled that there had been an intention to hold this Conference since before the war and that it had been agreed with Unesco last year that the Conference should be summoned in 1948 by the Belgian Government, Unesco being represented by an observer.

16. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL COMMISSIONS AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

The CHAIRMAN wished to remind them of the great importance given to this question by the members of the Executive Board.

17. EDUCATION

With reference to Item A (War-handicapped Children, Professor CARNEIRO proposed that the Board postpone this subject until the report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction came under review.

18. NATURAL SCIENCES

The CHAIRMAN wished to draw attention to the differences in presentation between Document 6 EX/8, whose headings followed those of the Budget, and the Document embodying the Programme adopted by the Conference; thus, Item A (Popularization of Science and its Social Implications), which appeared in the Programme under the heading of Social Relations, here came under the heading of Natural Science. In point of fact the project was to be handled by an Inter-sectional Committee.

With regard to Item B (Other Projects and Programme Services), the Chairman wished to know if the Conference on the Development of Science in Latin America should be regarded as a "Regional" Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied in the affirmative and added that he hoped to be able to submit to the Board very shortly the list of countries he intended to invite to that Conference.

The CHAIRMAN thought the Executive Board could take it on itself to authorize the Director-General to call together the Conference on High Altitude Research Stations in a place other than that appointed by the General Conference, observing that Interlaken seemed more suitable than Paris for a conference of this kind.

Professor CHEN Yuan agreed with the Chairman.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Professor VERNIERS wished to know whether the essential object of the scientific and cultural history of mankind (here included under the heading of Natural Science) was not to furnish primary, and even more, secondary, school teachers with material designed to demonstrate that civilization and the progress of culture were in fact dependent on the spiritual contributions of all countries; if this was accepted, this project should normally come under the heading of Education for International Understanding.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the classification used in Document 6 EX/8 conformed to that adopted by the Budget Sub-Commission in Mexico; the example quoted by Professor Verniers was covered by the Chairman's earlier remark. It should be noted that an Inter-section Committee had already been appointed to study the question of the scientific and cultural history of Mankind.

In this connexion Professor PHOTIADES asked the Director-General to bear in mind the very useful work in this field done by the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London.

19. SOCIAL SCIENCES

The CHAIRMAN was glad to note the rapid progress already made in these fields since the Mexico Conference and the steps proposed for the coming year.

This chapter was adopted without comment.

20. PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC SCIENCES

With reference to paragraph D (Other Projects and Programme Services), the DIRECTOR-GENERAL told the Board that he was now in a

position to give the information asked of him earlier with regard to co-operation by Unesco with the United Nations Conference on Human Rights. That Conference's Minorities Sub-Committee had adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General:

to inform Unesco of the United Nations' interest in programmes of education against race prejudice;

to request Unesco to make available to the United Nations all available documents or analyses on this point derived from the study of tensions or any other programme of Unesco; to seek close collaboration between Unesco and the United Nations;

as a first step, to suggest that Unesco propose and recommend the general adoption of a programme for the dissemination of scientific data on racial questions.

In addition, the Sub-Committee on Education had adopted a resolution requesting Unesco to set up a committee of internationally known experts alike in the theory and practice of education, to study and select certain basic principles for universal democratic education, in order to combat intolerance and hostility whether between nations or between various groups.

The first of these resolutions had been adopted by eight votes to five abstentions, and the second by seven votes to four and three abstentions. The resolution had only been adopted a fortnight ago and consequently the Secretariat had not had sufficient time to consider the means of implementing them.

Sir John MAUD wished at this stage to raise a point of detail

6 EX/SR 4 (rev) - page 12
2 June 1948

regarding a similar case, where the Mexico Conference had proposed collaboration between the United Nations and Unesco. He was referring to Resolution 3.18 "Educational Opportunities for Women". Under the terms of this resolution the Director-General was instructed to collaborate with the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council in promoting enquiries through competent bodies into educational opportunities open to women.

Having regard to the enormous mass of work already placed on the shoulders of the Director-General, Sir John felt that the Director-General was not at present in a position to pursue this question. He thought that the Commission on the Status of Women should be informed of this.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this was one of the eleven projects in the field of education which had not been accorded the high degree of priority given to seven other projects in the same field. It was, therefore, one of the items where they must be satisfied with slow progress and, as nothing much could be put in hand, they must not expect spectacular results in the coming year.

Sir John MAUD expressed his entire agreement on the wisdom of proceeding slowly, but again stressed the necessity of informing the Economic and Social Council of this.

The CHAIRMAN, reverting to the other question raised by the Commission on Human Rights, expressed the view that it was for the Director-General to consider what action was possible within the limits imposed by the credits at his disposal.

21. ARTS AND LETTERS

Dr. OPOCEŇSKY asked for an amendment to paragraph A.1 (International Theatre Institute). He wanted the words "in principle" added, so that the text would read "the Government of Czechoslovakia has in principle agreed to invite the International Theatre Congress to meet in Prague in June". The final decision actually rested, as he had already explained, with the Council of Ministers. He was, however, sure that the decision would be favourable.

Passing to Item A.3 (Encouragement of High Quality Reproduction), the CHAIRMAN thought it would be useful to ask the Director-General to explain, for the benefit of those who were not experts in these matters, the reasons which had dictated the selection of these four spheres. It was no doubt a question of special reproductive facilities.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the choice of subjects had been made after a discussion with experts and had been dictated by the necessity of confining oneself to questions embracing a wide sphere, on which a vast amount of information was already available. Thus, as regards Persian art, there was already a large collection of reproductions in the United States which could be used, and would so cover the Middle East; the same was true of Italian Renaissance art. As for European art of the 19th century - in the case of which he personally had suggested that they should confine themselves to the end of the 19th century - this covered the sphere of modern art. Finally as regards Prehistoric art, he too had suggested this choice, the subject being very interesting, although often neglected, and in regard to which many reproductions had already been made.

22. LIBRARIES

The CHAIRMAN said that the Book Coupon Scheme was not mentioned here. Considerable sums had, however, been allocated to it in another document submitted to the Finance Committee. Before any financial commitments were made, a fuller report on the subject would no doubt be made available to the Executive Board.

He recalled that at the close of the previous meeting the Board had still to adopt two resolutions recommended in the Programme Committee's report (Document 6 EX/16.)

Sir John MAUD moved the adoption of these resolutions, with, however, a slight amendment to the English text of the second one. He thought it would be better to suppress the reference to the Budget Sub-Commission, so that the text would read: "..... in view of the General Conference not having appropriated any funds for this purpose".

Adopted

The CHAIRMAN referred to the considerable amount of work which had already been done since the Mexico City Conference. He thought this was very encouraging and hoped that the same could be said of all the projects. As Dr. Stoddard had wished, the day was approaching when the Board would be able to discuss not only what Unesco was going to do, but what it had done.

(At this juncture M. Roger Seydoux joined the meeting)

The CHAIRMAN said that the spontaneous applause which had greeted M. Seydoux's arrival was sufficient evidence of the Executive Board's pleasure at seeing him take the place vacated by Professor Auger. He was sure that he spoke for all his colleagues in extending to M. Seydoux a warm welcome.

The Programme Committee should be entrusted with the continuing task of approving or disapproving suggestions made by the Director-General as regards the priority to be given to the various actions which the Secretariat was to take. The Mexico City Conference had asked the Director-General to adapt the programme to the Budget, with the result that the report no longer followed the duodecimal order of the programme, and this difference as regards presentation was liable to lead to confusion. He therefore thought that the Director-General should now be asked to prepare a commentary on the projects, in accordance with the order observed in the programme, indicating clearly the items in regard to which action had been taken or was in contemplation. Meanwhile he thought that the Board should, in principle, approve the Director-General's report, emphasizing its provisional nature and leaving the Programme Committee full discretion to alter the order of priorities; the Director-General himself might in any case wish to alter this order.

Sir John MAUD then moved the text of the following resolution:

"The Executive Board

- (1) Invites the Director-General to prepare a commentary upon the Programme for 1948 approved by the Second Session of the General Conference, indicating the projects on which specially intensive work is being undertaken or is proposed.
- (2) Invites its Programme Committee to consider this commentary and take such action thereon as seems advisable before the next session of the Board.
- (3) Meanwhile approves in principle the proposals on the implementation of the Programme set out in the Report of the

M. SEYDOUX thanked the Board for the great honour it had done him in summoning him to sit among its members, who knew that he had for several years devoted his energy to the task of promoting international understanding by education, science and culture. He promised the Board his full co-operation in the fine work it had undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that Sir John Maud wished to submit the text of a resolution.

Sir John MAUD expressed his great pleasure at being the first to welcome M. Seydoux. He was pleased to note that the agenda for this session of the Board - the first held since the Mexico City Conference - was very different from that for the session which had followed the First General Conference. Positive results had already been achieved; there had been adopted a resolution to the effect that the work in 1948 should be constantly supervised, so as to keep projects within reasonable bounds and to restrict them to those which were the most urgent, without specifying - very rightly in his opinion - which these should be. The report which had since been drawn up by the Director-General was an excellent document, showing the points to which he attached the most importance, and Sir John Maud thought that the time had come for the Board to approve this document. The great amount of preparatory work for this session of the Board had prevented the Secretariat from applying these suggestions, and the Secretariat must now be allowed to go ahead. Clearly, this report did not exhaust all possible action by the Board, or even by the Director-General. Unesco's action should indeed be continuing one, and the conclusions in the report merely represented a first instalment of it.

Director-General of 5 February 1948 (6 EX/8).

Dr. STODDARD seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN said he was all the more pleased by the adoption of this resolution in that it bore on the next item in the agenda, 10(b): "Consideration of special responsibilities of the Board in the execution of the 1948 Programme, in accordance with General Conference decisions". He pointed out that the 1948 Programme included one or two items involving special responsibilities on the part of the Board and of the Programme Committee, which had been instructed to pay due regard to them in the interval between the plenary sessions.

In view of the small amount of time remaining available to the Board at the present meeting, the Chairman suggested settling certain internal questions. He reminded the Board that Professor Auger was a member of certain Committees (The Programme Committee, the Committee on Relations with International Non-Governmental Organizations, and finally, the Special Temporary Committee on the Time, Place and Organization of the Work of the Third Session of the General Conference.) He was sure that the Board would be unanimous in asking M. Seydoux to replace Professor Auger on these three Committees. For the rest, given the considerable tasks with which the Board was faced, he was sorry that he would have to ask its members to sit on Sunday morning or on Saturday evening.

(The Board decided to hold a meeting on the morning of Sunday, 15 February).

The CHAIRMAN then pointed out that the "Temporary Committee on the Status and Responsibilities of the Executive Board" had not yet been able to meet, and he suggested a short meeting for the next day, 14 February at 9.30 a.m.

(Approved).

The CHAIRMAN said that he had, however, had conversations with the members of the Committee of Experts which was advising the Director-General on the Organization of the Secretariat. It was clear that some of these administrative problems derived from the tasks allocated to the Board by the General Conference, and so far as he himself was concerned he thought that an exchange of views with these experts, at a private meeting, would be very useful, bearing in mind, however, that it was obviously to the Director-General, and not to the Board, that these advisory experts would send their report.

(It was decided to hold a private meeting with these experts on 14 February at 3.p.m.)

Before concluding the meeting, so as to enable the members of the Board to attend Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's address on Gandhi at 6.30 p.m., the CHAIRMAN suggested continuing the study of the questions connected with the Beirut Conference. He reminded the Board that they had before them two reports, the Joint Report of the Programme Committee and the Special Temporary Committee (Document 6 EX/15) and the Director-General's Report (Document 6 EX/10).

He was especially glad that M. Seydoux was present, since the latter was one of the many delegates who had had some doubts on the subject

and had submitted concrete proposals. The report 6 EX/15 recommended the adoption of the Director-General's report, subject to certain comments.

The CHAIRMAN suggested reading the Director-General's report paragraph by paragraph, due regard being paid to the observations of the Special Temporary Committee.

M. SEYDOUX asked whether the report which he had presented on this subject to the Mexico City Conference had been communicated to Member States and to the Executive Board, for the document now submitted did not altogether convey the idea underlying his report.

The CHAIRMAN said he feared that the members of the Board were still grappling with the mass of documents which had been submitted to them and that they had not perhaps had a chance of studying M. Seydoux's report; but the Secretariat had taken that report into account in drawing up the document at present before the Board.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that M. Seydoux's report had been distributed at the close of the Mexico City Conference with all the other official documents, but that, having regard to the large amount of material submitted to the Board, he had thought it better to take it into account in drawing up his own report, rather than submit its actual text to the members of the Board again.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that the mixed Committee had decided against the organization of regional conferences, apart, of course, from those of National Commissions. (Item A.2) (Approved).

Item A.3. was also approved.

As regards Item 1.B. (Nature of Discussions) a new element had been introduced by the Committee, providing for the consideration of reports of Member States, and asking that this discussion should be included in the agenda.


The CHAIRMAN also indicated that the discussion of the programme would be confined to certain items mentioned in the agenda, since the permanent features of this programme were only indicated in the Director-General's report and in the Budget. While recognizing every delegation's right to ask for a discussion of questions which it had raised, the Committee had emphasized the fact that it was for the Executive Board to prepare the agenda and programme of work, and that this would enable the Board to concentrate their discussions upon the items selected and to restrict the number of subjects dealt with.

Sir John MAUD, while recognizing that the Conference must be presented with a complete programme and Budget for 1949, thought that the Board should indicate the most important items in the clearest possible manner, with a view to keeping the proceedings within reasonable bounds. Every item in the Director-General's report might be discussed, but there would be advantage in concentrating such discussions upon new developments which had taken place in the course of the year. Finally, the Conference would have to approve a complete programme, in the light of an examination of the Programme, the Budget and the Director-General's Report. If certain items were added to the Programme, it would be necessary, for obvious budgetary reasons, to cut down upon other items in the Programme.

The CHAIRMAN said that this exchange of views had constituted a useful opening of the discussion.

In reply to M. SEYDOUX, who thought that, if his report could be distributed it would serve as a useful guide for further discussions, the CHAIRMAN stated that this report would so far as possible, be made available to members of the Board.

(The Meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.)

 (The members of the Executive Board are requested to submit any corrections to Mr. S.G. Gebelt, Room 107)

6 EX/SR 5

PARIS, 16 February 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the Fifth Meeting held on Saturday, 14 February 1948 at 11.0 a.m. at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris XVIe.

Present :

- Chairman: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)
- Vice-Chairmen: Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)
- Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor Benjamin CARRION (Ecuador)
Professor Chen YUAN (China)
H.E. M. Victor DORE (Canada)
Resat Nuri GUMRESKIN (Turkey)
Sir John MAUD, K.O.B. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan CPOJENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. G. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. THOMAS (Greece)
M. Roger SEYDOUX (France)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
- Alternates: M.H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor Stanislaw ARNOLD
Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey
Dr. Manuel CAPRETA MACIA (Mexico) for H.E. Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ
- Observers: M. Louis GROS (United Nations)
Mme. MOREL (International Labour Office)
Dr. GREGOREWSKI (World Health Organisation)
- Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Dr. W.H.C. LIVES (Deputy Director-General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. S.G. GEBELT (Secretary)

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion on the organisation of the Beirut Conference should be continued. After that, the Committee would discuss in the following order: Activities in Germany, the Report of the Reconstruction Committee, the Report of the Finance Committee, and Action to appoint a Panel of Advisory and Administrative Experts.

Item 14 (b) of the Agenda - Third Session of the General Conference - Organisation of work.

The documents concerned were 6 EX/10, 6 EX/15 and the statement of M. Seydoux at the General Conference, when, as Rapporteur, he presented the report of the Drafting Committee to the Programme Commission. The statement was contained in document 2C/VR.18.

The CHAIRMAN was asked by the Director-General to say that the Report of the Secretariat in Document 6 EX/10 was based on a careful examination by the Secretariat of the points made by M. Seydoux.

The Special Committee on the Status of Members of the Board which had met that morning had decided that one of the problems it had to consider was the implication for the conduct of the General Conference of any decisions taken regarding the role of the Board. One of the difficulties at Mexico had been that of deciding when the opinions of the Board should be submitted to the Conference and discussed by it. This was a question of principle which would have to be decided before the next General Conference.

Document 6 EX/10, B. Nature of Discussions.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Board had already decided that after the Report of the Director-General, the Debate on his Report and the examination of the Budget, there would have to be a series of special topics on which discussions would be based. At that point the meeting had adjourned. He asked for any observations on the subject.

Sir John MAUD thought the Programme Committee should be asked to bear these suggestions in mind when preparing the Provisional Agenda for circulation to Member States in April. It should draw up the Agenda in the light of discussions at the present Session of the Board and in accordance with suggestions from Member States. He therefore moved that the relevant part of Document 6 EX/15 should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN raised the question of the type of invitation that the Director-General was to extend to Member States.

Professor PHOTLADES thought there was some confusion between the organisation of the Conference and its Programme of Work. The first problem to be considered was that of its organisation, for example, the number of commissions that should be constituted and whether it would be necessary to have working parties.

The CHAIRMAN observed that he was trying to deal with the points in order. The nature of discussions should be taken first as it affected the number of commissions, etc. The Director-General had proposed a new procedure for the next Conference, that the continuing elements of the programme should be presented in the Director-General's Report and in the Budget, instead of being submitted in the form of Programme Proposals. The Agenda therefore, should contain, not the 1949 Programme, but proposals for new activities in 1949. The Chairman thought a first Provisional Draft Agenda in broad terms might be established at once for the guidance of Member States as follows :

- (1) Report of the Director-General.
- (2) Reports of Member States.
- (3) Proposed new activities to be begun in 1949.

(4) 1949 Budget.

(5) Other matters to be included at the request of Member States.

The Director-General could transmit this Draft Agenda to Member States, inviting proposals for points (3) and (5) and adding a note that an opportunity to review the activities of the Organisation, so far as continuing programme operations were concerned, was given under Items (1) and (4).

The Chairman then indicated that Mr. Gebelt had just made a very useful suggestion; if the above proposal was accepted the letters to Member States should include the Board's discussions on the subject.

Dr. STODDARD liked the plan very much. It would regulate the work of the Conference and give the Member States a better chance of forming adequate delegations. He emphasised the usefulness of National Commission reports to enable the Conference to devote its attention to public relations and information. In his opinion the delegates should come to Beirut, not in the mood of revising and criticising the programme, but of learning more about it.

Professor SOMMERFELT agreed heartily with the Director-General's proposal. He pointed out that two separate reports were not always necessary: in Norway for instance the report would be made by the National Commission.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that it was for Member States to decide the extent of the participation of the National Commission in drafting the report. The Agenda could not mention the National Commission specifically.

Dr. STODDARD thought this would be an excellent opportunity to review the work of those Commissions.

M. SEYDOUX agreed with Dr. Stoddard. He thought it was desirable to give the National Commissions ample time to examine all the problems which would be laid before the Conference, but he could not quite see how they could be advised about the new projects in due time. The French National Commission, composed of 80-100 members, was about to start its work and he wished to know when it would receive the relevant document which formed the most interesting part of the Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked the speaker what date he would suggest.

M. SEYDOUX said that as far as France was concerned the 1 July ought to be the time limit.

Professor CHEN YUAN was in favour of an even earlier date in the case of China and Dr. EL DIWANY agreed with him.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ agreed with Professor Chen Yuan and suggested 1 June for distant countries.

Professor VERNIERES thought there was a direct relation between this date and that of the Executive Board meeting in July. The Board would have to meet before the date suggested, unless its powers were delegated to the programme committee.

The CHAIRMAN was afraid the Board had not yet absorbed all the implications of the proposed plan. The continuing activities would be reviewed in the Director-General's Report and in connection with the Budget. The Board was responsible for the programme to be submitted to the Conference with regard to new activity. He suggested the adoption of the following two steps (1) A decision by the Board, or the Programme Committee if its powers were delegated to it, that certain new

6 EX/SR 5 - page 6
16 February 1948

activities be proposed to the Conference; (2) That the Secretariat should study the new proposals, reduce them to their details and submit them to the Board for approval. As the latter would be a fairly lengthy process, it might be difficult to make a clear distinction between those two steps. The Australian operating body, for instance, was anxious to be informed as soon as possible as to the character of the new proposal.

Sir John MAUD agreed with the Chairman and pointed out that his original notion was to send a provisional Agenda in April, with a request to Member States to submit new proposals at an early date. All the documents, and perhaps the Budget, might be ready for examination in July. He felt sure he was expressing the general feeling that the Beirut Conference should not spend too much time on the discussion of brand new activities, but on the deepened and developing 1949 Programme. Concerning item 3 of the Agenda suggested by the Chairman, he thought the wording might be altered to "items in the 1948 Programme selected for discussion and proposed new activities for 1949". Thus an opportunity would be created to examine how far the 1948 Programme had progressed.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that when Member States were invited to submit proposals they should be told that the final decision rested with the Executive Board, according to the Constitution.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, whilst agreeing with Sir John Maud, thought it would be very difficult to make out this preliminary list in a month, the chief reason being his wish to have the opinions of the newly appointed members of the Secretariat. He suggested that a preliminary provisional Agenda, which did not include all topics and new projects, could be got out early in May.

6 EX/SR 5 - page 7
16 February 1948

The CHAIRMAN understood that this list could be established by the Programme Committee acting on behalf of the Executive Board. Australia, for one, would be very disappointed if it was not ready before May. He wondered if the list the Director-General had in mind was not more elaborate than was strictly desirable and was in favour of an earlier date, even if the new members of the staff were not given the opportunity to express their opinion.

Professor CHEN YUAN supported the Chairman's view.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that in his opinion two meetings of the Programme Committee would be better than a meeting of the Committee followed by one of the Board. The first one could take place in the middle of March, to decide on the preliminary list and general form of the Agenda to be transmitted to the governments of the Member States, and the second, at the end of April, to get the rest out early in May.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that consultations as to the first list could be carried out by correspondence.

M. SEYDOUX asked Sir John if he had understood him right: he did not wish the Beirut Conference to review the entire 1948 Programme, but only those parts in which a great deal of work still remained to be done.

Sir John MAUD explained that he had not had that selection in mind. Not backwardness, but importance and suitability at Beirut should be the criterion. Some matters were well forward and yet they would gain by being further discussed.

6 EX/SR 5 - page 8
16 February 1948

M. SEYDOUX was not quite satisfied. He thought the work before the Secretariat, and the National Commissions, was enormous and that the greatest emphasis should be laid on the work whose progress had not been so rapid. The Programme Committee could probably effect this pre-selection.

Dr. STODDARD stressed that the discussion had reached a crucial point. He supported what had been so well expressed by Sir John. The Programme Committee and Executive Board had had many opportunities to criticise the Administration, and had taken full advantage of those opportunities. No further public criticism was needed at Beirut, since reports containing criticism only were negative. The Beirut Conference should be the occasion to send out reports about those things of which the Organisation was proud.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. STODDARD for his very helpful statement.

Professor PHOTIADES expressed his full confidence in Sir John Maud and Dr. Stoddard to find a satisfactory compromise, which would (1) safeguard Unesco's interest by showing the good work done and (2) avoid criticism by giving more impetus to the Humanities.

The CHAIRMAN thought he could summarise the wishes of the Board as follows : The Director-General should send to the Governments of the Member States a first, provisional list of items of the Agenda of the Beirut Conference. These would be :

1. Report of the Director-General
2. Reports of Member States
3. Items in 1948 Programme selected for discussion and proposed new activities for 1949.
4. Budget
5. Special matters raised by the Member States, the U.N. or its Specialised Agencies
6. Organisational questions - including National Commissions

and also

Election of new members of the Board;
Election of the Director-General;
Admission of new members;
Place and date of the Fourth General Conference

In connection with his report, the Director-General will explain that there would be opportunities for review of the continuing activities which were not covered by Item 3 and inform the Member States that they would shortly receive a list of the items which the Executive Board had in mind under that item and this would give them an opportunity to make suggestions. The Director-General would consult, as soon as possible, with the Programme Committee to establish the list under Item 3. After the Member States had sent in their suggestions, the Executive Board or Programme Committee would prepare the final agenda which would be sent out as early as possible. He suggested that the date, some time in April, should be established by the Director-General after consultation with him.

The Executive Board adopted this Procedure unanimously.

Professor CARNEIRO drew the attention of the Board to the very important role the National Commissions were called upon to play in the preparation of the Beirut Conference. Unfortunately, they were very short of documents as to the Mexico Conference and even concerning Unesco itself. The lists of documents published by Unesco were not up to date and did not go beyond June or July 1947, accordingly he would make the following formal recommendation. (1) That the Secretariat should get those lists of documents up to date and (2) send them to the National Commissions to enable them to complete their archives.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that the Secretariat could send documents direct to National Commissions only in those cases where the respective

6 EX/SR 5 - page 10
16 February 1948

governments had agreed on this procedure. He agreed that Member States and National Commissions should be kept informed of all the documents issued and that special steps should be taken to ensure this. The problem was a fairly difficult one because the amount of documents was very great while their importance was unequal. As regards publications, they would be discussed later.

Professor CARNEIRO thought there was a misunderstanding: all public documents of Unesco were unrestricted as to the method of transmission and circulation and yet National Commissions often did not receive them.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the machinery to avoid this was being improved. A list of all documents would be published, and from time to time (every two or three months) the Monitor would list the latest additions.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the relevant Mexico Resolution specified that even information should go by different channels. In order to speed up the discussions he tabled the Director-General's proposal to restrict the number of Commissions to the following :

- (1) The Programme and Budget Commission
- (2) The Administrative Commission
- (3) External Relations Commission

(The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the terms of reference of Commission No. 2 would include all matters internal to the Secretariat, as well as the Financial Regulations.)

He suggested that the allocation of matters between Commissions 2 and 3 should be left for subsequent decision, and the Board agreed.

M. SEYDOUX wished to know if the matters which had previously been entrusted to the Budget Sub-Commission, would now be discussed under the Financial Regulation.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Director-General had informed him that a separate Sub-Commission would no longer be necessary and Financial Regulations would be dealt with as internal matters.

M. SEYDOUX referring to paragraph (c) asked if the name Working Parties would be retained.

The CHAIRMAN declared that this point would come up at a later stage. He wished to add that it might be desirable to have four Commissions by dividing the Programme and Budget one to avoid what had happened in Mexico, that is that the Administrative Commission's discussions had affected the Budget which was being discussed by the Sub-Commission of another Commission.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed that this difficulty always existed when the Budget Sub-Commission was part of the Programme and Budget Commission, and modified points on which the Programme Sub-Commission had taken decisions.

Dr. OPOCENSKY thought the existence of the Budget Sub-Commission depended on how the Budget was drawn up and on the work of the Board Financial Sub-Commission. He was inclined to agree with the Director-General that it would no longer be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the provisional approval of three Commissions, the Board's right being reserved to make modification in the light of experience and felt sure no great inconvenience would result if a new decision was made.

Dr. STODDARD agreed with this but asked for special provision for reports on projects of world-wide interest. He had in mind the organisation of symposia on Fundamental Education, Hylean Amazon, Mass Communication and International Ideas Bureau. He was glad to note that

6 EX/SR 5 - page 12
16 February 1948

the Programme contained possibilities of reviewing these projects for the benefit of the observers, who would be present, and would have thus better information concerning them.

The CHAIRMAN thought the Board was now agreed on three major Commissions which would report to the Plenary Session of the Conference.

M. SEYDOUX agreed, subject to the reservation already made by the Chairman.

Professor OHEN YUAN pointed out that the Commission had recommended dropping the name Working Party.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that there was one difficult and important question left: What were the groups which must remain as the organic part of the Conference? Should they be groups, symposia or committees for the exchange of views with no initiative as to resolutions or sub-committees charged with the preparation of resolutions and recommendations to the Plenary Session?

Sir John MAUD moved that the Board take the definite decision that sub-committees and no other word should be used. The Mexico Conference had been a lesson as regards the drawbacks of hybrid bodies. Their composition could be left open in accordance with the recommendations of the mixed committee.

Professor CARNEIRO wanted to know if those sub-committees would have the possibility or duty to present resolutions to the General Conference. The experience of the Mexico Conference was that sub-committees could do useful work only when they could make certain recommendations. It was true that sub-committees sometimes went into too many details, but the Conference could easily correct that.

Dr. PARRA-FEREZ agreed with the Chairman as to the three

commissions; however, he felt that the Executive Board could not decide beforehand against a sub-committee for the discussion of some particular point. He agreed with M. Seydoux about the Budget Sub-Committee, which it was impossible to rule out at present.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that with regard to the Programme, the Member States were anxious to know what delegates they must send to the Conference. In Item 3 of the proposed Agenda, the suggestion was that many matters would be subjects for sub-committees but it would be desirable to limit their number to six whereas in Mexico there had been 15 working parties. It was the current opinion that the Conference should first meet and then set up its sub-committees, but the Board could recommend a limitation of their number.

Dr. STODDARD wanted some clarification on the nature of the sub-committee: Dr. Parra-Perez had suggested that they should be set up by the Commission which had that right; Sir John's suggestion was that a Programme Sub-Committee should be established. His suggestion was to follow the main lines of Unesco itself and have sub-committees for education, science, culture, arts etc.

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Board to meet at 3 p.m. to consult with the three experts who were advising the Director-General as to the re-organisation of the Secretariat, and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.



6 EX/SR 6 (rev.)
PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the Sixth Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e
on Saturday, 14 February 1948 at 5.45 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)

Vice-Chairman: Professor A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor CHEN Yuan (China)
H.E. M. Victor DOPE (Canada)
Ragat Nuri GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Sir John MAUD, K. O. D. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. O. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
M. Roger SEYDOUX (France)
Dr. George D. STODLARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Deputies: Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey
Dr. Manuel CABREPA MACIA (Mexico) for H.E. Dr.
Martinez Baez

Observers: M. Louis GRO'S (United Nations)
Mme. MOREL (International Labour Organization)
M. GREGOREZ/WSKI (World Health Organization)
M. VILLET-LAVALLEE (Food and Agricultural Organization)

Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W. H. O. LAVES (Deputy Director-General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
M. S. G. CABRUT (Secretary)

Consultative Committee on Finance and Administration

At the opening of the public meeting, the CHAIRMAN announced that, after receiving communications from the governments of Belgium, Norway, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, the Executive Board had appointed the following experts to the Consultative Committee on Finance and Administration:

Mr. E.P. Seeldrayers (Belgium)
Mr. Einar Grøstad (Norway)
Mr. Charles Hulten (U.S.A.)

These gentlemen had been invited to sit on the Consultative Committee until the next General Conference. The Chairman then submitted to the Board the following Draft Resolution: "The Consultative Committee on Finance and Administration shall render a report to the Board on the auditors' report, which will be passed to it".

This resolution was adopted.

The Chairman suggested that the chairmen of the various Committees of the Board who might wish to refer matters to the Consultative Committee should do so through the Chairman of the Executive Board.

Agreed.

Item 14(b) of the Agenda: Third Session of the General Conference;
Organization of Work (contd.) (Document 6 EX/10)

1. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION (Continued)

C. Organization of Commissions and Sub-Commissions or
Working Parties (contd.)

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Board that at the end of the morning meeting Dr. Stoddard had made a proposal providing for sub-commissions for each of the principal sections of the Programme.

Dr. STODDARD explained that his proposal dealt with the setting up of sub-commissions for a number of matters including Education, Science, the Cultural Arts, Mass Communication and Reconstruction. He would leave it to the Programme Committee to make further suggestions.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked the Board to postpone any decision on this item, so that the Programme Committee could have time to examine the matter at leisure; nor was it essential to take an immediate decision on the appointment of the six or seven sub-commissions responsible for examining the 15 questions or so to be included in the Programme for 1949.

M. SEYDOUX inclined to favour Dr. Stoddard's proposal. In his view the Board should come to a decision, if not forthwith, at least before the end of the present session, so as to enable Member States, their delegations and their National Commissions to make preparations for the

next General Conference on a practical basis. The titles suggested by Dr. Stoddard for five of the sub-commissions appeared acceptable to everyone, especially as they corresponded to the list unanimously approved at Mexico by the Drafting Committee and adopted by the General Conference. He added in conclusion that he shared the view expressed that morning by Professor Carneiro that it was essential for the number of specialized bodies to be limited to a maximum of six and for these to be no longer "Working Parties" (of unhappy memory), but true "sub-commissions" submitting resolutions which could be revised, as required, by the parent commissions.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it would be a mistake to try to decide there and then the number and titles of these sub-commissions. The Executive Board had already decided that the number of sub-commissions and the number of questions they would be required to examine must be limited; there appeared to be great difficulties in bringing all essential questions within the terms of reference of six sub-commissions (e.g. the matter of relations with National Commissions and Non-Governmental Organizations). Would it not be better to give the Programme Committee time to consider so complex a question, especially as, even if they were warned in March, Member States and the National Commissions would have ample time to prepare for the General Conference?

Dr. STODDARD explained that his motion was quite fluid, as it provided for such other sub-commissions as might be recommended by the Programme Committee; for instance, the Sub-Commission on Science could be replaced by two sub-commissions, one for Natural Science and the other for Social Science.

On Professor CARNEIRO's request, Dr. STODDARD moved his proposal in the following terms: "that the Programme be made up from five main sub-commissions (Education, Science - possibly sub-divided into Natural Science and Social Science, - Cultural Arts, Mass Communication, Reconstruction); and that, if the Director-General should deem further sub-commissions desirable, these might be set up on the recommendation of the Programme Committee".

M. SEYDOUX asked if Dr. Stoddard would agree to increasing the number of sub-commissions provided for in his provisional programme to six, so that they could have one sub-commission for Natural, and one for Social Science.

Dr. STODDARD accepted the amendment and added that, on the Director-General's request, he would replace the expression "Cultural Arts" by the expression "Cultural Questions".

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the motion on which they were to vote was a draft recommendation from the Board to the Programme Committee.

Dr. Stoddard's motion as amended was adopted by 11 votes to 3.

D. Time Schedule of Meetings.

The solution proposed in paragraph b) was adopted.

E. Role of the Executive Board

Consideration of this item was postponed to a later meeting of the Board.

F. Staffing of the General Conference

This item was noted without remark.

2. DOCUMENTATION

A. Basic Considerations

M. SEYDOUX asked if the Board was agreed on the adoption, if practicable, of a single text comprising the Programme and the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this raised a point of order, as the Board was responsible for drafting the Programme, and the Director-General for framing the Budget.

M. SEYDOUX suggested that there was no difficulty about submitting the Programme and Budget as two separate documents, which could readily be consulted simultaneously by simple collation.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered this a good solution.

M. SEYDOUX's suggestion was adopted.

Sir John MAUD pointed out that the "Joint Report of the Programme Committee and the Special Temporary Committee on the Time, Place and Organization of the Work of the Third Session of the General Conference" (Document 6 EX/15) made a recommendation regarding Item 2. A. iii. c. of the Director-General's Report 6 EX/10.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the proposals submitted as resolutions by the sub-commissions could be supported by reports. If the Sub-Commissions submitted draft resolutions, the work of the Chairman, Rapporteur and Secretariat was very difficult, as those resolutions would have to be drawn up in an acceptable and reasonable form.

The Board adopted the recommendation in Document 6 EX/15 brought to their notice by Sir John Maud.

M. SEYDOUX said that in consequence of this vote Item 2 A. iii. c. must be re-drafted.

B. Suggestions for Documentation

The CHAIRMAN thought paragraph (i) went into too much detail for the purposes of the Board and that the points raised were really notes for the Director-General; much of the document under consideration appeared to be intended only for internal use by the Secretariat.

Sir John MAUD accordingly asked that only those items be considered on which the Joint Committee had asked the Board for a decision. For his part he could see only one item to discuss, that arising out of the last paragraph of Document 6 EX/15, namely the duration of the Third Session of the General Conference.

Professor SOMMERFELT shared this view and pointed out that the Joint Committee had decided to recommend a duration of three weeks and two days.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that he had asked for a certain amount of latitude, permitting him, if necessary, to advance the opening date of the Conference two or three days; hence the "three and a half weeks" mentioned in Document 6 EX/15.

The CHAIRMAN added that several members of the Joint Committee had asked that there be a time-limit for the exercise of this latitude.

The recommendation in the last paragraph of Document 6 EX/15 was adopted without amendment.

Next Session of the Executive Board

Sir John MAUD proposed that the date of the next session of the Executive Board be left to the discretion of the Chairman.

Professor SOMMERFELT supported the proposal, but hoped that members would receive all relevant information well in advance.

The CHAIRMAN asked members to hand the Secretary a note indicating those weeks in which they had commitments precluding their attendance at a session of the Board.

Dr. STODDARD asked the Chairman if he had any idea of the month in which the Board was likely to meet.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, as all decisions concerning the Programme of the next General Conference had been left to the Programme Committee, the Board might meet at the beginning of July.

Dr. CPOCENSKY said it would be difficult for him to make himself available between 1 and 8 July.

M. SEYDOUX suggested that the Chairman pick a week between 1 and 15 July.

Sir John MAUD gave his reasons for suggesting that the selection of a date for the Board's next session be left to the Chairman. The choice of date was dependant on the fixing of a time-table for the various Committees and on the preparation of the documents for the Board's session. The Chairman was in a better position than anyone else to take account of these two essential factors in picking a date.

Dr. STODDARD proposed that the next session of the Board should take place during July in default of an earlier session being called by the Chairman.

This proposal was adopted.

Meeting of the Board During the Beirut Conference

The CHAIRMAN said he had gained the impression from a number of private conversations that it would be desirable to arrange meetings of the Board at the time of the Beirut Conference in the territory of one or several of the Lebanon's neighbours.

Dr. EL DIWANY pointed out that, as the General Conference was to be held in the very centre of a vast cultural region, it would be desirable for the Executive Board to meet at the two extremes of that region, say, at Istanbul (before the Conference) and at Cairo (after the Conference).

Professor CARNEIRO thought the proposal excellent from the point of view of prestige and spreading Unesco's influence. However, the question had two aspects: an official visit by Unesco, allowing of direct contact with governments and National Commissions in these two centres of Arab culture, was undeniably valuable; but it was of secondary importance whether the Executive Board actually met there or elsewhere, especially as the move from Istanbul to Beirut and later from Beirut to Cairo would to some extent hamper the work of the Board and involve additional expense for the transport of the technical services. There was really no reason why these two visits should not take place and the Board meet at the seat of the Conference; indeed, this solution would have the advantage of creating no disturbance to the Board's work and no obstacle to the official visits to Istanbul and Cairo. He would however like to hear the views of his Egyptian and Turkish colleagues.

Dr. EL DIWANY felt that a purely social visit involved certain material inconveniences, while a meeting of the Executive Board could not fail to provide a great stimulus to local interest in Unesco. As regards transportation of the technical equipment for the Board, this was not as difficult as Professor Carneiro thought, as witness the early stages of the Executive Board meetings in Mexico, where the difficulties did not prevent the members accomplishing their task.

M. GUNTEKIN shared the views of his Egyptian colleague: while a visit by Unesco could not fail to give pleasure to Turkey, a meeting of the Executive Board would be on quite another plane, in view of the interest it would arouse in the Turkish press. Before very long Turkey would be able to say whether the suggestion was feasible; for the moment it would be a pity to deny Istanbul the benefits of a visit which might be very good for Unesco.

Professor PHOTIADES pointed out that, as this particular part of the Eastern Mediterranean was the cradle of civilization, it would show failure to appreciate Unesco's cultural mission to refuse to entertain the proposal just made. It was therefore essential that Unesco should officially visit Istanbul (in default of Ankara) and Cairo; the most economical way of doing this would be for the visit to be made by the Executive Board as

2 June 1948

part of an official journey. They must not overlook Egypt's graceful gesture in yielding to the Lebanon over the Third Session of the General Conference; nor the desirability of drawing a distinction between Arab and Turkish culture. Thus, a visit by the Executive Board to Istanbul and Cairo was essential at the time of the Beirut Conference, especially as it might be more than 20 years before Unesco again had such an opportunity.

Dr. OPOCENSKY thanked the Egyptian and Turkish delegates for their invitation. However, it might be best to take no decision until the Board received an official invitation.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that for the present it was not a question of taking decisions, but of examining the matter from a general point of view. Many administrative and technical points would remain to be decided at a later meeting.

Dr. EL DIWANY explained that he spoke in his private capacity and not in the name of the Egyptian Government.

M. GUNTEKIN said that Unesco was everywhere a welcome guest; should the Organization decide to pay a visit to a Member State, it was a great honour for that country, and no country would hesitate for a second to extend in all sincerity an official invitation.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that for the moment they were only concerned with exploring the possibilities of holding a meeting of the Executive Board in the territory of one or two of the Lebanon's neighbours. He then read a resolution proposed by Sir John MAUD, to which, he said, he had taken the liberty of making certain minor alterations:

That the Board ask the Director-General to report to the next session of the Board on the material arrangements that would be involved if the Board decided to hold meetings in neighbouring countries before and after the Lebanon Conference.

Sir John MAUD added that, however much the Board might wish to pay a visit to the two countries concerned, they must ask themselves if it was possible, from a material point of view, to hold two meetings in two different countries, one before and one after the Beirut Conference. Hence the advantage of considering the need to hold only one meeting in a neighbouring country.

Professor CARNEIRO reminded them that he had expressed the hope that Unesco would pay two official visits, to Istanbul and Cairo respectively, with or without a meeting of the Executive Board; his proposal was designed only to facilitate visits very valuable in themselves.

Professor PHOTIADES supported Professor Carneiro's view.

The CHAIRMAN thought it was not out of place to consider the possibility of holding meetings of the Board at Istanbul and Cairo; however, he re-read the resolution proposed by Sir John Maud with the

following amendment:

..... Before or after the Beirut Conference.

This resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there still remained many items of the agenda for consideration, and expressed the view that some of them must be postponed till the next session; others would have to be referred to the appropriate Committee of the Board, and others again be left to the discretion of the Director-General and the Chairman of the Executive Board. It would nevertheless be essential to consider the following items at a last meeting of the Board, to be held on Sunday, 15 February at 9 a.m.:

Salaries and Allowances (Item 12);

Creation of an Appeals Board and Appointment of its
Chairman (Items 13 b. and c.);

Action to be taken in accordance with General Conference
Resolutions on Unesco's programme in Germany and Japan
(Item 10 c.);

Grants-in-aid to International Non-Governmental Organizations
(Item 8);

The Meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.



6 EX/SR.7 (Secret) (rev)

PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the Seventh Meeting held on Sunday, 15 February 1948
at 9.00 a.m. at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (XVIe)

Present:

Chairman: : Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)

Vice-Chairman: Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)

Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)
H.E.M. Victor DORE (Canada)
Resat Nuri GINTEKIN (Turkey)
Sir John MAUD, K.C.B. (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan POJENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. G. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
M. Roger SEYDOUX (France)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Deputies: M.H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor Stanislaw
ARNOLD
Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik GEORBAL
Bay
Dr. Manuel CABRERA MACIA (Mexico) for H.E.
Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ

Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W.H.C. LIVES (Deputy Director-General)
M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. S.G. WEBER (Secretary)

The CHAIRMAN said that the Board would proceed, in secret session, to a discussion of the question of salaries and allowances to which it attached considerable importance.

The members of the Board had before them the Report of the Director-General on this subject (doc. EX/CF/6 - Corrigendum). The Finance Committee had studied at length the question of the new salary and allowances scale. It had discussed this new scale more especially from the point of view of the salaries paid by the French Government. This was a very delicate matter, and the results of the Finance Committee's work were embodied in the above-mentioned document. They were proposals by the Director-General and, before asking the latter

to present them and to furnish any explanations that might be desired, the Chairman thought it would be useful to describe the background of the work which had culminated in these proposals.

He thought that the best way of approach would be to consult the table in Annex I of the document, where it would be seen that four separate alterations to the old scale were contemplated. Two other factors, not indicated in the table, were involved in the preparation of the new scale. These were, on the one hand, the abolition of the daily living allowance paid to staff recruited outside Paris, and on the other, the recent devaluation of the franc, which increased by 80% the number of francs which the staff received.

He reminded the meeting that the daily living allowance of \$5. for persons without dependents and \$7. for those with dependents was an altogether temporary measure, which had been adopted when the Secretariat was transferred from London to Paris and was intended to cover the initial installation expenses of the staff. As the Board would recall, the General Conference had requested that this allowance which, he repeated, was essentially provisional in character, should be abolished.

The abolition of this allowance would result in a considerable immediate reduction (of some \$1,825 or \$2,555 a year, according to whether or not there were dependents) in the amounts received by certain classes of personnel, which the latter would feel all the more in that they had come to regard these allowances as a fixed part of their salary. Clearly this allowance, when added to the salary of the lower grades, formed a considerable part of their total emoluments; an initial result of its abolition would therefore be to accentuate the difference between the salaries of the lower and those of the higher grades. It should moreover be noted that the staff of the lower grades were much better paid than they would be outside Unesco and that the daily living allowance was not paid to locally-recruited personnel, which latter of course consisted principally of French nationals; this again gave rise to considerable differences in treatment, and to the formation of two distinct groups within the staff.

Reverting to the four alterations to the old scale, to which reference had been made above, the Chairman explained that these alterations bore:

1. on the salaries
2. on a Dislocation Allowance,
3. on an End of 1947 Salary Adjustment,
4. on a Future Cost of Living Adjustment.

As regards alterations to salaries, the new scale had been based on that used by the United Nations, this involved an increase of from \$200 (in the case of the lower grades) to \$100 (in the case of the higher grades), through one of \$150 for the intermediate grades.

As regards the dislocation allowance, this recalled the old daily living allowance, although it was far less generous. It had to be recognized that staff whose homes were a long way from Unesco headquarters had to meet considerable extra expenditure. The allowance now proposed was to some extent a combination of the rental and expatriation allowances paid by the United Nations. The scale proposed would vary in inverse ratio to salaries. The Finance Committee had recognized the need for such an allowance but had suggested that it should be limited to five years. This was a point which the Executive Board would have to decide. This allowance should not moreover be confused with the Installation Allowance proposed in the Director-General's Report, which was intended to meet initial hotel, etc., expenses and was limited to 90 days.

The next two elements related to the fact that prices were continuing to rise in France. The End of 1947 Salary Adjustment took account of the supposed inadequacy of the new salary scale, in view of the rise in the cost of living in France. The Future Cost of Living Adjustment was intended to allow for a continued rise in the cost of living or for a decrease in the cost of living. As regards the first of these two schemes, it had been explained to the Finance Committee, when it considered the matter, that an inquiry had been carried out to compare the cost of living in New York and in Paris respectively; it had been found that the cost of living was 103% higher in Paris than in New York and it was for this reason that it had been argued that although the devaluation of the franc gave an 80% increase in francs, it was reasonable to make the end of 1947 adjustment, tapering it off towards the higher grades. The Finance Committee had discussed whether the adjustment was necessary or not, and, in the Chairman's opinion, this was a most difficult point to decide.

As regards the second scheme, despite a series of important plans on the part of the French Government to check the rise in prices, the impression of observers was that of an accelerated rate of increase. It was therefore not surprising that the Staff wished for some assurance that there would be an automatic adjustment. The serious problem raised by the above schemes was that the resulting scale of salaries in francs appeared enormous compared with salaries paid by the French Government. Even the salary figures at a moderate grade were above those which any ordinary French employee could hope to obtain. But many members of Unesco's Staff came from abroad and had commitments outside the country and it was necessary to offer adequate salaries, in order to attract the right kind of people. It must also be remembered that Unesco's Staff was less fortunate than the Staff in New York, as its members were not paid in dollars.

As a last point, the Chairman recalled that the Finance Committee had provisionally approved the End of 1947 Adjustment only on the assurance from the Director-General that it was necessary in order to attract the right people.

Dr. STODDARD thought it should be made quite clear that the future cost of living adjustment could work in either direction, and if the cost of living decreased, it would be a downward adjustment.

Dr. EL DIWANY asked if there was any limit to the portion of salaries which could be transferred to home countries.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the transfers would be limited by the resources at Unesco's disposal, but it still remained to be decided whether the Director-General, the Executive Board or the Finance Committee would set those limits.

As there had been no French member of the Finance Committee, he then called upon M. Seydoux to give his opinion of the proposed scales.

M. SEYDOUX agreed with the Chairman that the increased salary scale raised a problem for the French Government, as it was inevitable that comparisons should be made. It was, however, difficult for him to take up a position at the present time, as he had only been a member of the Board for two days and had had insufficient time to study the documents. Also it was indispensable for him to talk with the representatives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the French Treasury before expressing any final view.

Life was indeed difficult and expensive in Paris for everyone and, at first sight, seemed to him to be especially difficult for foreigners, who were often in a precarious position at Unesco and also had a difficulty to maintain in their own country. But in comparing the Unesco salaries with those of French national employees, serious difficulties were encountered as Unesco employees of grades 9, 10 and 11 would, according to the proposed scale, be receiving salaries as high or higher than a director-general in France and even as high as the President of the Council of State, who was the highest paid official in France. His position was therefore an uncomfortable one and, if the Board was obliged to take a decision at once on the proposed scales, he would prefer to abstain from voting.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ admired M. Seydoux's prudence, as the problems involved were delicate ones. In his opinion, no comparison could be made between Unesco salaries and French national salaries, as international salaries could not be compared with any national ones. The rate of the proposed Unesco salaries was justified by the necessity of attracting the right type of persons and enabling them to work under normal conditions. He felt, however, that the French Government should be informed, if only as an act of courtesy, of the line which Unesco intended to take. The French authorities would be confronted by two problems (1) the question of equality between French employees at Unesco and French national employees; (2) whether they were prepared to grant to French employees of Unesco privileges and immunities denied to French national employees. In the first instance, Dr. Parra-Perez considered it impossible to establish equality; in the second, it was a matter for the French authorities to decide.

He had been struck by what M. Seydoux had said concerning French national salaries and Unesco salaries but thought it would be unwise for the Executive Board to make a comparison between the two. Taking an instance from his own country, he remarked that the Venezuelan Ambassador to Washington received a far higher salary than the President of the Venezuelan Republic, and this on account of the higher cost of living in Washington.

In conclusion, Dr. Parra-Perez thought the Board should take a decision at once, but should not consider the problem as solved. Continued study would be necessary, especially in the light of information received after M. Seydoux's consultations with the French authorities.

Sir John MAUD noted that the position was a difficult one which must be faced. He agreed with Dr. Parra-Perez that it would be difficult to take a final decision at the present meeting, but he thought the Board should take decisions of principle, in view of the work which had been done by the Finance Committee and the great effort made by the Secretariat during the short time which had elapsed since the Mexico Conference, to prepare proposals and documents for the present session of the Executive Board. Taking, therefore, the underlying principles of the proposals of the Finance Committee, he pointed out that Unesco was one of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and must be in line with them. Here, the principles of the Finance Committee seemed to be sound: the daily living allowance of \$5 or \$7 was abolished and the UN scale was adopted, although increased to allow for the higher cost of living in Paris. Personally, he would have preferred a compression of the first and third salary scales, that is to say, no End of 1947 Adjustment as well as an increased base salary, but he thought this could not be changed at present. He felt it was right to cover future changes in the cost of living, as provided for by the Future Cost of Living Adjustment and agreed that large enough salaries should be paid to attract the right kind of staff from outside France; the Director-General's advice should be followed by the Board in this instance. If, however, the Board accepted the new scales, the Organization should go slow in recruitment during 1948.

He therefore moved that the proposals of the Finance Committee should be approved by the Executive Board with a recommendation by the Board to the General Conference that they be accepted on condition that they be reviewed in one year's time in the light of changes in the UN salary scale and changes in the situation in France and in the world. He suggested that the Finance Committee should be asked to study further details, in consultation with the French authorities, but this would not change the principles of the Finance Committee's proposals, which he thought the Board should adopt.

Seconded by H. E. M. DORE.

Professor CARNEIRO thought that if the Board accepted the principle that all the personnel of the Secretariat should be treated alike, it would be useless and dangerous to pursue negotiations with the French Government regarding the situation of the French staff of the

Secretariat. The salary scales adopted should be uniformly adopted, independently of local conditions. He was sure M. Seydoux would accept the principle of equality of salaries within the Secretariat, and he could therefore approve the proposal of Sir John Maud, enriched by the remarks of Dr. Parra-Perez.

Dr. EL DIWANY asked whether salaries of Unesco employees were communicated to their respective Governments, and whether all members of the staff were exempt from taxation.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the Organization was functioning under a resolution of the First General Conference, to the effect that any taxes paid on salaries should be reimbursed by Unesco. With regard to the communication of salaries to Governments, this was done if requested. In any case, a document was circulated at the First General Conference, giving grades and salaries of all members of the staff, and this was a public document.

The CHAIRMAN then read the resolution of Sir John Maud:

"The Board approves the proposals of the Director-General as amended by him, following the discussion with the Finance Committee on Salaries and Allowances, on the understanding that:

- (1) The Finance Committee will consider any changes of detail which seem necessary in the light of further information supplied by the French authorities;
- (2) In one year's time from the present date there should be a review of the present scale of salaries and allowances*.

The Chairman was not personally satisfied that the End of 1947 Adjustment was necessary and he regretted that there had been no informal discussions with the French Government before the proposals had been put forward by the Secretariat to the Finance Committee. The latter, however, had decided to rely on the Director-General's assurance that the increases were necessary. Sir John Maud urged the Board to accept these proposals, but the Chairman felt the Board could have done so more gladly, had the French authorities been previously consulted.

As regards Professor Carneiro's remarks, although the Chairman thought he was right in theory, practice in Switzerland and New York had proved that it was preferable for discussions to take place between international organizations and the Governments of the countries where they resided.

In the Chairman's opinion, therefore, the Board should express its confidence in the Director-General's assurances, although some members might have doubts as to the necessity of certain measures.

As regards paragraphs (1) and (2) of Sir John Maud's proposal the Director-General should report to the next General Conference on any changes proposed by the Finance Committee in the light of consultations

with the French authorities. The Board could only approve the scales pending the next General Conference, which might reopen and modify the whole question.

Sir John MAUD agreed with the Chairman's remarks and thought it important that the staff should know that the proposals were only approved pending the next Conference and that, even if they were not changed by the Conference, they would be subject to modification by the Board in one year's time.

H.E.M. DORE wished the point to be stressed when any new member of the staff was engaged.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that if a member of the staff was given a contract for more than one year, based on the new scale, there should be a clause in the contract permitting the Organization to modify allowances and making it understood that the staff member might either benefit or lose by the modification. This new form of contract should be communicated to the Executive Board and the Finance Committee for their information.
Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed an amendment to paragraph (b) on page 4 of the corrigendum of document EX/CF/6. "Staff members will be permitted....." should read "Staff members may be permitted....." Regarding the proposals as already approved, the working out of the details should be left to the Director-General, requesting him to report to the next meeting of the Finance Committee on decisions taken. As regards transfers to the U.S.A. the Chairman would like to see the staff more generously treated later on, if dollar resources permitted, but without submitting individual members to an inquisition regarding their commitments in the U.S.A. Also the Finance Committee should be authorized, in the light of the Director General's decisions, to consider his own position, and he should decide with the Finance Committee on the treatment of high officials receiving a representation allowance.

As a member of the Finance Committee, Professor PHOTIADES wished it to be stated in the Minutes that the non-authorization of staff members to transfer a part of their salary to the U.S.A. placed them in a position of inferiority vis-a-vis the staff of the United Nations in New York and Switzerland who drew their salaries in hard currency, and even in an inferior position as regards all tourists who had recourse to the free market rate.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the proposals related only to graded staff, and proposed the addition of the word "graded" before "staff members" in paragraph 2 (d) on page 2 of the corrigendum to EX/CF/6.

Dr. OPCOENSKY asked whether the salaries of ungraded officials had also benefited by the devaluation.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Deputy Director-General had informed the Finance Committee that he was studying the problem of

bringing all employees in Unesco House within the new scale, but that there were certain services, such as those of the guards, which were provided under contract by other Organizations which paid their salaries and nothing had been envisaged in those cases.

M. SKEDOUX proposed that a formal vote should be taken on Sir John Maud's proposals. He had been very interested by the debate and thanked his colleagues for understanding his point of view. In reply to Professor Carneiro, he stated that he had never intended to dispute equality of salaries within the Secretariat, but he agreed less with the suggestion that local conditions should not be considered, and this would not be in conformity with UN regulations.

In conclusion, he would not vote against Sir John Maud's proposal, but still preferred to abstain from voting, as he was insufficiently informed and also because the French authorities had not been informed of the decisions. He did not wish to enlarge on this last point as the Chairman had already said what he thought with tact and firmness.

Professor CARNEIRO said he had not meant that local conditions should not be taken into account, but that the Organization itself should be allowed to do so.

Sir John Maud's proposal was adopted by 15 votes and one abstention.

(The meeting rose at 1.0.55 a.m.)



6 EX/SR 8 (rev.)

PARIS, 2 June 1948

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sixth Session

Summary Report of the Eighth Meeting held
at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris XVIe.
on Sunday 15 February 1948 at 11 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: Dr. E. Ronald WALKER (Australia)

Vice-Chairman: Professor Alf SOMMERFELT (Norway)

Members: Professor Paulo CARNEIRO (Brazil)
Professor CHEN YUAN (China)
H.E. M. Victor DOKE (Canada)
Resat Nuri GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. Dr. G. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela)
Professor A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Dr. George D. STODDARD (U.S.A.)
Professor L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Deputies: M.H. BIRECKI (Poland) for Professor Stanislaw
Arnold
Dr. Manuel CABRERA MACIA (Mexico) for H.E. Dr.
M. Martínez Baez
Mr. Richard COWELL (United Kingdom) for Sir
John Maud
Dr. EL DIWANY (Egypt) for H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey
Mr. P.N. KIRPAL (India) for Sir Sarvepalli Rad-
hakrishnan

Observers: M. Louis GEOS (United Nations)
Mme. MOHEL (International Labour Organization)
M. GREGORZEWSKI (World Health Organization)
M. VEILLET LAVALLEE (Food and Agriculture Organ-
isation)

Secretariat: Dr. Julian HUXLEY (Director-General)
Mr. W.H.G. LAVIS (Deputy Director-General)
Mr. [REDACTED] (Assistant Director-General)

The CHAIRMAN declared the meeting open to the public and explained that the Board had approved the Director-General's proposals as to salaries and allowances for a period not exceeding one year. When the re-examination of this scale took place local conditions, the advice of the French Government, and the practice of the United Nations would be taken into consideration. The matter now rested entirely with the Director-General. He also announced that Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan who had had to leave the meeting, had designated Mr. Kirpal as an alternate. Sir John Maud would have to leave in a few minutes and Mr. Cowell would take his place.

Professor SOMMERFELT, referring to the question of the currency in which grants-in-aid should be paid, said that the leader of the Permanent International Committee of Linguists in Holland had been informed that the grant-in-aid for his Committee would be paid in guilders or French francs. The Dutch Government refused permission to the Committee to pay experts in Swiss francs or dollars, and the Committee would therefore find itself in difficulties, unless part at least of the grant-in-aid could be paid in Swiss francs or dollars.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that the Organization was at present examining the need for dollars of recipients of grants-in-aid. As no decision had yet been taken, Unesco had made no statement to any Government regarding the currency in which grants-in-aid would be paid. This was the only answer he could give for the moment concerning the specific grant-in-aid mentioned by Professor Sommerfelt.

Opening the discussion of Item 10.c of the Agenda "Action to be taken in accordance with General Conference Resolutions on Unesco's Programmes in Germany and Japan" - (Document 6/EX/19) - the CHAIRMAN asked speakers to be as brief as possible.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL speaking on behalf of the Director-General said that in accordance with the instructions of the Mexico Conference (page 3), the Director-General had approached the Allied Control Authorities (whose reply would be found in Annex II~~E~~). Additional letters had been addressed to the Authorities in each of the four zones. So far, one written reply from General Lucius Clay had been received (Annex V) and on its basis the Director-General proposed to undertake the activities outlined on pages 1, 2 and 3 and asked for the Board's approval.

M. BIRECKI said he did not wish to comment on the advantages of the work Unesco could do in Germany, which were obvious. However, the question was very complex and hasty action undesirable. Therefore, each step undertaken should be carefully studied. The Mexico Resolution was very cautious in that respect. The Allied Control Authorities were the only competent authorities in Germany and their reply had created an entirely new situation. All that could be done at present had been done and he moved the following resolution: "The Executive Board has taken note of the Secretariat's approaches to the Allied Control Council with a view to implementing the Resolution adopted by the Second Session of the General Conference concerning Unesco's relations with Germany, and refers the matter to the Third Session of the General Conference."

Dr. OPOCENSKI supported this resolution and was of the opinion that the reply of the A.C.A. terminated the matter as far as the Secretariat was concerned.

Dr. STODDARD did not wish to start a legalistic argument but wished to stress that the Mexico Resolution did not specify that no further action should be taken if the A.C.A. turned down Unesco's proposals. General Clay's reply was evidence that some Zone Commanders thought this work desirable and approved of it. He thought the reply of the Allied Secretariat made that clear and therefore he was in favour of proceeding with the work.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the English and French versions of the Mexico Resolution were not identical. The English text spoke of "appropriate Allied Authorities" in the first instance and, later, of "appropriate Allied authority", whereas the French text referred, in both cases, to "appropriate Allied authorities", and he had been told that the General Committee of the Conference had accepted the English text. It was now for the Executive Board to make up its own mind. He wanted to point out that those who had been studying the text in English started from a different standpoint than those using the French text and not to divert discussion from the motion which had been moved and seconded.

Mr. COWELL thought that the substance of the discussions made it quite clear that it was the desire of the Mexico Conference that work in Germany should start. Accordingly, he endorsed the statement made by Dr. Stoddard. He had no mandate to prejudge the reply which would be received from the Commander of the British Zone but he thought it very probable that it would be favourable. Hence Unesco should go ahead with the work and thus a concrete plan could be arrived at in time for submission to the Third General Conference. Finally he wanted it made clear that points 1, 2 and 3 of the document submitted were mere samples of what Unesco could do. The organizing of international sections of universities was also of primary importance.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at this stage it was Mr. BIRECKI's motion only which was being discussed and not the substance of the Director-General's proposals.

Mr. BIRECKI held the view that the English and French texts, in spite of the small difference, both agreed with his resolution: when Unesco entered into negotiations with a government be it the one of present-day Germany or any other, and its proposals were turned down it could not turn round and enter into discussion with the governor of a province however big and important it was.

M. SEYDOUX did not wish to attempt to prejudge the French Zone Commander's reply but it would very probably be favourable and he agreed with everything Dr. Stoddard and Mr. Cowell had said. He also pointed out another difference in the French and English texts: after long discussions in Mexico "surveys and possible experiments" had been rendered by "des expériences éventuelles".

Dr. OPOCENSKY contested the right of the Secretariat to go beyond Conference decisions. When the A.C.A. replied negatively the matter was at an end and should be referred at least to the Executive Board. The political aspect might have considerable influence on the future of Unesco: hitherto there had sometimes been disagreements within the Executive Board but never any blocs or divisions and he urged the most careful reflection before coming to a decision.

Professor CARNEIRO thought the Board was faced by a rather delicate situation. The A.C.A. had turned down Unesco's proposals whereas some, at least, of the Zones had accepted them. Discussing this matter here was very different from discussing it in Mexico where the delegates represented their governments and had entire political freedom. Before casting his vote he wished to know if there were any precedents for a Specialized Agency of the UN doing work in Germany by the sole authorization of a Zone Commander.

The CHAIRMAN expressed complete agreement with what Dr. Opocensky had said as to the procedure which should have been followed. The Director-General had exercised the authority and discretion which were his and had written to the Zone Commanders, when it might have been perhaps more appropriate to consult the Executive Board before taking action on a delicate political question which had threatened to divide the Mexico Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, in defending what might be imputed to an error of judgment on his part, stated that he had assumed that the English text was the master one since it had been a British proposal and therefore that it meant what it said. As each Zone Authority had complete powers in the area under its administration he had agreed with the Deputy Director-General that Unesco should go ahead with letters to the Commanders of all the four Zones. Surveys and possible experiments had to be approved by the Board and he felt that he would not have fulfilled his duty if he had nothing to submit before the July meeting.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Director-General for his explanation and stated that if his advice had been sought he would not have advised the administration to address the Zone Commanders after the A.C.A. had sent the formal refusal, a fact of first political importance, without first consulting the Executive Board. The question of Germany was so important that he was ready to call a special session to discuss it and examine the Zone Commanders' replies.

Professor PHOTIADIS was of the opinion that the Executive Board obviously could not decide upon its proper course. He suggested it should be left to the Director-General and to the Chairman of the Board to review the matter and report to the next session of the Executive Board.

Professor SOMMERFELD thought July would be too late and was in favour of a special session, say, in about three weeks time.

Dr. STODDARD, speaking to the original motion and to the amendment proposed by Professor Photiades, wished to dissociate himself from the Chairman's remarks as to the Director-General's and the Deputy Director-

General's right to execute a Conference mandate. If the Mexico Conference had wanted to say "Allied Control Authority", it would have done so, and by the terminology used it had provided for the contingency which had arisen. He agreed with his distinguished English colleague that further delay was undesirable and thought that the earlier agreement was not to go into details of what was going to be done. General Clay, in his reply, mentioned what he thought it would be proper for Unesco to do and the Board now had all the necessary data.

The CHAIRMAN was anxious to stress that he had not questioned the Director-General's authority to act as he had done. He merely thought that when the A.C.A. had refused to collaborate - there was some ambiguity whether it had done so as a statutory body or because its members had failed to agree among themselves - it had been unwise to act in such an important political question without consulting the Executive Board. However, the Board was faced with a situation of fact and the letters sent could not be recalled. It would now have to pronounce on one of two motions: (i) to drop the whole matter as Mr. Birecki suggested or (ii) to refer the matter to a special Board Session as Professor Photiades proposed.

M. BIRECKI held that what had been described as an amendment to his motion was really a new motion. The resolution of the Mexico Conference was adopted by "political" delegates and as the matter affected Unesco's relations with Member and non-Member States, it was desirable that it should be settled by the General Conference.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ wanted to know if it was in accordance with the Rules of Procedure that the Board should first examine the proposal which was furthest from the Director-General's.

The CHAIRMAN said the Rules made no mention of this but he recommended it.

Professor CHEN YUAN asked if the Board could not consider first the proposal made by Professor Photiades since it was an amendment to the original motion.

The CHAIRMAN stressed that he had not spoken for or against Mr. Birecki's motion but would cast a deciding vote, if necessary. If the motion was rejected the Executive Board would examine what should be done next; if it was adopted the whole matter would be referred to the General Conference.

Professor CARNEIRO raised a point of order. He had asked for specific information and wanted to know if it was possible to receive it or not.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Director-General had information that Zone Commanders had the right to decide certain matters bilaterally. There was no information available from sister agencies on this point. In reply to Dr. Opocensky he declared that with the 9 members present, plus the accredited alternates, the Board had a quorum.

M. SEYDOUX raised a point of order. In order to avoid all possibility of division the amendment proposed by Professor Photiades should be taken first as it would probably be adopted even if it did not fully satisfy the Polish and Czechoslovak members.

Professor CHEN YUAN supported this suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a vote on procedure had to come first: four members had spoken in favour of taking first the proposal by Professor Photiades whereas Mr. Eireeki claimed that it was a separate motion and asked for his motion to be taken first.

The Executive Board decided to vote first on the proposal by Professor Photiades by 9 votes to 2, and 2 abstentions.

Dr. STODDARD thought this proposal was completely contrary to the mandate the Board had received in Mexico and to the intentions of the Mexico Conference. Having initiated correspondence with the Zone Commanders, Unesco could not wait for the A.C.A. permission to go ahead with the work.

The CHAIRMAN was in complete agreement with Dr. Stoddard. The Board was the responsible authority to take decisions but it was being suggested that a certain delay might make it possible to give some satisfaction to those members who at present wanted the whole matter shelved.

Professor PHOTIADES asked if the Mexico Conference had decided that the problem should be examined at the February Board meeting? He had no recollection of this being the case.

Mr. COWELL was in agreement with Dr. Stoddard: the issue had been taken on to the political plane, on which the Board was not competent. On this account delay might be useful but his understanding of the Mexico resolution was that the Director-General had full authority to consult the Zone Commanders.

Professor CARNEIRO expressed his agreement with Professor Photiades and Mr. Cowell and thought it a wise precaution to vote for extra time to review the question.

Professor PHOTIADES' proposal:

The Executive Board instructs the Director-General to communicate the results of the negotiations he has already commenced with the Allied Authorities in Germany to the Chairman of the Board as soon as possible, in order to prepare a Joint Report by the Chairman and the Director-General on these negotiations for the consideration of the Board, at a special meeting to be called by the Chairman.

was adopted by 10 votes and 3 abstentions.

Professor CHEN YUAN wished to know what had been done with respect to Japan.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that only very informal talks had taken place and that no correspondence had yet been entered into.

M. BIRECKI concurred with Professor Chen Yuan that something should be done about Japan and expressed surprise that action had not been as rapid in that connexion as it had been concerning Germany.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that instructions about Germany had been given a long time ago whereas the resolution on Japan was quite recent.

The proposal made by Professor Chen Yuan that "The Director-General be instructed to proceed immediately with negotiations with the Allied Authorities in Japan" was unanimously adopted.

At the formal request of the Chairman the Executive Board then approved the Director-General's proposals in item 5 of the Agenda "Establishment of Regional Centres", and in item 6 "Relations with the U.N. and the Specialized Agencies".

Concerning Item 7 (a) "Review of Negotiations with the Government of France" the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Board should "take note of the correspondence and hold over its consideration to the next Session", and the Board agreed with him.

Concerning Item 7 (b) "Review of negotiations undertaken by the Director-General with a view to continuing the work of Unrra in China", the Director-General stated that a satisfactory agreement, involving no financial commitments, had been signed and the Executive Board accepted his report.

After the Director-General had promised that the Member States' reports would be published in May, his proposals contained in Item 7 (c) were adopted.

The Report of the Committee on Relations with International non-Governmental Organizations (Item 8 of the Agenda) was approved after Dr. Stoddard had asked for an early reconsideration of its part concerning grants-in-aid.

Concerning Item 9 (a) "Terms of reference of the Programme Committee" Mr. COWELL suggested that the Rules required some small amendments so that the alternates could be designated by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that a change in the Rules of Procedure to include the Committees of the Board could be effected at the next meeting. With respect to Item 9 (b) "Report of the Temporary Committee on the Status and responsibilities of the Executive Board", he stated that the work had started and a report would be submitted at a later stage.

Professor CARNEIRO, supported by Professor PHOTIADES, asked for the adoption without discussion - since it had been drawn up unanimously - of the "Report of the Committee for Cultural Reconstruction" in

Item 11 of the Agenda and the Board adopted his suggestion with the rider that Members should present any observations on it to the Director-General.

Concerning Item 12 "Financial Questions", the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Board's authority should be delegated to the Finance Committee, and the Board agreed.

M. SEYDOUX asked that the French Authorities should be informed in good time.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Item 13 "Persomel Questions", should be referred to the next session of the Executive Board as there was not enough time left for an adequate discussion.

Dr. PARRA-PEREZ announced that he would speak on the Appeals Board when it came up for discussion.

The Executive Board accepted para. (a) of Item 13 "Report of Nominations Committee" and referred the rest of that item to a later session.

In reply to Professor Sommerfelt and M. Seydoux, the CHAIRMAN stated that geographical distribution would be discussed at the same time. At his request the Board approved document 6/EX/18 concerning Unesco's relations with the World Health Organization. Everyone would welcome the closer co-operation between them. He agreed with Dr. Parra-Perez that certain matters arising under Item 14 "Third Session of the General Conference" would have to be deferred to the next session of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN then adjourned the Executive Board until summoned by its Chairman.

(The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.)