

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the first meeting, held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e), on Thursday, April 10th, 1947 at 10.15 a.m.

Present:

Chairman:

H. H. H. V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman:

Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)

H. CHEN YUAN (China)

M. A. PILSKI (Poland)

H. E. Shafik GHORBAL BEY (Egypt)

M. R. H. GURULKIN (Turkey)

Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)

The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)

Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)

H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)

H. E. M. O. PARRA-FERREZ (Venezuela)

M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)

Sir Sarvagalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)

Dr. A. SCHMIDT (Norway)

M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Dr. G. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy:

M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (for M. P. AUGER)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies.

United Nations :

Prof. John HUSKINNEY, Director of the
Human Rights Division.

International Labour Office:

I.L.O. Correspondent in Paris

Mac. MOREL.

Item 1 of the Agenda: Opening of the Session.

In opening the Session, the CHAIRMAN emphasised its importance. He then outlined the arrangements for meetings and for the preparation of the records. One member of the Executive Board, M. LUCER, was unable to attend the present Session since he was on a visit to the United States. M. LEON BLUM had expressed his intention of being present. The Chairman then welcomed Professor JOHN HUMPHREY, Director of the Human Rights Division of the United Nations, and M. WEL, representative of the International Labour Office.

In view of the fact that some members of the Executive Board were unable to remain in Paris until the end of the Session, the Chairman suggested some changes in the order of the items of the Agenda. He proposed to discuss them in the following order: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 7 & 9. It would be decided on Saturday whether 5 or 10 should be taken next. This was agreed.

Item 2 of the Agenda: Adoption of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that two new items should be added to the Provisional Agenda: (1) consideration of rules of procedure of the Executive Board, under Item 5, and (2) relations with non-Member States, under Item 11 (f).

The Hon. A. MacLEISH referred to the discussions which had just taken place in the Standing Committee. The interpretation of certain items had been broadened. Certain points, including the Provident Fund and the question of applications of new members, would come back before the Executive Board.

The Agenda was adopted with these additions.

Item 3 of the Agenda: Approval of the Minutes of the last Session.

The Minutes were adopted.

Item 4 of the Agenda: Report by the Director-General on developments since the last Session

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that much hard work had been done since the last Session. The programme had been brought into line with the budget, the budget itself had been framed and various administrative and staff questions had been dealt with. Several new members had been engaged on the staff, some of whom would proceed to South America for field science operations.

Unesco was cooperating with various governmental and non-governmental organisations and agreements had been reached in respect of the loan of staff for short periods.

The Director-General reported on his visit to the United States, where he had taken part in a meeting of the Coordinating Committee for the activities of the Specialised Agencies. Arrangements had been made to avoid overlapping and to undertake joint activities. He had also visited the United Kingdom and had been in touch with the Ministry of Education, the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office. M. THOMAS had been to the United States for the meeting of the Economic and Social Council. He had also taken part in the Philadelphia Conference organised by the United States National Commission, which had been attended by about 1,000 organisations interested in education and science. This was a remarkable initiative on the part of the United States National Commission, and he hoped that it would be followed by other countries.

As regards the question of external relations, he informed the meeting that the Economic and Social Council had approved applications for membership of Unesco from Austria, Switzerland and Italy. Hungary's request had come in later and would be considered at the next session.

Speaking of action in ex-enemy countries, the Director-General said that

an enquiry was being conducted as to the best methods of obtaining contacts. He had written to the governments represented on the Allied Control Commission and had received two favourable replies. He had also written to the Allied Control Commission in Berlin concerning contacts with educational circles in Germany.

As regards the rent of the building, he informed the meeting that the figure of 18,000,000 francs. had been unofficially set and that an agreement would be reached shortly.

Permission had been received from the United Nations to take over the custody of the assets of the former Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.

As regards publications, volumes containing the Unesco Month lectures in French and English were now available. The publication of a work on the Exhibition of Modern Art was also contemplated. It was also hoped that a book on Unesco would shortly appear in the Penguin series.

In respect of privileges and immunities, the Provisional Agreement with the French Government had been prolonged and broadened. The privileges and immunities were now extended to members of the Executive Board. Steps had further been taken, on the initiative of the United Nations, to prepare a general convention on privileges and immunities for all Specialised Agencies. The draft agreed upon would be submitted to Governments for their comments, and a conference of member states of all the Specialised Agencies would be summoned to consider the results.

As regards the programme, all Sections had submitted suggestions for the collection of information. It was possible that a central documentation and statistical section would have to be set up to handle this material. It might be utilised for the publication of a Unesco Year Book. As regards information

from non self-governing territories, help would have to be sought from the Colonial Offices and from the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. The question of fellowships was also being gone into and arrangements were being made for coordination between the sections.

The Director-General then reviewed the work of the different Sections.

As regards fundamental education, a meeting of experts was scheduled to take place, and a regional conference was to be held in China early in September.

The question of International Understanding was also being studied. A teachers' seminar would be organised near Paris in the summer and plans for an international study centre were being prepared. Progress had also been made with the survey of textbooks. The problem of re-education of ex-enemy countries was under consideration and contacts had been established with officers in the occupied territories.

As regards Natural Sciences, surplus machinery had been purchased with a view to supplying the needs of the devastated countries. Progress was being made with the recruitment of staff both for headquarters and for the field.

Active cooperation had developed with the International Council of Scientific Unions and other similar bodies. Unesco was endeavouring to stimulate the formation of new international non-governmental organisations.

As regards the Medical Sciences, he drew attention to the formation of a Joint Advisory Committee of Unesco and the World Health Organisation. The question of the publication of medical abstracts was also being studied. Work was already well advanced in preparation for the cataloguing centre of type-culture collections of the International Society of Microbiology.

Four volumes of inventories of scientific apparatus would be published in 1947. The Section had drawn up an extensive report on International Research
Cons.Exec./2c Sess/S.R.1. (rev.)
E.

Laboratories and observatories at the request of the Economic and Social Council. It had also done important work by helping to reorganise the International Academy of the History of Science.

As regards Social Science, Unesco was negotiating with the Economic and Social Council with regard to joint action. The causes of international tension would be studied. The Section was in correspondence with fifty-six international organisations.

The Libraries and Museums Section had been making inquiries into needs and resources. It had received about eighty offers of books and periodicals. Various distributions had been made through the British Book Centre. A meeting of experts on Public Libraries would be held in the early summer. An attempt was being made to prepare a European Regional Union Catalogue, and to arrange an exhibition of microfilms.

Cooperation had been established with the International Museum Council. As regards the International Museum Office of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, Unesco would take over part of its activities.

In respect of Humanistic Studies and Philosophy, there was not very much to say. An important point was the collaboration with the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and the possible publication of a volume of excerpts from the answers received to the inquiry conducted in this connection.

The Director-General remarked that there was little to be said on the subject of Arts and Letters pending the appointment of a new Head of Section and Director of Projects. Information was being collected with regard to books suitable for translation, as well as with regard to translators to be selected. An international pool for literary reviews was to be created in cooperation with the International PEN Club. At the PEN Club's Conference to be held at Zurich in June a whole day would be devoted to their relations with Unesco.

The Director-General said that a list of the needs of the devastated countries in the field of music was in preparation.

The Director-General said that there had been considerable activity in the Section dealing with the Theatre and that there was to be a meeting of experts in the summer at which Mr. Priestley and M. Jouvot had consented to be co-Chairmen. They hoped to draw up a report on the creation of an International Theatre Institute, to be submitted to the Mexico Conference.

The Director-General said that Mr. Grierson, who had just returned, would give details to the Board later on with regard to Mass Media. Before leaving for New York Mr. Grierson had informed the Director-General that he had received an offer from a big film company to produce six documentary films on the Unesco programme. A survey of technical needs and resources for war devastated countries was being initiated in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Netherlands, Norway and Denmark, and in the Far East, China, Malaya, East Indies and the Philippines. It was hoped to hold a conference of field teams in the summer.

There had been great activity in the Reconstruction Section, and there would be further details when M. Drzewieski returned from the United States at the end of the month. A monthly bulletin in English, French and Spanish had been issued. Letters to the donor and recipient countries had been sent out and important replies were coming in. 300 sets of the Encyclopaedia Britannica had been prepared for distribution and 178 had already been allocated. A Conference of 42 private international organisations had been held in February for the relief of war-devastated countries in the field of education, science and culture. Material had also been collected for the publication of a propaganda booklet.

The Director-General ended his report by saying that the foregoing was only a sample of Unesco's activity and that the staff had been going through a very difficult time as Unesco, whilst still in the process of organisation, had to operate as an adult Agency.

The CHAIRMAN said he appreciated the scope of the activities of Unesco.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ said that he had great pleasure in noting the activity of Unesco and that he understood the difficulties of organising and working at the same time. He said that the External Relations Section, in particular, had done excellent work and that he congratulated the Secretariat. He then proposed, for future sessions, that the Director-General's report should be submitted, in writing, to the members of the Executive Board before the meeting, as it would save time if it could be studied in advance. He submitted the following resolution:-

In view of the importance of the Director-General's report to the Executive Board, the latter requests the Director-General in future to make his report in writing and to circulate it to Members of the Board in time for them to study it.

Dr. OPOCENSKY seconded the resolution, which was adopted.

M. CARNEIRO said he had two questions to ask regarding contacts with ex-enemy countries. Was Japan to receive the same treatment as Germany? He proposed that the Director-General should be requested to submit a written report for consideration at the next meeting on all negotiations on this subject, which was of great interest to public opinion. He also asked whether a Joint Commission of the WHO and Unesco was to be formed with representatives from the Secretariat and the Executive Board.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that 4 members of the Interim Commission of the WHO and 4 members of the Executive Board, helped by the Secretariat were to meet next Wednesday. In regard to M. Carneiro's first question, he said that the German problem was the only one to have been approached so far. Peace treaties were awaited before dealing with the other countries, when a report would be prepared.

M. PHOTIADES said that he would like an explanation of the term "ex-enemy countries".

M. CARNEIRO replied that he had mentioned Germany and Japan.

M. PHOTIADES said that was why he wanted a more precise definition and wished it to be put down in the minutes.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was a matter for discussion later on when Unesco's external relations were debated. He thanked the Director-General for his report of which a summary would appear in the minutes of the meeting.

Item 8 of the Agenda - Programme (Unesco Prog./1/1947).

After a brief introduction by the DIRECTOR-GENERAL, the CHAIRMAN informed the Board that the document stating the views of the United States Government on problems likely to arise at the Executive Board's Meeting had been circulated, and that a supplement had just been distributed. It had been handed in that morning and was in English only.

M. SEYDOUX asked for a translation; the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it would be available as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on Unesco's Programme for 1947.
(Unesco/Prog./1/1947)

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ enquired whether this represented the complete programme of Unesco.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was complete as regards projects and activities common to all sections, but not the continuing activities of each Section.

Mr. MacLEISH asked whether the Chairman wished to consider it as a whole, or item by item.

The CHAIRMAN suggested considering it first in a general way.

Mr. MacLEISH wished to make some general observations. He said he was troubled by the document and by some of the things he had heard in the Director-General's report this morning. He wished for clarification of certain matters of general significance. He said the situation in which they met had changed since the General Conference and the first meeting of the Executive Board and that it had changed for the worse. Unesco was committed to the idea that people of opposing views could meet and act in harmony, but that there had been a sharpening of tension and ideological warfare which was a direct challenge to Unesco. This fact must be recognised and had direct bearing on the programme as agreed in London and Paris. Unesco existed not to advance education, science and culture, but to use them in the interests of peace. He said the situation had deteriorated lamentably since the Final Act had been drawn up. Some of the Unesco projects listed were vague and incomprehensible. For example, with regard to

Cons. Exec. /2e Sess. /S.R. 1 (rev.)

E.

Mass Media of Communication, no concept was made clearer now than it had been last autumn. The Social Science Section which had been examining better abstracting systems would do better to deal with more urgent problems.

Mr. MacLeish said that the condition of the world must be borne in mind. A brief and clearly stated programme in the interests of peace was necessary for Unesco and some action must be shown before next autumn. An organisation in action must be created which would be understood by the world. Unesco's main purpose was to produce a coherent programme to be understood and approved by public opinion in all countries.

On behalf of M. FALSKI, Mr. Zaniewicki said that the third presentation of Unesco's programme of work lacked unity, secondary points being given too much importance which gave an impression of chaos to be deplored six months before the Mexico Conference. Nothing was clear, there was no concrete plan to be executed before the Conference. At least 25, if not 30, surveys had been planned for this year. Were they all necessary? He thought not. In any case, however, a list of priorities and a calendar must be drawn up, for the use of National Commissions responsible both for the distribution of surveys to the relevant organisations, and for their execution. The difficulties of pre-war Intellectual Co-operation resulted from the fact that National Commissions received too large a number of surveys at unfavourable times, and without any prewarning.

All surveys must, therefore, be concentrated in a single service of Unesco. Generally speaking, Unesco's programme, as well as the organisations of its Secretariat should be established not only in accordance with domains of activity (social sciences, arts, etc.), but parallel to means of action (publications, exchange of persons, scholarships etc.).

Certain phrases of the report such as: "Unesco will promote" such and such an activity, or will "encourage" or "facilitate" etc. really meant nothing definite, and for this reason it was impossible to take up a position as regards projects, since the way in which they were to be executed was not explained.

The task of the Secretariat of Unesco was not to promote art or make scientific discoveries, but to serve as a liaison and co-ordination agent between scholars, educationalists and artists of Member States, with a view to the "maintenance of peace and security." The Secretariat was an instrument of the General Conference, and if its activity was being criticised at the present moment, it was in order that it might not be criticised at the Conference.

M. CARNEIRO said that the fundamental task of the Executive Board was to organise the programme of the General Conference for action in 1947. Concrete results must be presented to the Mexico Conference. Conditions were precarious, especially as regards the Budget and Personnel; funds were late in coming in and recruiting was delayed. A curtailment of the programme drawn up at the General Conference must be faced. In order to encourage public opinion, however, a live and enthusiastic programme must be presented, not a cold, out-and-dried one. A comparison must be made, chapter, by chapter, between what the General Conference approved and what was now proposed. Unless this was done, the Executive Board would not fulfil its function. Journal No. 22 of the General Conference must be studied to ascertain what the initial plans were. The Executive Board was to help the Secretariat in the execution of the programme.

(The Meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the second meeting, held at Unesco House,
19, Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e), on Thursday, April 10th, 1947, at 2.45 p.m.

Present: M. Léon BLUM, President of the First General Conference.

Chairman: H.E. M. V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members: M. P. CARNETRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M. M. FALSKI (Poland)
H. E. Shafik GHORBAL Boy (Egypt)
M. R. N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MacLEISH (United States)
Sir John MAUD (Gt. Britain)
H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H. E. M. C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. P. AUGER)

Representatives of the United Nations and Specialised Agencies.

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Rights of
Man Division.

International Labour
Office: Madamo MOREL, ILO Correspondent in Paris.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL communicated a telegram from Dr. Zhukova, asking for a meeting of the Joint Committee of the World Health Organisation and Unesco for April 14th. As the Executive Board would not have finished its work by that day, Dr. Huxley suggested that the meeting should take place in the afternoon of Tuesday 15th. It was an important meeting, and he suggested that Unesco should be represented by those members of the Executive Board whose scientific training especially qualified them for this task. In the absence of Mr. Agger, he suggested that Unesco's representatives on the Joint Committee should be Messrs MARTINEZ BAEZ, CARNEIRO, KRUYT, and WALKER.

The Board adopted this proposal and approved the names suggested.

Item 8 of the Agenda: PROGRAMME (Continuation of discussion)

Dr. WALKER said that the Executive Board should take stock of the position in view of the important criticisms made by Mr. MacLeish. He pointed out that Unesco was a United Nations agency created by the member governments to fulfil specific purposes not covered by other organisations. The Preamble to Unesco's Constitution clearly set forth the aims and methods of the new Organisation, which had constantly to be borne in mind in a study of the programme. Dr. Walker drew particular attention to the Preamble and Article I of the Constitution (purposes and functions) which emphasise co-operation among the nations, and recorded the agreement of the Member Governments to participate in this active co-operation. He recalled the difficulties which the Preparatory Commission had met with in framing a concrete programme of work in conformity with this plan. They had encountered a tendency to make Unesco a research centre, an agent for assisting other scientific organisations, and to overlook its primary concern, the establishment of peace

The programme had been elaborated by a lengthy process of discussion and amendment, begun at the Preparatory Commission and continued at the General Conference in the Commissions, and especially the drafting committee under Mr. MacLeish. Its execution was then entrusted to the Executive Board and the Secretariat and the Standing Committee had had the task of developing from the programme a series of concrete activities, taking account of the finance available, and having regard always to the purpose and methods of Unesco laid down in the Constitution. The Standing Committee had provisionally approved, as a basis for future work, the distinction between these major projects, bearing directly on peace and security, to be initiated in 1947 on the one hand, and continuing activities and other projects on the other. The three major projects were Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, Fundamental Education and Education for International Understanding. The Standing Committee had approved this reduced programme, but noted that the very definition of fundamental education already raised a problem, since it meant more than simply combating illiteracy. The third project was more or less a summary of Unesco's whole programme. It was now for the Board at its present session to examine more closely and to define these three projects, all of which were directed towards peace and security.

Dr. Walker, like Mr. MacLeish and Mr. Falski, confessed to some disappointment at the document on the programme which the Secretariat had submitted to the Board. Its weaknesses were, of course, due to the fact that the Board had stressed the urgency of questions of organisation and administration, which had thus absorbed much of the Secretariat's energies. The Executive Board had the heavy responsibility for carrying out the programme approved by the General Conference, having due regard to the finance available and the general world situation. Dr. Walker said that he was rather more hopeful than

Dr. Walker said that he was rather more hopeful than Mr. MacLeish on this score. The realities of the world situation had not changed for the worse, although clearly the situation had all along been much more difficult than many people had realised. Unesco should not be unduly influenced by waves of opinion in particular countries.

Dr. Walker credited Unesco with more vitality than this document reflected. He thought:

1. That the three main projects must be kept in the forefront of the Board's preoccupations and that the Director-General should continue to direct the work of the Secretariat along these lines, with the employment of all the means at his disposal.

2. That the weakness of the document under discussion was due to the continued weakness of the Secretariat on the programme side; governments must help the Secretariat to find in the different countries collaborators capable of aiding it in the task of converting these projects into concrete work.

3. That, as regards methods of work - this point had not been touched upon by Mr. MacLeish - it was not sufficiently indicated that the main work to be undertaken by the governments which pledged themselves to pursue the international collaboration so often mentioned in the Constitution of Unesco. The Secretariat was the servant of governments, and not, as there was a tendency to think, a mere Paris agency; Unesco was a form of international collaboration between the governments and peoples of the world. The programme before the Board did not lay enough stress on methods calculated to rouse interest in all countries and to develop cooperation.

Dr. Walker was not in favour of re-drafting the document, but rather of appointing a programme sub-committee, which would be responsible to the

Executive Board and which, in consultation with the Director-General, would ensure continuity of the Executive Board's work, in relation to the programme, in the intervals between the Board's Sessions. Here he anticipated another item on the agenda, under which he intended to suggest the setting up of various committees (finance, nominations, programme), but thought it well to propose the establishment of this Sub-Committee at once.

Sir John MAUD agreed upon the urgency of immediate action to diminish international tension. They had to examine what work in the programme ought to be put in hand immediately both by governments and by the Secretariat. Unesco was still in its early days and many large countries were still unrepresented, notably the U.S.S.R., and this limited the positive work that could be done. He thought that what had already been achieved promised well for the future. They had to take account of things that had happened since the General Conference both inside Unesco and outside. Very satisfactory meetings of the Standing Committee had taken place in January and February.

The programme now before the Board, though not as precise as they could wish it, was nevertheless the outcome of excellent work both by the Board itself and by the National Commissions and the Secretariat. Sir John Maud thought that they should try to improve it rather than tear it up and start again. He agreed with Mr. MacLeish on the need for a permanent organisation capable, on the one hand, of maintaining peace and, on the other, of getting ahead as far as possible in 1947.

The appointment of a Deputy Director-General, the presence of valuable new recruits and of the pick of the Preparatory Commission were pledges of success. Although he acknowledged the priority to be given to the

three main projects advanced by Dr. Walker; Sir John Maud thought that progress ought at the same time to be made with as many other projects as possible before the Conference met in Mexico. This meeting was only a few months off and the Board had many decisions to take (conferences, place, time &c.). It must therefore make a point now of furnishing the Secretariat with definite instructions which would enable it to go ahead with renewed confidence. Sir John Maud agreed with Dr. Walker on the importance of the technical activities which, though not spectacular, might exercise the greatest influence on the development of international collaboration and a spirit of peace.

He suggested as one of the most urgent tasks:

Reconstruction and Rehabilitation. He thought this chapter in the programme excellent; it enlisted the aid of all Sections in the Secretariat and was an example of those many-sided problems from which the Board had chosen the three projects which they thought the most general, but not necessarily the most important. It was now for the Board to make their selection from among other activities which were of equal interest despite their more particular character. In examining this programme they must keep in mind two main objectives:

1. The bringing together of men;
2. The bringing together of ideas.

The first objective could be attained during the five months before the Mexico Conference by means of exchanges, the award of scholarships, &c. The United States deserved Unesco's deepest gratitude for their offers in this field. Great Britain could also help on a more modest scale, with fellowships in the fields of the radio and press. Unesco must facilitate acceptance of these offers, take full advantage of the most suitable among them and extend

its help both to donor countries and to recipient countries before the Mexico Conference. The Hylean Amazon project was another excellent example of rapprochement between the specialists of different countries in collaboration for a common purpose in a particular area. The proposed Summer Seminar for Teachers was also an example of what could be done in this work of rapprochement. The teachers must be got hold of first, for it was they who influenced their pupils; encouragement should also be given to the plan for an international study centre. Bringing people together inevitably meant bringing ideas together - Sir John Maud's second criterion. In this connection he pointed out that Unesco had been asked to cooperate with the Human Rights Commission. By inviting distinguished persons in the different countries to compare their ideas and by placing on record both their points of agreement and disagreement, Unesco was altogether within its function.

Mr. Grierson's help would enable Unesco to launch effective action in the field of mass education. Some of these projects were barely outlined in the document before the Board. This applied to the function of Philosophy in the widest sense of the term, in which field also useful work could be embarked upon in 1947. Lastly the preparation of the Mexico Conference itself was another priority task. It would be a disaster if it failed to realise expectations. Time was short and the Secretariat was faced with a large amount of work in connection with it. This work must have priority, not only within the Secretariat but also on the part of the different Governments. If the documents for the Conference were to be properly studied, they must be in the hands of Governments at least three months before the meeting.

Sir John Maud concluded by urging that, as soon as the Board Meeting closed, the Secretariat and the Heads of its Section should be enabled to go ahead with clear instructions and with the Board's full approval.

Cons. Exec./2e Sess./S.R. 2 (rev.)

Dr. A. SOMMERFELT urged the importance of clearly distinguishing the competency of Unesco from those of the Economic and Social Council. In connection with the third main project in the programme, he emphasised the possible importance to the development of international understanding, of scholarships (like those which Norway intends to award to the devastated countries), for these scholarships encouraged prolonged contacts between persons of different nationality.

M. L. VERNIERS, quoting the story of Icarus, stressed the need for a practical attitude. As things were now, they must abide by the programme drawn up, preserving only its essentials, and must as soon as possible communicate the principal projects to the Member States. M. Verniers thought, like Dr. Walker, that the Secretariat should not be asked to do everything. Member States must themselves take practical measures and Unesco must learn to utilise the powers represented on the Executive Board to help it establish and carry out its programme. Dr. Verniers ended by emphasising the potential role of the small countries.

M. SEYDOUX, deputising for Professor Auger, who was detained in New York, pointed out that, according to the preamble of the Unesco Constitution, the main objective of the Organisation was to contribute to the maintenance of peace through education, science and culture. He thought that the document, UNESCO/Frog./1/1947 dated 28th March, 1947, did not take sufficient account of the Report of the General Conference, which had been largely drawn up by Mr. MacLeish. They would have to go through the document item by item and arrive at a text in closer conformity with the Report. M. Seydoux observed that, at the London Conference of 1945, the view had been held that Unesco

Cons. Exec. 28 Sess. /S.R. 2 (rev.)
E.

ought to be not only international but universal in character and be ready to welcome not only those countries already belonging to the United Nations, but all countries which had ratified the Charter of the United Nations or who would do so in the future. Referring to the remarks of Mr. MacLeish he thought that the very purpose of Unesco was to help in mitigating ideological antagonisms.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN said that reference had been made to ideological conflicts, which were increasing. The purpose of Unesco was to effect ideological harmony and diminish the tensions - a task which might be difficult and delicate, but was urgent, and could only be undertaken by Unesco.

Sir Sarvepalli continued that if the conflicts were sharpening, it was not due to the people, who had but one desire- peace, but to the governments, which were now creating all the trouble. It was the task of Unesco to educate the masters by educating the people, who would then bring pressure to bear on their governments.

Ideological conflicts became inevitable when anyone assumed that the cultural pattern which one had adopted oneself was the only cultural pattern; with such a view, cooperation was not possible. Unesco must bring peoples and ideas together, for when ideas faced each other, then there was a chance of their reconciliation. The world was not only multi-national, but also multi-cultural.

One of the essential aims of Unesco was to give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture. The attack on illiteracy formed one of the chief planks of Unesco's programme at the last Conference. An international organisation could work only if nations were free, and they could not be free unless their standards of education, science and culture were raised.

Half-knowledge, however was a greater danger than no knowledge. Most people regarded themselves as educated when possessing intellectual knowledge or mechanical skill. Intellectual training alone did not make one educated. The inspired values of philosophy should govern the whole enterprise. Sir Sarvepalli feared that sufficient emphasis was not being laid on the need for a science of values, a proper appreciation of the true aims of life. Knowledge and power, organisation and discipline were all means to the highest of all ends; the realisation of the true values of life, which were more precious than wealth and power. It was Sir Sarvepalli's hope that when Unesco insisted on fundamental education, it would interpret it, not merely in the sense of literacy, but in the sense of discrimination between a right and wrong judgement of values.

In considering the complaints levelled at the Secretariat and its programme, Sir Sarvepalli called attention to the lack of a sense of security and a sense of confidence, which must be removed before the Secretariat would be able to do its work efficiently.

M. PHOTIADES said that, in spite of the difficulties they had encountered in carrying out the programme and preparing for the Unesco Conference, he had good hopes that Unesco would achieve constructive work built upon a correct scale of values.

Professor CARNEIRO was of the opinion that Unesco ought to be able to find a solution to social problems which could not be solved politically (conflicts of race, religion, castes, social classes etc.). It must try to reach the masses and not only a chosen few.

Dr. H.R. KRUYT saw no contradiction between the two aims assigned to

Unesco, namely to advance education, science and culture through international collaboration, and to work for the maintenance of peace by collaboration in the educational, scientific and cultural fields. Unesco must seek to achieve international cooperation in these different spheres.

Professor CHEN YUAN thought that, although some of the projects were rather vague, they should be able to draw up a suitable programme by applying to it the tests formulated by Sir John Maud.

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey, speaking for the Arab world, pointed to the danger of cultural campaigns undertaken by advanced and powerful countries in countries less favoured. The Member States of Unesco must not be divided into donor countries and recipient countries. All must be able to share in the tasks which Unesco set out to accomplish.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ, presenting a view-point opposed to Dr. Kruyt's, declared that Unesco, under the terms of its own Constitution, was to concern itself with education, science and culture only so far as these could contribute to the maintenance of peace. That was why the organisations with which Unesco had established relations in these different fields had all of them been international organisations.

H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY expressed agreement with the first two projects in the programme (Reconstruction and Rehabilitation and Fundamental Education). With regard to the third project, he regretted that more emphasis had not been laid upon the part to be played by literature and the arts in creating international understanding, and also that more specific tasks had not been assigned to the Social Sciences Section.

(The Meeting rose at 6, 30 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the third meeting, held at Unesco House,
19 Avenue Klöber, Paris (16e), on Friday, April 11th, 1947 at 9.45 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: H.E. M.V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members: M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M. M. FALSKI (Poland)
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. R.M. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MACLEISH (U.S.A.)
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. P. AUGER)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies.

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the
Human Rights Division.

International Labour Office: Mx. MOREL, I.L.O. Correspondent in Paris.

Item 8 of the Agenda: Programme (Continuation)

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL read a letter, which he had just received from the U.S. Department of State, dealing with Items 8 and 10(c) of the Agenda. The opinion expressed in this document was that, in view of the limited resources of Unesco, it would not be advisable to spend substantial Unesco funds in other than Member States or those which had requested membership. As regards point 10(c) (Staff appointments), it was pointed out that the specifications for the posts vacant had arrived very late and that the appointments made for the moment should be on a temporary basis. Subordinate staff might receive long-term contracts. However, no appointment should be made prior to a thorough investigation of each applicant's technical competence, personal qualifications and loyalty to international organisations.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the programme should now be discussed item by item.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained the difference between the new programme and that which had been approved by the General Conference. In the first place, Unesco's budget had been cut down; secondly, the Conference programme, consisting of six reports from sub-commissions, had had to be coordinated into a single programme; and thirdly, the form of the Conference document had not been that of a working and budgetable programme. Unesco was at present preparing a general pamphlet on the programme, and he would remind the Executive Board that the Director-General had been authorised to make the necessary changes in consultation with the Board.

Finally, it was absolutely necessary to have an agreed programme by the end of this meeting, in view of the next General Conference. If many

changes were made at this juncture, loss of time would ensue.

He then explained the construction of the programme, drawing attention to the major activities dealt with in Part I and the sectional activities listed in Part II.

The Executive Board then turned to the detailed consideration of the document Unesco/Prog./1/1947.

Section A. Reconstruction and Rehabilitation.

M. FAJSKI expressed the view that certain points in this project required clearer definition. In the first place he thought that the purpose of the proposed campaign should be the reconstruction of the devastated areas of countries members of Unesco. It was necessary to have information concerning the war losses of countries in the cultural field. Also, certain questions in regard to the proposed relief priorities etc. should be clearly defined. The point figuring under 1(d) of the programme (assistance in the preparation of propaganda material) could, he thought, be deleted since it was covered by point 1(a). The field surveys mentioned under 1(e) could be conducted by national organisations.

M. ZANIEWICKI, on behalf of M. FAJSKI, read a declaration on the work of reconstruction undertaken by Unesco and proposed, in particular, that Unesco should publish reports concerning cultural destruction in countries which were Member States. All the reports together would form a work in memory of the millions of intellectual workers and the thousands of schools and historical buildings which had disappeared for ever. Victory had been won through these sacrifices. These losses would serve as a basis for the distribution of relief by Unesco's Reconstruction Section. Among these losses must be counted loss

of human lives, and their cultural significance estimated. The war which had just ended had been so terrible, not only because of the use of modern scientific weapons, but because of the whole destructive system employed by the Germans to devastate occupied countries. The fury of their attacks was especially directed against education, science and culture; it was for this reason that the Political Delegation thought that Unesco should have a word to say when UNO dealt with reparations, including cultural reparations.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that he was in agreement, but that the question of cultural reparations should be kept separate from reparations in general.

Sir John MAUD said that, in order to speed up the discussion, he would move that Section A of the programme should be approved by the Executive Board as the basis of the work of the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Section.

M. PHOTIADES seconded the motion.

Mr. MACLEISH warmly supported the proposal. He mentioned that he had received a cable from the World Health Organisation expressing some concern at the possibility of the overlapping of its activities with those of Unesco.

M. SEYDOUX said that he would support the motion if reference to the re-establishment of the German Colonial Library under point 4(e) were deleted.

Dr. WALKER also agreed with the motion. He considered that certain points called for rapid and concrete information to member states. This applied in particular to the contribution they were invited to make towards the Rehabilitation Programme. A campaign was being made to raise an International Children's Fund. Should Governments organise two campaigns, one for this

purpose and one for reconstruction, which might overlap, or could the matter be dealt with in a single campaign?

M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant to the Director-General) said that the question had been discussed by the Economic and Social Council. That body had agreed on the necessity of coordinating relief campaign activities. According to a resolution presented by the United Kingdom delegation, each Government would be free to organise the campaign for the International Children's Emergency Fund in its own country and on its own responsibility. The proceeds would be allocated later in consultation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Replying to M. Falski, he mentioned that the Economic and Social Council had studied the question of activities formerly undertaken by U.N.R.R.A. The resolution which had been adopted said that the beneficiary countries will be chosen on the criterion of needs and urgency thereof.

The CHAIRMAN read out Sir John MAUD's resolution, as amended following a proposal of Mr. MACLEISH, that the funds should be reserved in the first instance for work in Member States.

"THAT Section A of the Programme be approved as amended, as a basis of action in the field of rehabilitation and reconstruction until the Second Session of the General Conference.

In the execution of the Programme, care will be taken to avoid overlapping with other organisations.

Non-earmarked funds and resources will be allocated in the first instance towards work in Member States."

M. FALSKI and Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ objected to the words "in the first instance",

After a brief exchange of views, the resolution was adopted without

change.

Dr. WALKER observed that he understood that this adoption was subject to the submission of a progress report at the next meeting.

M. CARNEIRO said that he hoped that the Director of the Section concerned would be present at that date.

M. ZANIEWICKI drew attention to the fact that the Polish proposal on reparations, which had been submitted to the General Conference, had not yet been dealt with. Many countries had sustained losses, some of which were cultural. Could not Unesco advise the United Nations on this point? Could the Executive Board discuss this question? How should losses be estimated? How would relief be distributed?

Dr. WALKER pointed out that the question of reparations was being discussed by the Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow. He did not feel that Unesco could go very far in the matter, but the Executive Board might draw attention to certain aspects of the question. A Sub-Committee of the Executive Board might possibly consider whether a memorandum could be drafted, stressing the special needs of some countries for reparation and restitution in the fields of education, science and culture, for submission to the Governments concerned with the terms of the Peace Treaties.

M. FALSKI agreed, remarking that the question was one which concerned all countries.

Mr. MACLEISH said that he must take exception to this proposal. The Executive Board was not competent to handle the question. It would be better to postpone the matter until the discussion on the functions of the Executive Cons. Exec./20 Sess./S.R.3. (rev.)
E.

Board.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN seconded this suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion on this point would be postponed.

B. FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that there had been some discussion on the use of the term Fundamental Education, and that a committee of experts had agreed that the words "attack on illiteracy" were not enough, and so had decided to use this term. Many attacks on illiteracy had been made by separate nations and colonial governments but the question had never been envisaged on a large scale. An attack on ignorance was necessary for mutual understanding between peoples in the modern world.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN said that a wide-scale attack on illiteracy had been made in India; he wished to know whether this had been taken into account in the drawing up of sub-paragraphs a, b, c, d, etc.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that in selecting areas for pilot projects, as great progress in this field was being made in India, it had been decided, in view of Unesco's limited resources, that it was unnecessary to operate in that country. China, as the largest far-eastern country, was selected, and the Chinese Government had agreed to call a regional conference in the Autumn. Haiti, as a representative small country, was chosen; and, as it was thought advisable to include a colonial area, British East Africa was also selected.

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey, referring to sub-paragraphs a, b, c, etc., asked whether this particular action would be confined to specified areas, such as China, Haiti and British East Africa.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that surveys would be as general as possible; some questions would not be relevant to the specialised areas. General activities would be followed by co-operation with selected Member States for pilot projects.

Dr. A. SOMERFELT expressed the hope that the Secretariat would concentrate on pilot projects.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that this depended on the help received from Member Governments. It was impossible to start this summer in China owing to the postponement of the regional conference. Survey and research were necessary as well as action in the field. A committee of experts was to meet next week, and intended to write to Member Governments for expressions of opinion within their own countries. Progress therefore depended on the co-operation of Member Governments.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ said that no allusion had been made to Unesco's book on Fundamental Education, which had already been prepared. He considered it desirable to distribute it as soon as possible.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the book was being printed, and that it had not been mentioned as it was a matter of the past. As soon as it was printed, however, it would be distributed, accompanied by a circular.

Sir John MAUD considered that action should be taken at once on the Fundamental Education project, and called for its approval. He requested the Director-General to make early arrangements for the appointment of some person as Director, or in some other capacity appropriate for the launching of the

project. He wished to point out certain important points :-

- a) he agreed with Dr. Sommerfelt that pilot projects should be put into execution before the Mexico Conference;
- b) it was highly desirable that Unesco should participate in the Regional Conference in China;
- c) with reference to sub-paragraph h, he thought that the relating of the Hylean Amazon project to the project of Fundamental Education was very important.

Sir John Maud observed that the publication of Unesco's book was a first step towards the pooling of experience and the making available of information concerning action already carried out in different countries.

He warned those responsible for the project that education for better health and agriculture, and economic improvement, as stated in the first paragraph of Section B, were only of secondary importance in the fulfilment of Unesco's present programme, as they came primarily under the competence of other Specialised Agencies, whereas education for artistic and cultural development, for citizenship and international understanding, were primary considerations.

Referring to sub-paragraph (a), he said that this question needed study and tactful handling, but might prove to be very useful. For example, in the United Kingdom, as regards the raising of the school age to 15 years, it would have been encouraging to know that other countries were taking the same steps. It was Unesco's task to make this kind of information available to all.

Summing up, Sir John Maud proposed that project B (Fundamental Education) should be approved, and that the Director-General should be requested

to appoint a Director, who would collaborate with experts. He again stressed the importance of the progress of pilot projects in the selected areas, and the relating of the Hylean Amazon Project with the programme of Fundamental Education. He said he wished to leave a free hand to the new Director, but suggested that he should be advised to give secondary importance to the question of agriculture, health and economic improvement.

M. SEYDOUX referred to the delicacy of the problem and criticised the words "attack on ignorance". He thought that certain words should be avoided which could be poorly taken in certain countries. There were ignorant people everywhere, even in countries which considered themselves very civilised. Referring to the speeches made the previous day by Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey, he agreed with them that there is no superior culture and that certain peoples less advanced intellectually were on the contrary more so in other ways, notably from a moral and religious point of view. The task of the future Project Director would be difficult and would demand much prudence and tact.

He therefore proposed the following resolution:-

"The Executive Board notes with interest the pilot projects envisaged in the sphere of Fundamental Education.

It recommends that, in carrying out these projects, and particularly with regard to the choice of advisers, the implementation of suggestions and the supply of equipment, the greatest attention shall be paid to the historical, cultural and linguistic traditions of the countries in which the projects are to be launched."

M. VERNIERS wished for a precise explanation of sub-paragraph (j):

"Arrange, in connection with the Mexico City Conference for:

- (1) An exhibit of materials on fundamental education,
- (2) A regional study conference."

Cons.Exec./2e Sess./S.R.3.(rev.)

E.

With reference to (1) he wished to know if the exhibition was to be of a general nature, and, if so, he requested that countries should be informed as soon as possible, in order to procure materials. (For instance, Belgium might eventually transfer material from the Belgian Congo to Mexico without passing through Belgium). He also wished to know what type of exhibits were required.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that this would depend on the Executive Board's opinion of the Unesco Month. He thought that the exhibition should be organised by the Mexican Government, but if it was decided to have a general exhibition the respective Governments would certainly be informed as soon as possible.

Mr. MACLEISH, referring to the general position, of which he had spoken the previous morning, said that the people of the U.S.A. had taken a great interest in Unesco since the General Conference, and that individuals frequently asked him what Unesco proposed to do. His reply had been based on the project as originally expressed, i.e. minima standards of education. This aspect had now disappeared. Too much reliance was placed on the words "Fundamental Education", on which there was much divergence of opinion. Unesco must not confine itself to attacking illiteracy, but must take positive action. He suggested that the method evolved by the Secretariat in its book on Human Rights should be applied to this project, and that the following question should be studied: What are minimal educational requirements for life together, in peace, in the present world?

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL welcomed Mr. MACLEISH's suggestion and thought

that research should be carried out by experts in various countries, to ascertain the meaning of Fundamental Education.

Sir John MAUD wished to insert certain words, in agreement with the ideas expressed by Mr. MacLeish, in his resolution,

M. CAMBEIRO stated that the meaning of Fundamental Education was contained in the sub-title of a book to be published by Unesco "Common Ground for All Peoples". A common basic ground of ideas was essential to human progress. Unity was needed to solve problems not yet solved owing to lack of a common basis. This principle would not come into conflict with national traditions. Basic unity was only possible if the ignorant masses, who participate in the government of their country, had a minimum basis of education.

Unesco's aim was political in that it aimed at preparing mankind to take over responsibilities. The inclusion of the Hylean Amazon project in this programme was important for obtaining a better knowledge of human nature and its improvement. A study of the Brazilian native, whose mentality was that of the Stone Age, would be most interesting in tracing the evolution of human nature.

M. FALSKI said that Fundamental Education was not only an important but a complicated problem. He had read Unesco's book and found that it lacked clarity with regard both to terms and to methods. He wished to know whether this project was a first step in a system of education of the masses, or a special system outside mass education. He said it was very important in the education of children, not to close the door to higher education. The idea of special education for the masses, apart from higher education, had been expressed in the Eighteenth Century. To give an example from the present day,

the German aggressors had allowed primary education in Poland but had closed all secondary and higher schools. They had killed large numbers of the more highly educated, as constituting a danger to themselves. Unesco must be careful in proclaiming Fundamental Education as its aim... It must not confine itself to elementary education of the masses, but must give them the possibility to go further and further. So far it had directed its attention to backward countries only, but education should be envisaged for all countries and the door left open everywhere to higher education. This constituted a social problem on which the future of Unesco depended.

M. Falski said that he did not believe in new techniques, as advocated in sub-paragraph g). Nor did he agree with the sending of advisers, as proposed in sub-paragraph i). People could only be sent to discuss problems with the countries concerned, showing them our own educational systems and offering them help.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL accepted Mr. Falski's correction of the word "advisers" and suggested the substitution of "consultants", who would only go on the request of the country concerned, and would inform them of what was being done elsewhere.

Dr. SOMMERFELT, referring to the question of health, said he had received a telegram from Norway expressing anxiety as to a possible overlapping of work with the W.H.O., but hoped this would be avoided by the approaching meeting between the W.H.O. and Unesco.

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey noted that Sir John Maud intended to amend his motion in accordance with Mr. MacLeish's suggestions, and hoped that M. Soydoux's proposal would also be added. He said that if Fundamental

Education was not to be destructive, it must be an adoption of the best that people possessed. He expressed a wish that the preliminary paragraph of the project should not be weakened. In Egypt, it had been decided that it was useless to provide education for a sick child, and that education and health should march hand-in-hand. He therefore wished the preamble to be kept as it was.

He said that the progress of Unesco's work in this field should be made known to the whole world, stage by stage. Publication should not be limited to English and French, and Egypt would co-operate in a translation into Arabic by providing translators and facilities.

He suggested that the exhibition proposed in connection with the Mexico City Conference should not be restricted to Mexico, but that in co-operation with other governments, there should be exhibitions in other capitals.

Lastly, he suggested that experts should have a wide experience of conditions of work in each country.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Sir John Maud and M. Seydoux should confer together to compose the text of a resolution to be presented to the Board at the beginning of the afternoon session.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL welcomed H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey's offer of translation into Arabic, and informed the board that a copy had already gone to Brazil to be translated into Portuguese and published by the National Commission there. He hoped this example would be followed by other governments.

With regard to the Mexico exhibition he said that for technical reasons it was undesirable to try to make it a general exhibition this year. He suggested, rather, that a travelling exhibition should be prepared at the Mexico Conference.

The Director-General understood that Sir John Maud's resolution would stress co-operation, in the field of fundamental education, with specialised agencies i.e. the W.H.O. He said that he was glad that H.E. Shafik Ghorbal Bey had stressed the importance of education for better health and agriculture, and for economic improvement. As a member of a committee of the British Colonial Office which had considered mass education in the African colonies, he had realised that education was useless without a better standard of living. To the Regional Conference in China the Government of Haiti was sending doctors and agricultural and veterinary specialists to discuss the improvement of the standard of living. Artistic efforts could not be encouraged in a vacuum and the economic aspect in any area must be considered.

In the United Kingdom they had the best developed school medical system, especially as regards meals. M. Métraux was to work on the Hylean Amazon project in co-operation with a sociological expert.

Referring to Sir John Maud's question regarding the nomination of a director, letters had been sent out, but replies not yet received, and so he could not be nominated for a month or more.

(The Meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the fourth meeting, held at Unesco House, 19
avenue Kléber, Paris (16e), on Friday, 11th April, 1947, at 2.45 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: H.E. M.V. DOKE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members: M.P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M.M. FALSKI (Poland)
H.E. Shafik CHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. A. N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MAULEISH (U.S.A.)
Sir John MAUD (Gt. Britain)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M.A. PHOTIADIS (Greece)
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M.L. VERNIERIS (Belgium)
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M.P. AUGER)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialized Agencies

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the
Rights of Man Division

International Labour Office: Mme. MOREL, I.L.O. Correspondent in Paris.

Item 8 of the Agenda: PROGRAMME (Continuation of discussion)

Sir John MAUD read a draft resolution which he had framed with the

help of M. Seydoux. The new text took account of suggestions put forward in the course of discussions.

"The Executive Board:

- "1) Approves the Fundamental Education project proposed under B of the programme, as amended in the light of the discussions at the present session of the Board;
- "2) Requests the Director-General to take the speediest possible steps to put the project under the leadership of one person who will work in agreement with the panel of experts already referred to;
- "3) Asks that, with a view to action in the next six months, special attention should be given to:
 - a) A definition of the scope of Fundamental Education, with special regard for the minimum conditions to be satisfied in every country; if education, science and culture are to promote and maintain peace and security;
 - b) One or more of the pilot projects alluded to in the programme;
 - c) The Regional Conference in China;
 - d) Fundamental Education as part of the Hylean Amazon Project;
- "4) As regards public health, agriculture and economic progress, full collaboration must be secured with the other specialised agencies of the United Nations before action is undertaken by Unesco;
- "5) A progress report should be submitted to the Board before the next General Conference, showing in greater detail the scope of the

project, the methods of carrying out and action already taken;

- "6) In the carrying out of this project, especially so far as concerns the appointment of advisers and experts, the formulation of suggestions and the supply of material, account must be taken of the historical, cultural and linguistic traditions of the particular country."

Dr. SOMMERFELT supported the draft resolution thus amended.

It was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously.

C. EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on this chapter of the programme.

M. VERNIERS desired to make a few observations which might facilitate anything that might be undertaken under B. Certain items, affecting one or another project, would be found lower down. Thus PART II of the programme provided under No. 3 on Page 10 for a Teachers' Charter, in which connection he wished to point out that, although admitting the great importance of improving syllabuses and methods of teaching, he attached greater importance still to the quality of the teachers. Everyone knew that good teachers were essential, but the point could not be repeated too often. In order to promote a better Fundamental Education, it was above all important that teachers should be adequately paid so that they should occupy a respected position and be saved from those burdensome material cares which prevented them from devoting themselves wholeheartedly to their educational task. It was for this reason that M. Verniers welcomed this proposal by Unesco which, by securing from governments their approval of a suitable scale, would be doing extremely valuable work, thus substantially contributing to any action that might be undertaken under B.

M. CARNEIRO observed that this question stood on the agenda (Item 4) of the joint conference of the International Bureau of Education and Unesco,

to be held in Geneva next July.

M. PARRA-PEREZ, although he had not taken part in the general discussion of the day before, wished to express agreement with the general lines of the programme and with the observations made by his colleagues. The Board should not criticise too sharply the scale of the enterprises contemplated by Unesco. Fertility of ideas was better than a paucity, but the Board had now to make its choice from among the Secretariat's proposals and to state which were suitable for immediate execution.

He then made two remarks about Section C. The first referred to the reform of school textbooks, especially history books. Before the war there had been some question of establishing a universal text-book. He was pleased to see that this idea had been dropped and that Unesco was considering the reform of textbooks on a national scale as well as the compilation of a list of bilateral or regional agreements so far concluded. In his view this was not only the best, but the only method to apply. They must beware of confusing words of different meaning like "national" and "nationalist"; the word national signified a necessary and ineradicable sentiment and it was only when it became exacerbated that this feeling became nationalistic, a sentiment which generated antagonism and was to be condemned. He thought it impossible to prevent each country from teaching history in its own way, for every people had an obvious interest in teaching its children the story of their ancestors. They could not hope to stimulate the same interest by teaching world history. What must at all costs be avoided was the arousing of hostile feelings towards other countries.

M. Parra-Perez was pleased that the idea suggested during the

General Conference, to work on the establishment of a single textbook for the teaching of history, had been dropped, as he considered it impracticable. He felt, moreover, that Unesco's function went beyond establishing a list of existing bilateral agreements and that it should try to get this method adopted by other countries. He cited the agreement concluded between Argentina and Brazil, which had included reforms in this direction.

M. VERNIERS observed that, although on the whole he approved the projects enumerated under C., he could not accept M. Parra-Peréz' viewpoint. Although the bilateral agreements about History textbooks concluded between different countries were to be recommended, the experience of the last twenty years had shown how hard it was to reach any practical result, especially in the case of old countries with a long history. While he desired to see the experiment pursued with tact, perseverance and patience, he thought it was very important to incorporate the history of nations within a universal history. National history textbooks devoted very little space indeed to the history of non-European countries and he had been horrified to light upon a Belgian history book in which only a page and a half had been given to the very important history of the United States. While the Board had to conform to the wishes of the General Conference, which had rejected the idea of preparing an international history book, M. Verniers would like teachers, especially secondary teachers, to be furnished not with a single definitive textbook, but with a work grounded upon civilisation rather than upon politics. The emphasis must be on collaboration between all peoples in the work of civilisation.

Mr. MacLEISH acknowledged the importance of this exchange of views, but pointed out that the Board had only a very short time to consider all the

items on the Agenda. Could not Chapter C be adopted in its entirety?

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was for the Board to choose its own methods of work. Recognising that the programme was in harmony with the intentions of the Conference, the Board could accept it as a whole or discuss it item by item, which he thought might give speedier results.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ proposed the adoption of Chapter C.

M. SEYDOUX, supporting Dr. Martinez Baez's proposal, had a few reservations to make. Paragraph 3 (International Study Centres) would be better placed in Chapter D - Social Sciences - rather than under Education; Paragraph 5 (International Relations Clubs), although it aroused no objection on principle, had last November been given only priority number 2. Finally Paragraph 6c (Collection at Unesco House of school textbooks), though it was an interesting matter, did not seem to him urgent and it would cost a lot of money. He asked for the elimination of this item.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that the project under discussion was not strictly a project of the Education Section, but one of those many-sided projects affecting various sections of the Secretariat. As soon as a competent Director was appointed, this programme would be re-grouped and organised.

M. SEYDOUX accepted this view on condition that the question of International Study Centres was entrusted, when the time came, to a Social Science specialist and not to an Educational specialist.

Mr. MACLEISH also approved the project provided it was mentioned that this was an attempt to group, for purposes of administration, various items which were destined for later re-grouping and further that account should be taken of the priorities fixed in November and that all questions which were not

within the field of Education should be examined by the competent Sections.

Dr. WALTER reserved the right to revert to his proposal when the Board discussed point E. He deplored the haste with which the Board was compelled to study a programme which covered the whole work of Unesco and raised the question of all its methods. It was a pity to have to deal so quickly with such important problems - real high-lights in Unesco's work - when it was really for the Board to judge the difficulties inherent in them and to smooth them out. He reserved the right to return to certain points when they came to discuss cooperation with other organisations, since this was a project illustrating work which might be done by collaboration with governments.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that members of the Board were perfectly free to express their views and to conduct the discussions as they wished. He thought that they should examine each item to see whether it was in accordance with the wishes of the Conference or at variance with them. Certain new items could be brought forward at the next Conference.

Dr. SOMMERFELT supported the proposal put forward by Dr. Martinez Baez, as amended by Mr. MacLeish. He added that it was important to complete the work contemplated under 6a before the Mexico Conference, in view both of its intrinsic worth and the international agreements it involved.

M. PARRA-PEREZ expressed agreement with Dr. Martinez Baez and would be disposed to accept his proposal provided it did not restrict the right of members to speak on all items of the programme.

Dr. WALKER accepted the project as a whole subject to certain remarks on method which he would make under Section E.

M. FALSKI recognised the importance of the item under discussion and,

although he thought a general study very desirable, it was also necessary to go into details. The chosen items seemed to him a little haphazard. School textbooks were not everything and their first concern was with the teaching staff. The teaching of modern languages was not on the programme, nor was international school correspondence. On this last matter, it would be easy to get in touch with the Federation of Exchange Associations in Paris, the Red Cross etc. Another matter excluded was university vacation courses for foreigners; lastly M. Falski drew attention to the importance of a conference of teachers' associations. The latter were a solid element upon which Unesco could usefully rely.

Sir John MAUD agreed with M. Falski about the importance of exchanges of students and professors. Item 7 (Survey of Exchange Programmes) was vague; it might be deleted and replaced by Exchanges of Pupils and Teachers. Incidentally he disliked the expression "workshop" and would like to see it deleted from No.2 of the English text. Further he proposed the elimination of the word "relations" in No.5 (International Relations Club). The word added nothing and could be replaced, if necessary, by a more colourful word likely to stimulate the imagination of the young.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked Sir John Maud and asked if he would be content to have the attention of those in charge of executing the programme drawn to these points.

Sir John MAUD expressed himself satisfied.

M. FALSKI asked whether the proposed collection of school textbooks at Unesco House could not be made by means of exchanges between different countries effected through the National Commissions, instead of collecting every thing in Paris.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ proposed that the Board should approve part C of the programme (Education for international understanding), on the following conditions:

- that the International Study Centre be included in the programme of the Social Sciences Section, or its direction ensured by a social science specialist;
- that account be taken of the priorities fixed by the General Conference of November 1946;
- that, since the project is a combination of activities arising out of the programmes of different Sections, the Secretariat be invited to determine the methods of work calculated to secure the unity of the project and its successful execution.

This resolution was adopted.

D. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that this was a question affecting all the Sections. In order that Member States may not be overwhelmed by innumerable questionnaires from different Sections and that Unesco might easily collect the information it needed for the preparation of its Yearbook on Education, Science and Culture throughout the World, someone on the Secretariat would have to be made responsible for co-ordinating the collections of the different Sections.

H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY mentioned that Czechoslovakia was ready to furnish all the information asked of it, but that it could only be given in the national language. Unesco would have to find the necessary translators.

M. SEYDOUX proposed that Section D should be adopted without discussion. This proposal was supported by Sir John M. UD.

Section D was adopted.

E. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Dr. E.R. WALKER held that this Section raised two questions:

1. Regarding the relations of Unesco with the other specialised agencies in the conduct of the programme, he thought that Unesco's function still needed defining. He and three other members of the Executive Board had been nominated to meet representatives of the provisional World Health Organisation on Tuesday 15th April. The Executive Board must before then define what Unesco understands by cooperation with organisations of this kind. The different specialised agencies, like the World Health Organisation or the FAO had, under the terms of their constitutions, been entrusted with definite tasks of research, education and the organisation of scientific institutions within their special fields, which might well overlap the activities of Unesco. Unesco's function must therefore be clearly defined. Dr. Walker would like to see Unesco adopting a policy which in certain well-prescribed fields would leave research initiative in the hands of the specialised agency. Unesco's own field of work was so enormous that it must avoid undertaking anything that was already being done by others. It must concentrate its effort upon problems with which nobody else was dealing. In regard to other questions, which, moreover, governments would expect to be solved by the agencies they had specially created for the purpose, Unesco should only lend its assistance. It could also, on occasions, ask the specialised agency to extend the scope of their enquiries, with or without Unesco's help, to take account of Unesco's wider interests.

2. As to the methods of work to be employed by Unesco in its relations with governments, national commissions, or the peoples of the Member States, Dr. Walker reminded the meeting that Unesco's Constitution specified that the Organisation should encourage international collaboration, which was not the

same thing as collecting information coming from different countries. For that reason, Dr. Walker submitted to the Executive Board the following draft resolution:

"Bearing in mind the purpose of Unesco and its methods of work as laid down in the Constitution, the Executive Board resolves that the programme adopted by the General Conference shall be implemented to the greatest extent possible by measures involving the active participation of Member Governments and national co-operating bodies, and collaboration between them. The Board therefore agrees that:

"1. Surveys and investigations should be delegated to Members wherever possible, and the resources of the Secretariat concentrated upon stimulating and assisting the Members rather than upon the actual conduct of research within the Secretariat. (This will entail adequate consultation with Member Governments when proposals for such surveys are under consideration, in order that Unesco's requests may be adjusted to the resources and interests of Members).

"2. Member Governments (individually or in groups) should be invited to undertake the actual organisation and conduct of such special conferences, 'seminar-workshops', 'pilot-projects', etc., as may be included in the approved programme, and the resources of the Secretariat might be concentrated upon stimulating and assisting such projects rather than itself undertaking them.

"3. The Secretariat should explore and propose other practical methods by which Member Governments (and their peoples) give effect to their agreement, under the Constitution, 'to develop and to increase the means of communication between their peoples and to employ those means for the purpose of mutual understanding' "

Dr. WALKER reverted to this resolution point by point.

In connection with paragraph 1, he stressed the need for the active participation of governments in these surveys and investigations. For instance, in the case of the project enumerated in paragraph 6 of Section (Preparation of a Model Method of Textbook and analysis), Dr. Walker thought that this was a task to be accomplished not by the Secretariat but by three or four countries of different political shades, which would collaborate in the practical execution of the project, the Secretariat's part being confined to co-ordination.

In connection with paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, Dr. Walker

cited the instance of Summer Seminar-Workshops for Teachers, included under paragraph 2 of Section C. It was desirable that the Director-General should invite two or three countries possessing famous schools of Social Science to undertake the organisation of these courses rather than leave it to the Secretariat alone. Nor was there any reason for choosing Paris as the centre of these seminars. It would be well if Unesco's activities were not confined exclusively to Paris but were world-wide, as it might well be that some other country would provide a more stimulating background for a seminar of this sort.

Paragraph 3 was in the nature of a suggestion to the Secretariat, as to further work designed to encourage collaboration among members of Unesco.

Professor CARNEIRO, while paying a tribute to Dr. Walker's experience, was reluctant to support his proposal. It risked depriving Unesco of its mission and destroying the unity of its work. He thought it dangerous to delegate to States tasks of Unesco which it was essential should be accomplished in an international spirit.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ, raising a point of detail, concerning relations with the specialised agencies, asked whether the Executive Board could not take the desired steps to give definite instructions to those of its Members who were to meet the representatives of the provisional World Health Commission on Tuesday.

Sir John MAUD, while acknowledging the importance of the question put by Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ, thought that they should keep for the moment to the general discussion of Dr. Walker's draft resolution. He reminded the Board that the United Kingdom delegation had argued at the last General Conference that Unesco's work should be carried on not only in Paris but in all countries.

They must remember, however, that Unesco had a two-fold function; to accomplish certain work on its own account and to help the different countries to carry out various tasks. Dr. Walker's resolution might tend unduly to restrict the first of these two functions. Accordingly, Sir John MAUD proposed two amendments to Dr. Walker's draft;

In paragraph 1, they might replace the words "wherever possible" by "to appropriate international organisations and to groups of individuals from various countries, whenever possible and appropriate".

It was for the Secretariat to judge whether a particular task should be entrusted to a government or to a given Organisation.

In paragraph 2, Sir John Maud proposed to replace the word "undertake" by the words "co-operate to the fullest extent possible in". This suggested the idea of less direct activity.

Returning, by way of example, to the question of Summer Seminars for Teachers, Sir John Maud pointed out that, if two or three countries were to organise these courses, as Dr. Walker had suggested, they would never be able to take place in six months. If such Seminars were to be organised quickly, the work would have to be done by the Secretariat.

M. SEYDOUX felt that Dr. Walker had raised a matter which concerned the policy of the Organisation itself and which came within the jurisdiction of the General Conference rather than of the Executive Board. He thought it would be dangerous for Unesco to entrust a large number of projects to national bodies. The latter varied very greatly in importance in the different countries and there would be a danger of thus giving a marked preponderance to certain countries, which would be contrary to the spirit of Unesco.

M. Seydoux favoured adopting Section E as it stood. This proposal was supported by M. PARRA-PEREZ.

Professor PHOTIADIS was of the opinion that Dr. Walker's proposal could not be accepted by scientists because it tended to restrict freedom of research. Scientists must be able to pursue their investigations wherever they wished and find all possible help in Unesco. On that account, Professor Photiades concurred in the opinions expressed by Professor Carneiro and M. Seydoux.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ was prepared to support Dr. Walker's resolution as amended by Sir John Maud. He reminded the Board that the committees responsible for preparing the programme in 1946 in London had stressed the need for avoiding duplication and that the Poles in particular had expressed a wish that Unesco's work should not be confined exclusively to Paris.

Mr. MacLEISH was also in favour of Dr. Walker's draft resolution, together with the amendments by Sir John Maud. He pointed out that to throw out paragraph 2 of this resolution would amount to saying that Unesco was not to make use of the National Commissions.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether Dr. Walker accepted Sir John Maud's amendments.

Dr. WALKER expressed his readiness to do so. He had never intended that his proposal should restrict freedom of research, but only wanted Unesco to give priority to tasks that no-one was as yet tackling. Nor did he ask the Organisation to modify its general policy. He was only pleading for a method of work which would appeal to the Governments and organisations of the different countries. There were certain tasks which could be performed within

the Secretariat but others which could only be accomplished outside it. Above all they must always have in mind the aim they were pursuing, namely the maintenance of peace. He hoped that the Executive Board would approve his draft resolution with the amendments by Sir John Maud.

M. CARNEIRO thought that Dr. Walker's resolution was at variance with Unesco's purposes. Unesco's budget had been voted by the Governments in order that the Organisation might accomplish certain tasks on their behalf. They could not now ask the same Governments to perform these tasks themselves. This would mean a double outlay, which certain small countries would be unable to support.

Moreover, there were certain surveys which could not be impartially carried out by national officials. Only the Secretariat had the international staff which could make these investigations in the way that was desired.

For these reasons, Dr. Carneiro felt bound to vote against Dr. Walker's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN then took a vote on M. Seydoux's proposal to approve Section E of the programme without a discussion of Dr. Walker's resolution.

This proposal was rejected by nine votes to six.

A vote was then taken on Section E with the addition of Dr. Walker's draft resolution as amended by Sir John Maud.

The whole of it was approved by eleven votes to seven.

F. EXCHANGE OF PERSONS, INCLUDING FELLOWSHIPS AND SCHOLARSHIPS.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded the meeting that Unesco had been fortunate enough to secure for the study of this project the help of an outstanding expert, Mr. John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Professor CHEN YU-N proposed the adoption of Section F.

Sir John MAUD supported Mr. Chen Yuan's proposal on condition that no attempt was made following consultation with Mr. Marshall, to limit the role of the Secretariat, especially in regard to the actual grant of fellowships to individuals.

Section F was adopted.

G. COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that here again Unesco had had to have recourse to a panel of experts whose work might continue into 1948.

M. SEYDOUX proposed the adoption of Section G.

Professor VERNIERS enquired whether the Secretariat ought not to take steps for the convening of an international conference to meet in Brussels towards the end of 1947 in order to revise the Berne Copyright Convention, and to study the preparation of an International Convention.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that Dr. Kuypers had told him at the last General Conference that it was undesirable for this Conference to meet before 1948.

Professor CARNEIRO supported M. Seydoux's proposal for the adoption of Section G.

Section G was adopted.

(The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.)

UNESCO/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./S.R.5/1947. (rev)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the fifth meeting, held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kleber, Paris (16e), on Saturday, April 12th, 1947 at 9.45 a.m.

Present

Chairman: H.E. M. V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M. M. FALSKI (Poland)
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. R.M. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. P. AUGER)

Representatives of
United Nations and
Specialised Agencies:

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Human Rights Division.

International Labour
Office:

Mme. MOREL, T.L.O. Correspondent in Paris.

Item 8 of the Agenda: PROGRAMME, Part II, Section A: Education

M. SEYDOUX said that he would propose that Section A be adopted having regard to the priorities approved by the General Conference. He then pointed out that the project for adult education was rather more ambitious than that adopted by the Conference. The French National Commission had asked him to draw attention to the fact that sub-paragraphs c), d) and e) of paragraph 1 had not been decided by the Conference. The Paragraph 3 (Teachers' Charter) had been given third priority by the Conference. Paragraph 4 c) had been understood at the Conference to refer to the devastated countries. Paragraph 5 had not been adopted by the Conference, and the Executive Board should examine the question.

M. FALSKI said that Part II was not presented in proper form. It was difficult to understand which were the present and which the future tasks. As regards paragraph 5 (Re-education of ex-enemy countries) he submitted the following resolution:

"The Executive Board resolves as regards the programme for the re-education of ex-enemy countries:

- 1) that the enquiry as to the possibility of opening up ex-enemy countries to programmes of Unesco shall be limited in the first period to the attentive observation of the real spirit and tendencies of their populations relating to the ideal of peace and international understanding;
- 2) that no activity in favour of ex-enemy countries shall be undertaken by the Secretariat without a decision of the Executive Board."

He proposed that the Executive Board should reject without discussion the Secretariat's suggestion for the re-establishment of the German Colonial Library. The Teachers' Charter project could, he thought, be combined with that for a Conference of Teachers' Unions.

Mr. MACLEISH did not quite understand the relationship between the three major projects listed in Part I and the other projects. If it were not made quite clear that the latter had subsidiary priority, he would be obliged to disallow the whole section.

A point which had struck him was the absence in the text of this section of any mention of the ideal of peace and security which was one of Unesco's main objects. He suggested that it was necessary to return to the priorities established by the Conference.

The ~~DIRECTOR-GENERAL~~ pointed out that there was no suggestion that the three projects mentioned in Part I had absolute priority over those listed in Part II. Some of the latter were extremely important - in particular, the study of tensions crucial to peace and the Hylean Amazon Project. Then there was the work on Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, which had to be fitted into the programme.

No special reference had been made in this section to the promotion of peace and security because it had been assumed that this idea had been sufficiently stressed in the Preamble. The adult education project had been given prominence because it had been thought that quicker results could be obtained in this field. As for the question of priorities, these had been changed in the light of discussions in the Standing Committee and meetings of experts. The proposal concerning the German Colonial Library had already been eliminated from the programme. As for the work on Natural Science, it had been included in this part, as a very important specialised activity. Immediate attention should be given to it, otherwise Unesco would not be living up to the "S" in its name.

He pointed out that this was a very condensed programme. There were other continuing activities which had not been specifically mentioned.

Sir John MAUD said that he would second M. Seydoux's motion if the latter would agree to add to his text the words "and to the decision of the Executive Board with regard to the three projects on Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, Fundamental Education and Education for International Understanding". Speaking of the relationship between Parts I and II of the programme, he considered that the three great multisectional projects should not have absolute priority. He was much interested in the question of adult education, but thought that the plans for an International Conference of leaders might fit in with International Understanding.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed the hope that the resolution would not be carried in its present form. This would mean a return purely and simply to the priorities established by the Conference, and all the work that had been done since would be useless. He suggested that Part II might be discussed item by item. Several projects had already been suppressed. It was essential to have an approved list of items by the end of this session.

M. SEYDOUX, after a conversation with Sir John Maud, submitted the following motion:

"Section A of the second part of the Programme is adopted, provided that respect is paid to the spirit and priorities of the Programme approved by the General Conference and that account is taken of the decisions of the Executive Board with regard to the projects for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, Fundamental Education and Education for International Understanding".

Mr. MacLEISH thought that there was not as much time to discuss this matter as it deserved. The Director-General must be left free, but the role of the Executive Board was to approve the programme considered as a whole. It was necessary to set up the machinery, but Unesco must show some action this year. He urged that Unesco should indicate a policy and concentrate its activity thereon. He would accept the wording of the resolution presented by M. Seydoux and Sir John Maud if he could leave with the Director-General the thought that there must be a clear central focal point of action this year. The projects undertaken must be linked up with the three major projects.

Dr. WALKER would agree to the resolution with some reservations. In his view the proposed programme was not getting away from the spirit of the Conference. Work had to be adjusted in the light of experience and the international situation. The first three projects should be regarded as the dominant aspects of activity in 1947. In this he agreed with Mr. MacLeish, but pointed out that the sectional work was also important in so far as it was a long range task of international cooperation. It did not of course receive the same high light as the first three projects.

In his opinion, organisation and programme were interconnected. The emphasis on the three great projects had arisen from problems connected with the conference resolution on the organisation of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there were two resolutions before the meeting, one submitted by M. Falski, the other by M. Seydoux. The latter was seconded by Sir John Maud.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed the hope that the discussion on M. Falski's resolution would be postponed. It could be considered in connection with the question of non-member States.

Dr. WALKER asked whether the approval of the resolution would involve the approval of paragraph 5 (Re-education of ex-enemy countries).

M. SEYDOUX remarked that for this question a postponement had been suggested.

The CHAIRMAN stated that discussion of M. Falski's resolution would take place under the item concerning relations with non-member States.

Coming back to M. Seydoux's resolution, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he welcomed it with some reservation. It appeared to imply that the Standing Committee and the Secretariat had departed from the programme and the spirit of the Conference. He asked the Executive Board to indicate how far this had been done.

M. CARNEIRO said that he would support the motion in a general form, not peculiar to part A, since it could apply to the programme as a whole. Unesco's activity should be determined in the light of the interest and importance of the project.

Sir John MAUD agreed with M. Carneiro. If the resolution were adopted as at present worded, it might serve as a guide for the study of the rest of the programme.

The resolution of M. Seydoux, as amended by Sir John Maud, was put to the vote and unanimously adopted, it being understood that the discussion of Section 5 (Re-education of ex-enemy countries) would take place under another item of the Agenda.

PART II SECTION B: LIBRARIES

Dr. WALLER proposed that this project should be adopted, as it stood, without striking anything out. He added that only a small beginning could be made in work in this field in 1947.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ wished paragraph 1B) (Arrange in connection with the Mexico City Conference for: 1) an exhibition of Public Libraries) to be considered later on, when the Unesco Month was discussed.

Mr. MacLEISH seconded Dr. Walker's proposal. With regard to paragraph 2 (Bibliographical Services), as former Director of the United States National Library, he considered that the question of the inter-library loan system constituted one of the most important long-range aims of Unesco, involving great expense, and not to be treated as subsidiary bibliographical action.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed that the phrasing of the project was too compressed and said that the item would be stated separately. Work had already begun on the establishment of an inter-library loan system.

M. SEYDOUX also supported Dr. Walker's proposal. Referring to page 2 of the Unesco Bulletin for Libraries, he remarked that the question of publication in two languages had been settled at the San Francisco Conference. The Bulletin consisted of brief notes in English and only the introduction to chapters was written in English and French. It must be remembered that many people were not familiar with both languages and that, in order to respect an international spirit, both languages should be given equal preponderancy.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that in future editions both languages would be employed as far as possible.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of Section B.

Adopted

PART II SECTION C: NATURAL SCIENCES

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that assistance, by grants-in-aid etc., to international scientific organisations, had been omitted from Section C, to be discussed under another item; it was hoped that Unesco would encourage the formation of new international unions, where necessary.

M. PARRA-PEREZ approved Section C, but wished to ask a question. Was it intended to create only one mission for scientific co-operation in Latin America? It seemed to him that this would be insufficient, owing to the difficulty of communications and the impossibility of establishing an effective liaison system.

As regards the Hylean Amazon Project, M. Parra-Perez emphasised that he was not speaking as a representative of the Venezuelan Government, but as a member of the Executive Board, and that, consequently, the opinions he expressed were purely personal. He had reason to believe that his Government was exceedingly interested in this project and would be ready to give its support. He had heard two criticisms, or rather two questions asked: it was wondered why Unesco should be particularly interested in the Hylean Amazon region, and, also, why another region had not been chosen? It was easy to reply to these queries.

Results might be obtained from this project which would be of great advantage to science, especially medical science. It would prove, on the one hand, that Unesco was deeply interested in science and, on the other, that the Organisation's aim was to promote peace; it must not be forgotten that over-population was one of the causes of war, and that vast unexploited regions concealed potential riches and possibilities which constituted a sort of reserve for the world, from a demographic point of view. Governments to whom these territories belonged, had been considering this problem for some time. For instance, the combined efforts of the Brazilian and Venezuelan Governments, with the co-operation of the American Air Force, had produced some very interesting information regarding communications between the Amazon and Orinoco basins. This was a successful example of international collaboration. M. Parra-Perez therefore felt he was right in saying that the Venezuelan Government would take great interest in this problem, which was of great scientific importance. He had been informed that an Institute for Experimental Research was shortly to be set up in the Orinoco area, and he thought that it would be possible to establish a profitable liaison between these two projects. He then proposed that a third person should be attached to the Unesco Mission, who would be a scholar belonging to a South American nation concerned with the project.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ said that before Section O was approved, great attention must be given to it. Which international organisations were to be allotted subsidies? He asked that when the Budget was discussed that the Board would be supplied with all details on the organisation to which it was desired to give subsidies, the sums allocated to each one and the destination of these sums. With regard to the centres of Field Science

Cooperation, he admitted that he shared the anxieties of M. Parra-Perez. Referring to paragraph 1 a), he said that it would be a very long task to contact all scientists in Latin-America. He thought that sub-paragraphs b), c), d) etc. were very interesting but complex, especially the supplying of ideas, mentioned in sub-paragraph b). He gave Latin-America only as an example, but China and other vast areas would also prove difficult. Unesco must not give the impression of being too ambitious, and he felt that some reservations should be made. He observed that at the Interim Commission of the World Health Organisation the Brazilian representative had asked for precise information on this subject, as concerned the intervention of Unesco in the field of health. He said that he wished to receive instructions in view of the Joint Committee with the WHO.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he was glad to hear that M. Parra-Perez and Dr. Martinez Baez welcomed the Hylean Amazon project. He stated that the region had been chosen for two reasons. Firstly, because the Brazilian Government had suggested its suitability and, secondly, because it fitted in with the general principles which should govern Unesco's efforts towards co-operation in international science. Referring to the establishment of international research laboratories, decided upon by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, the Director-General said that in many cases international laboratories were unnecessary, but that, in scientific work in whole zones not yet explored, they were very important. The equatorial forests were of particular interest and the Hylean Amazon region was chosen as the largest single area, as yet unexplored.

An inter-governmental commission of countries with territory in the area would be set up and nothing further could be done until this commission met, which would probably be this summer. The Director-General welcomed the idea of appointing South American scientists and said that Dr. Corner would request the Governments concerned to second young scientists to work under his direction. With regard to the Field Science Co-operation Offices, he suggested that Unesco should rely on the great experience of Dr. Needham, who had already set up such an Office in China during the war, which only differed from the ones proposed in Section C in that it was bi-lateral instead of international. With regard to the difficulties of liaison and communication, he wished to point out that these Field Science Offices would be mobile for more than half the time, travelling about by air, and that there would be a small central office. The whole point of all Field Science Offices was that they should not be autonomous but should be serviced from Headquarters, which would endeavour to supply them with information and materials.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN said a good deal had been heard that day about the respect due to the spirit and details of the decisions of the General Conference. When one turned to the decisions of the General Conference on the Natural Sciences and the programme now submitted to the Board, certain marked differences were found. The nutrition centres were not to be found in the new programme. They had been dropped out - quite rightly, as the World Health Organisation was concerned specifically with medical education and nutrition problems. Nothing should be done by Unesco which was likely to appear as poaching on the preserves of other Specialised

Agencies. The conference of the representatives of the World Health Organisation and Unesco, which would meet on Tuesday afternoon, would discuss the question of nutrition centres and decide on joint action. Mutual co-operation among the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations was essential if the work of the United Nations was to progress satisfactorily.

The Hylean Amazon project was found in both programmes.

The third item of establishing field science co-operation offices appeared differently in the resolutions of the General Conference and the proposals now made by the Secretariat. The General Conference decided on the establishment of four field science co-operation offices, in China, India, Latin America and the Middle East. The programme now submitted to the Board omitted India. He did not know who was responsible for this omission; whether it was the Standing Committee or the Secretariat, or a Section of the Secretariat: the Programme Section or the Administrative Section. Whoever might be responsible for it, was doing violence to the spirit and the letter of the resolution of the General Conference. His colleague, Mr. Bhabha, who presided over the Natural Sciences Section, was enthusiastic about it, and the decision of the General Conference was received with great cheer in India. If, now, it was dropped, it would cause much disappointment to the people of India.

Whenever such curtailments were made, it was said that they were due to the cut in the budget. If there was a curtailment in the financial resources, it was for the Executive Board to decide which item had to be dropped, and not for the Secretariat. He considered the way in which this question of a field centre in India was dealt with by the Secretariat as most unfair.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that on account of the cut in the Budget it had been considered impossible to establish four field stations in 1947. It was possible that an error had been made in the choice of areas. He welcomed Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's suggestion that the item should be restored to the programme on condition that only preliminary research would be commenced in 1947 and real work started in 1948.

M. CARNEIRO said that the green book of the General Conference had given Natural Science a very important place and that Unesco's book "Science and Unesco" presented a programme justifying all hopes that the General Conference's proposals, would be carried out. When, however, the green book was compared with the present programme, a lamentable difference was noted, due probably to budgetary reasons. It was to be feared that the letter "S" in Unesco would disappear. As had already been observed, the question of nutrition had been omitted, but it was hoped that the WHO would take an interest in it in the evolving of future projects.

With regard to the Hylean Amazon project, progress had not been as rapid as could have been wished. This project had been proposed in London last year, and yet a Conference was only being called in July or August of 1947 to fix the general lines of the project, and it was therefore improbable that anything positive would be done in the course of the present year. Field Science Missions were being sent to the Far East, the Middle East, and Latin America, but these regions were too vast for good results to be obtained in less than six months. Highly qualified persons were being sent, but they were unfamiliar with the region and the language. There would therefore be great difficulties and it would be a long task which could not be accomplished in 1947.

Professor CARNEIRO, continuing, said that he would have liked to second M. Parra-Perez' proposal to appoint a South American scientist to be attached to the Unesco Mission; but he found the Director-General's suggestion unsatisfactory. It was not a young man who was needed, under the direction of the other scientists, but a strong personality with high prestige in South America - a collaborator as distinguished as the others - since the co-operation of at least ten countries involved political and social problems. In order to obtain financial aid from Governments, Unesco must allocate a certain sum of money to the Hylean Amazon Mission and give the Governments an idea of the amount of the contribution required of them. He suggested that a scientific representative of the Pan-American Union should be invited to the International Commission in South America at the end of the year, and also that a special invitation should be sent to the Mexican Institute for the Study of Native Life.

He expressed his confidence in the two men who were being sent by Unesco to carry out the Hylean Amazon project. He praised Dr. Corner (United Kingdom) for his work in Malaya and Dr. Malamos (Greece) for his work at the Tropical Institute in Hamburg. They would be welcome in Latin America. He felt assured that the WHO would not object to the presence of a doctor in the mission. The Hylean Amazon project aimed as much at the maintenance of peace as at the furtherance of scientific research. He also praised Dr. Needham's ability, as Head of the Division.

M. PARRA-PEREZ said that he was sure the Executive Board would welcome the participation of France, Gt. Britain and the Netherlands in the Hylean Amazon project, which was of great interest to them owing to their possessions in Guiana.

Shafik GHORBAL Bey gave his whole-hearted support to the Field Science Missions in the four regions already mentioned, including India. Both the objectives so nobly expressed by M. Carneiro and the difficulties which had been mentioned made a early start necessary and welcome. In the Middle East the difficulties were less formidable, as preliminary work had been carried out during the war. A Middle East Supply Centre had been created for war purposes which had led to interesting international work by British, American and Arab scientists. There were two or three points which he would like clarified. For example, there was the Delimitation of the Middle East region. During the war this region had expanded and receded according to the fortunes of war, sometimes including Iran, Turkey, Cyprus and ex-Italian possessions on the Red Sea. In the Nile Basin, equatorial Anglo-Egyptian Sudan had sometimes been excluded. Were the frontiers to be physical, natural or cultural? This question had practical, and not merely academic, implications. No preliminary work had been done in Egypt. He would be happy to place himself at the disposal of the scientists in order to obtain contacts in Egypt.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to point out two things. Firstly, that the delimitation of the Middle East area could not be decided at present. This was a question to be settled later by Dr. Purnell. Secondly, with regard to nutrition teams, it seemed, that the financial implications of the project had not been clear at the time of the General Conference. Funds were not at present available and the Food and Agricultural Organisation was not prepared to cooperate in 1947.

The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the Board to the time and said that, in view of the enormous task before them, he thought they must meet the following morning.

Mr. MacLEISH suggested that it might be necessary to meet the same evening (Saturday), and made a proposal to this effect.

Sir John MAUD seconded Mr. MacLeish's proposal and suggested they should meet at 9.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Board had decided not to meet in the evenings, though he himself had no objections.

Sir John MAUD said that as they were so behindhand with their programme he thought it necessary to meet in the evenings and said that he had understood that the decision not to do so had been informal.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been a formal decision and decided to put the matter to the vote.

M. SEYDOUX suggested working the whole of Sunday and also Sunday evening which might make it unnecessary to work on Saturday evening.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ opposed evening meetings on grounds of health and said that if they met under those conditions no good work would be done. He was however in agreement that they should work on Sunday.

Mr. MacLEISH expressed anxiety at the slowness of the proceedings and pointed out that the important questions of the Budget and Personnel had not yet been dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN put the matter to the vote.

It was decided by 8 votes to 7 that there should be no evening meeting.

(The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the sixth Meeting, held at Unesco House,
19 Avenue Kléber, Paris, 16ème, on Saturday 12th April 1947, at 2.45 pm

- Present: M. Léon BLUM, President of the First General Conference.
- Chairman: H.E. M. V. DORE (Canada)
- Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)
- Members: M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M. M. FALSKI (Poland)
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. R. M. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MacLEISH (United States)
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M. C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvopalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M. P. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)
- Deputy: M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M.P. Auger)
- Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies:
- United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Rights of Man Division.
- International Labour Office: Mme. MOREL, I.L.O. correspondent in Paris.

The CHAIRMAN greeted M. Léon Blum who was a welcome figure at meetings of the Executive Board. Before continuing their study of Item 8a of the Agenda (examination of Part II of the "Programme of Unesco 1947" Section C: Natural Sciences), the Chairman drew attention to the need for getting on quickly with the work and therefore called upon everybody to limit speeches to two or three minutes.

Dr. WALKER expressed disappointment at the laconic nature of the Natural Sciences programme. He would have liked more detailed information about the work of Unesco's busiest section, to match the interest felt by the Executive Board in the inclusion of this work within Unesco's general programme. Science was not of interest only to Scientists and Research workers; owing to its political and other repercussions it interested all mankind. The Board would like regularly to receive more substantial and more systematised reports on Unesco's work in this field than the rather fragmentary information so far given; he cited as examples paragraphs 3 and 4 on page 13 of the English text, which were only general headings.

As regards the Hylean Amazon Project, Dr. Walker called it the very model of a good project. Did it not illustrate the need for active cooperation both between Unesco and Member States and between the interested nations themselves?

Reverting to the interest in Science felt by other than Scientists and Researcher., Dr. Walker referred to Unesco's good fortune in having men like Dr. Huxley and Dr. Needham who realised the social value of science. Unesco's scientific projects must take account of this extra-scientific factor. As an example of such projects he quoted the Scientific cooperation
Cons.Exec./2e Sess./S.R.6(rev.)
E.

missions which had had to be reduced to three for lack of funds. These projects would have to be examined by the Board, which would ensure the maintenance of a geographical balance of work not purely scientific. This involved problems that were not purely scientific but also partly political. The Secretariat would soon have to start preparing its plans for 1948 and in doing so would have to take account of socially valuable projects.

Dr. Walker concluded by saying that, since the Natural Sciences programme was really a fuller one than appeared from Section C, the Executive Board should approve it.

Dr. KRUYT reverted to the important question of grants. In the past Scientific Research had always enjoyed the support of national organisations or of individuals. In actual fact International Scientific Organisations were the work, not of governments, but of the scientists themselves. This was a convenient and even excellent arrangement but it presented certain difficulties in the matter of credits and administration. For this reason Scientists eagerly hailed the creation of Unesco as promising them a way out of those difficulties. Dr. Kruty, unlike certain other people, was sure that international cooperation in the scientific field was an integral part of Unesco's task. Unesco ought to furnish grants-in-aid to international organisations of 20, 30 and even 40 years standing; this would greatly encourage scientific progress by ensuring cooperation between men of all countries who were working with a common zeal for the establishment of peace. The question of grants-in-aid had received the verbal support of the Director-General that very morning and it might therefore be assumed that they would find a place in the programme.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred Dr. Kruyt to Part I of the programme where Section E, on Page 7 of the English text, gave him all the assurances. Moreover they would be returning to the question of grants in connection with Item 8 (b) ii of the Agenda. In reply to Dr. Walker the Director-General mentioned that a statement on the work of the Natural Sciences Section since the beginning of the year had recently been published and was available to members of the Board. (Document Nat.Sci./25).

Sir John MAUD thought that the discussion had served a very useful purpose and was of a constructive nature. It now remained to take a decision, and accordingly he proposed that Part II Section C should be adopted, account being taken of two factors:

1) The observations of Mr. Parra-Perez and Carneiro, endorsed from a slightly different point of view by Dr. Walker: the Hylean Amazon project, which concerned several Sections, should form a fourth general project for 1947.

2) Sir Sarvopalli Radhakrishnan's speech requested that the Scientific Cooperation Mission to India, omitted this year for financial reasons, should appear in the programme for 1948.

Sir John MAUD proposed in the second case that since the Board had decided not to hold the night sittings, it would be a good thing to hasten progress by setting up a small committee to study the question of grants-in-aid and of the relations between Unesco and non-governmental organisations.

Mr. MacLEISH supported Sir John Maud's new resolution, but rejected the idea of the small committee, since the question of grants would

come up in due time under other items of the Agenda, and he had a suggestion up his sleeve which he thought would quickly dispose of it.

Sir John Maud provisionally withdrew his second resolution (establishment of a Sub-Committee).

M. PHOTIADES supported Sir John Maud's first resolution. In view of the "laconic" spirit presiding over the discussion, he was content to note the demographic importance of the Hylean Amazon Project.

Sir John Maud's proposal was adopted in the following form:

"The Executive Board

approves Section C of Part II of the Programme, concerning Natural Sciences, as modified in the light of the discussion at the present session of the Board, in particular so as:

1. to treat the Hylean Amazon project as the fourth general project of Unesco for 1947, together with the three general projects already approved by the Board;

and

2. to include a Science Cooperation Office for India as a project to be studied with a view to action in 1948".

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that Section D, Social Sciences, should be taken point by point.

M. Jean THOMAS stated that the last sentence in paragraph 1 under "Home and Community Planning": "Since this has not been decided" was no longer in conformity with the facts. He had just returned from the United States where he had represented Unesco at the Meetings of the Economic and Social Council, and he wished to explain the difficulties he had met with in this matter. Intervention by the representative of Unesco with the French and American delegations, which jointly drafted the final

Cons. Exec. /2e Sess. /S.R. 6. (rev.)

resolution, had resulted in the following decisions:

1. To instruct the Social Commission, assisted by the Economic Commission, to study the problem of housing in cooperation with the specialised agencies.
2. To instruct the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps towards a later study of the housing problem in cooperation with the specialised agencies.
3. To instruct the Secretary-General to centralise all information about the housing problem and to disseminate it through a special review.
4. To instruct the Secretary-General to convene a conference of experts on housing and town planning.

Nevertheless, most of the delegations were of opinion that, owing to the importance and urgency of the matter, the necessary action ought to be taken by the United Nations themselves, the Secretariat being granted supplementary credits. It had, however, been decided that the preparatory work should be undertaken with the cooperation of all the specialised agencies. Many of the delegations to the Economic and Social Council had been surprised at Unesco's interest in the housing and town planning problem. H. Thomas had explained to them, but without convincing all of them.

In any case, thanks to the support of the United States and French delegates, Unesco's representative had secured two mentions of the share of the specialised agencies in the final resolution drafted. Unesco, therefore, had its place in the work of the United Nations on Home and Community Planning or, more strictly speaking, on the housing problem.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that paragraph 1 should remain unchanged since it was mainly concerned with prospecting work. It was still the fact, however, that while the Economic and Social Council considered only the housing question, Unesco must not lose sight of its assigned task, namely to Study Home and Community Planning, not only for towns (the one field of interest to the Economic and Social Council) but also for the countryside - this, from the social, medical, architectural, scientific and other points of view.

The Director-General remarked lastly that the conference proposed by the Economic and Social Council was only concerned with housing.

Dr. WALKER observed that the question had interested Unesco for a long time and that to-day's difficulties had been foreseen. The important thing was to move with caution, to pursue the question and to draw attention to any omissions. Accordingly they could adopt the whole of paragraph 1 with a few modifications. Thus at the end of paragraph (b) ("including the desirability.....") should be deleted; the United Nations were already examining something similar to this Centre and Unesco would be ill-advised to complicate their task. Lastly, could they have details as to the exact character of Unesco's participation in the conference of the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning, mentioned in paragraph (c)?

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL gave the details asked for. The Federation was a private international organ, which had held its conference at Hastings last October and which wished to hold its next conference in Paris; Unesco had merely offered it the hospitality of

Cons. Exec. /20 Sess. /S.R. 6 (rev.)
E.

its premises and the help of members of the Secretariat who were interested in the question.

As to paragraph (b), the Director-General saw no need to shorten it. The Economic and Social Council did not yet know what kind of body should be established, and it would therefore be better to defer the question of the situation of the proposed Centre and its relations with the United Nations, especially as such a Centre would have to concern itself, not only with the national territory of a particular country, but would also have to study the question from the international aspect and in all countries. Paragraph (b) was very carefully worded and it should be retained.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that Unesco ought to avoid any appearance of wishing to compete with the United Nations. Even if the Unesco project viewed the question from a slightly different angle from that of the Economic and Social Council, it should not mention this in an official document. It must, of course, pursue the question, but it had many other tasks to fulfil, tasks which did not yet impinge upon any other organisation.

As for the conference mentioned in paragraph (c), Unesco could well offer its hospitality and send observers to it; but the Economic and Social Council must be informed.

M. CARNEIRO said that the decisions of the General Conference compelled them to carry out this project, which had been contemplated by Unesco before the Economic and Social Council took it up. He was agreed that duplication should be avoided, but they must abide by the recommendation of the General Conference, which should take the place of paragraphs (a).

and (b); paragraphs (c) and (d) would be left intact. In this way, Unesco would not expose itself to charges of encroachment upon the Economic and Social Council.

The Secretariat, he added, was obliged to follow a recommendation from the General Conference, of which no trace was found in the Programme Project. It dealt with the International Study Centre (see Journal of the Conference, page 213: "with a view to the creation of an international relations study centre, the following measures would be taken in 1947, etc."). What had become of this?

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the project in question had been taken out of the Social Sciences Chapter and placed among the projects common to several sections.

Mr. MacLEISH thought that, since they were to make cuts, because of lack of funds, it was better to eliminate those projects with which other bodies were dealing. Moreover, this project, which was not contemplated for the current year and which had been granted no priority, had no place in Unesco, though the Organisation might follow the matter and offer hospitality to the June Conference.

M. SEDOUX, supporting the proposal by Mr. MacLoish, asked for a vote to be taken. He, too, however, noted the absence of certain items adopted by the General Conference, particularly the study of questions of international law and comparative law. Reverting to the project for an international study centre, he thought that this should be restored to the Social Sciences Section; he would also like explanations about the agreement concluded by Unesco with the International Studies Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL then explained that the question of international law, like that of Home and Community planning, had been taken in hand by the United Nations which had appointed a special commission for the purpose. There was an agreement with the International Studies Conference, but it had nothing to do with the question raised. The latter might form a project interesting only the Education Section or the Education and Social Sciences Sections together. For his part, he had supposed that, in regard to the International Study Centre, appeal would be made to Social Science specialists. In any event, it would be better to return to the question in connection with item 10, "Organisation of the Secretariat", since, although there was no doubt of the need for such a centre, it was primarily a question of practical organisation.

Mr. MacLEISH expressed willingness to adopt paragraph 1 of section D, account being taken of the observations by Dr. Walker and M. Carneiro.

Paragraph 1 of Section D was adopted as follows:-

"Home and Community Planning

"Unesco's task in this field will have to be clearly defined in relation to whatever activities the UN may undertake under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council. Since this has not yet been decided, Unesco will:

- (a) with a view to the future establishment of an International Centre for Home and Community Planning, limit its efforts this year to the encouragement of action taken by Governments in this field, and to the preparation, with the approval of the Economic and Social Council of fully documented projects;
- (b) participate and assist in the Conference of the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning to be held in Paris, June 5th to 7th, 1947;
- (c) prepare a report on this subject for the 1947 Mexico City Conference."

Paragraph 2: Study of Tensions crucial to Peace

Sir John MAUD viewed this as a project common to several sections. He was willing to adopt this paragraph, with these reservations:

1. The English title "Study of Tensions crucial to Peace" should be altered since, at any rate, in his country, it did not clearly explain the contents of the project. The French title sounded to him better and he would suggest some such title as "Study of Social Problems which threaten Peace". But the choice of a suitable English title could be left to the Secretariat;
2. The question of the International Study Centre, which was part of the "International Understanding" project, should be linked up with the study of Tensions crucial to Peace;
3. The survey contemplated in paragraph 1 of Section E, "Philosophy and Humanistic Studies" should also be linked with this paragraph. Sir John Maud thought that the Declaration by the United States Department of State was right in proposing the mobilisation of specialists in the Social Sciences and Philosophy in all countries which could take this step in 1947.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought it would be difficult to link this project with the International Study Centre, since the latter was only in the stage of preliminary investigation.

Mr. MAULEISH supported Sir John Maud's proposal.

Mr. PHOTIADES complained of obscurity in the French text of paragraph (c): "Recherches des possibilités.....etc....."

Sir John Maud's proposal was adopted in the following form:

"It is resolved

that paragraph 2 of Section D of the Second Part of the Programme be approved, subject to the following points:

- (i) that the Director-General considers the possibility of finding a more suitable title to the project, such as, for instance, "Study of Social Problems Threatening Peace";

(ii) that the activities to be conducted under the heading "International Study Centres" (Programme, Part I, C. 3) be linked with this project;

(iii) that, similarly, the philosophical aspect of the problems involved be considered in connection with the work to be undertaken under paragraph 1, Section D, "Philosophy and Humanistic Studies".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed to take Nos. 3 and 4 (Year Book of activities in Social Sciences and Social Sciences abstracts) together; they were only starting points for the collection of information concerning the possibility of publishing a Year Book and establishing an abstract service in Social Science work. No. 4 would require the collaboration of members of the Social Sciences Section. The only established contact was with the Rockefeller Foundation.

Dr. WALKER regretted the absence of concrete details about these items, but proposed that they should be adopted. They would have to trust to the future expansion of those questions and not forget that this would involve much more expense.

M. SEYDOUX disagreed with the Director-General on the question of International Law and the danger of overlapping with the United Nations. The latter was concerned with the codification of International law, a very limited and technical objective, whereas the aim of the Unesco project was to set up a plan in 1947, with the aid of experts, of comparative studies on national juridical systems and of international law, with the aim of advancing international law and making known to the general public the studies on this subject.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL admitted that the United Nations Committee covered only one aspect of the question, but the Board would agree that this was not a priority matter and, if they wanted something practical done in this field in 1947, the provision of further funds would involve transfers in the budget. The main project of concern to Unesco was the study of tensions crucial to peace and they could include International Law under No. D of this item. In reply to an observation by Sir John MAUD, the Director-General asked him not to press for the re-drafting of the text of the resolution by the General Conference, which would involve complicated and costly procedure. He thought it would be enough to mention that this was a deferred project like the mission to India, to be carried out in 1948, and they should be satisfied for the moment with instituting research.

M. PARRA-FEREZ agreed with M. Soydoux that there was no duplication here. The two questions were complementary and inseparable. If Unesco postponed this investigation, the United Nations codification committee would be obliged to undertake it and the work of Unesco would become less necessary in the future.

Sir John MAUD proposed the following resolution.

"to initiate in 1947, in consultation with the United Nations, appropriate International organisations and experts, preliminary study in the field of comparative and international law, with a view to carrying out the Resolution of the General Conference on this subject in due course."

M. OPOCENSKY supported this resolution, which was adopted.

E. PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES.

M. SEYDOUX proposed that this chapter should be adopted without discussion but with a small amendment to paragraph 2, Rights of Man, so as to avoid any overlapping with the United Nations. (N.B. M. Seydoux's amendment affected only the French text.)

M. CARNEIRO pointed out that the Conference had proposed the term "talks" which was an approved procedure. This method involved no great expense and permitted exchanges of views which were the very purpose of Unesco; these talks would have the further advantage of creating around Unesco an intellectual atmosphere which was sometimes missing and which would happily correct its possibly too administrative aspect.

Replying to a question by Dr. SOMMERFELT, M. THOMAS said that the Economic and Social Council had asked Unesco to prepare a report on No. 3 (translation of the classics) by June 1948.

After observations by M. Carneiro the DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that any reduction in the proposed field of work was due to a present lack of qualified staff. He thought that the despatch of circulars and the establishment of contacts with some two hundred individuals on the subject of the Rights of Man would be work enough for 1947.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN said that among the essential aims of Unesco was the promotion of intellectual and moral solidarity in the world. The preamble definitely stated that political and economic

Cons. Exco. /20 Sess. /S.R.6 (rev.)
E.

arrangements were not enough by themselves. So far as this aspect was concerned, philosophy and humanistic studies were vitally important. It was necessary to prepare a sense of psychological oneness and spiritual unity; by getting together the greatest thinkers in different parts of the world, it would be possible to understand how the different aspirations converged, and how diversity of religious doctrines need not involve discord among their followers.

The General Conference decided that an investigation on a large scale should be undertaken, indicating the borrowings of civilisations from one another and also the place to be given to the teaching of history. A false view of history, which concentrated on certain parts of mankind and neglected others, was responsible for tensions which threatened peace. If attention was confined to the last 300 years and the last 3,000 were overlooked, historical perspective was lacking. It was customary to think that nothing moved on earth which was not Greek in origin. If a particular period was dark for Europe, it was assumed to be dark for the whole world. The period of the Dark Ages of Europe, which dated from the Fall of Rome to the rise of Modern Europe, was quite bright so far as certain non-European parts of the world were concerned. It represented the Golden Age of Islam, the Tang period of China and the cultural penetration of India in the Far East. Even in matters of science and politics, the non-European countries had made effective contributions. If one wished to promote respect for other civilisations, it must be known what those civilisations had contributed. It was unfortunate that this most essential aspect, which was underlined by the General Conference, was omitted by the programme now submitted by the Secretariat. Budgetary considerations

should not interfere with such vital concerns. Sir Sarvepalli pleaded for the restoration of these two aspects of contacts of civilisations, and study of universal history. The world to-day had found itself as one body; it was now in search of its soul, and it could find its soul only if the bearings of civilisations on one another were understood, as well as the basic aspirations which bound together the different currents of mind and spirit.

Subject to the amendments asked for by M. Seydoux and Sir S. Radhakrishnan, paragraph 1 "Survey", was adopted as follows:

"A survey will be made of the International aspects of philosophy and Humanistic Studies with special emphasis on their role in Unesco's programmes. Preliminary efforts will be made to lay the foundation of a large scale inquiry into the borrowings, actual or potential, from one civilisation to another, and into how its activity in the Humanistic Studies can contribute to the maintenance of peace and the place of historical study in teaching".

3. Translation of the Classics.

(adopted)

F. ARTS AND LETTERS.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, to his great regret, had had to put this part of the programme among the non-priority projects, owing to the absence of a qualified Director. Concerning No. 1 (survey of the condition of artists and the arts), they must be content to prepare a detailed plan with the possibilities of material accomplishment, starting in January 1948. Any more ambitious project would court failure.

Cons. Exoc. / 2e Sess. / B.R. 6 (rev.)

E.

Dr. OPOCENSKY proposed that the funds provided for this survey should be used in executing the proposal by M. Seydoux and Sir S. Radhakrishnan.

In regard to No. 2 (International Theatre Institute) the DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this also was only an inquiry into the possible creation of such an institute; its results would be submitted to the General Conference.

No. 2 was adopted.

International Pool of Literature.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that initial study had been made and had been well received in interested quarters. He thought that the project might be pursued and extended.

Adopted.

4. Anthology of Creative Writing under Axis Occupation.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that a new title had been substituted for the original title of "anthology of suffering and Resistance", which had encountered opposition. In agreement with Mr. Stephen Spender he had thought it better at first to concentrate on authors' reactions to axis occupation. It would not be difficult to collect material and find a publisher.

Dr. WALKER had never favoured this project which he thought lay outside Unesco's field, but, as his country had not been occupied, he might not be a good judge. Without formerly opposing the item, he asked for it to be dropped.

M. FALSKI wanted to know whether the works were works written "under" or "about" the occupation, since it had been difficult to write in Concentration camps and these books were only now appearing. Was it to be a bibliography or an anthology?

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the proposed writings were books about the occupation. A bibliography would be a natural initial step, but the Secretariat was waiting for a decision by the Executive Board before starting work.

Dr. SOMMERFELT, speaking for an ex-occupied country, was no more enthusiastic about this project than Dr. Walker. He did not see the use of it. He thought that countries would do this work themselves and that in any event it would be well to define more exactly the period under consideration. While some authors had not been able to write during the occupation, others had not wished to do so.

Shafik GHORBAL Bey believed that a bibliography of the war was not part of Unesco's work and would certainly not contribute to international understanding. He asked for this item to be struck out.

M. SEYDOUX cited the testimony of K. J. CAIN who, during several years, had always expressed strong opposition to the project.

Sir John HAUD thought that another aspect of the problem should be considered. This project had been discussed and accepted by the General Conference. That decision had since been re-examined by the Executive Board and criticised, mainly, he believed, because of its title. He thought that the project needed to be presented in a different

Cons.Exec./2e Sess./S.R.6 (rev.)

form but that a project transmitted by the General Conference could not very well be eliminated. The creative artist was one of the prophets of the modern world and Sir John Maud saw in this item a brave attempt to give him his place on the ground floor of Unesco. If this proposal proved successful, they might expect a whole number of anthologies, for instance one on the best poems about the discovery of the atomic bomb, telling how poets reacted thereto. The creative artist was possibly the most difficult material to attract towards Unesco and for that reason Sir John Maud thought that they should hesitate before eliminating a scheme which would cost very little and absorb only an infinitesimal part of the Secretariat's energy.

Dr. CPOCEMSKY agreed with Sir John Maud that they should not run counter to the decisions of the Conference.

M. CARNEIRO without entering into the merits of the project thought that technical difficulties fully justified its postponement. Every day saw the appearance of a new publication on this subject and, in its present form, the anthology seemed to him to be premature.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL proposed the addition of the words "with a view to submitting a report to the Mexico Conference", leaving it to the Conference to judge the expediency of this project.

Mr. MACLEISH thought, with Sir John Maud, that the Board was not bound to accept all the suggestions, numbering 150 and more, transmitted to it by the General Conference. The shortcomings of this Arts and Letters Section was disurbing. Unesco certainly needed the support of

Cons. Exec. / 2e Sess. / S.R. 6. (rev.)
E.

writers and artists, who in many countries were ignorant of its existence. This encouraged him to endorse Sir John Naud's suggestion for attracting creative artists. It was even more necessary to secure their collaboration than that of scientists, philosophers and other such specialists. As the direct interpreters of the human mind, they must be represented on Unesco, if this part of the programme was to be given its deserved and necessary emphasis.

Dr. SOMMERFELT also accepted the Director-General's proposal and mentioned that Norwegian artists and writers were considering the creation of an international professional association as testimony to their interest in Unesco.

The Director-General's proposal was accepted.

5. Translation

M. SEYDOUX asked why the proposal for a Unesco Translation Office, which figured in the report of the General Conference on the Programme had been dropped. The reasons no doubt were financial. He added that, although the National Commissions could usefully be consulted, they could not be asked to draw up a list of works to be translated. He knew that the French Commission would oppose this project and he proposed that the original text be restored.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, if the term "Translation Office" had been eliminated, it was in order not to prejudge a new establishment in the Secretariat. The original text would be restored so far as concerned the National Commissions.

No. 5 was adopted.

6. Promotion of artistic activities.

In reply to Mr. MacLEISH, who wanted an explanation of what he thought a very vague title, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was Unesco's intention to encourage these activities and not itself to undertake them. Within the limits of available funds, it was only intended this year to supply modest assistance to certain organisations.

No. 6 was adopted.

7. Special Studies.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that, if Unesco were to do good work, it was important not to go too quickly. Contact had been made with a number of experts and would enable a more detailed plan to be set on foot for 1948, and this plan would be submitted to the General Conference.

No. 7 was adopted.

G. MUSEUMS

Sir John MAUD, supported by Dr. Krzyt, proposed that this chapter should be adopted without discussion.

Shafik GHORMAL Bey and M. PHOTIADES asked for an addition to No.4 (a) (Freedom of access to sites) and that the agreement of Governments should be provided for. There was reason to examine the qualities both of experts and of visitors.

M. CARNEIRO observed that the Brazilian Delegation had frequently raised the question of the publication of "Museum" and had asked that it should make its appearance before too long. He asked for

the publication as speedily as possible, and in two languages, of a periodical which would preserve as many of the characteristics of "Museum" as possible, with the addition of new technical and scientific elements. They would have to decide who would be in charge of this publication for this year - the former International Museums Office, Unesco, or the new International Museums Council.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL was sorry to be unable to give this information in the absence of Miss Morley, who would be taking over this Section in the summer. It would rest with her to arrange for this publication. He could only say for certain that it would not be in the charge of the International Museums Office, which was in course of liquidation.

M. SEYDOUX wanted certain precisions on this question. He pointed out that the Members of the Board had had occasion to appreciate the quality of "Museum", a periodical with a high reputation in the museum world and very useful from an international point of view. He proposed to replace the words "will promote" by "will resume" and to add the word "bilingual", for in its present form paragraph G.1 gave little hope of the early resumption of this publication.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that this amendment would be disastrous for Unesco, whose whole publications policy was now in the melting pot and who would tend rather to encourage publications than to undertake them itself. He would not like his hands to be tied. There also remained the question of the form of the publication since, although "Museum" fully met the needs of art museums, scientific museums lay

outside its field.

M. OPOCENSKY agreed with M. Seydoux. It was the duty of Unesco, after taking over the work of the former Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, not to allow a periodical to lapse which had fulfilled its purposes so well.

M. CARNEIRO asked for mention of the two working languages of Unesco.

M. SEYDOUX proposed the following text "will as soon as possible facilitate the publication of a periodical in the two working languages of Unesco".

After Sir John MAUD had suggested the addition of "in 1947", the DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that he could not commit himself to this time limit.

Dr. OPOCENSKY pointed out that, if this time limit could not be respected, the Board would be absolved from responsibility towards the General Conference.

M. SEYDOUX proposed that the Minutes should contain the desire expressed by the Board to see this publication resumed in 1947 if possible, the new text merely saying "will as soon as possible facilitate".

Paragraph G.1 was adopted in that form, together with the whole of Chapter G.

Owing to the lateness of the hour and the lack of time to study a new proposal submitted for Chapter H (Mass Communication), the discussion of this item was deferred to the next meeting.

(The Meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the seventh meeting, held at Unesco House
19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e) on Sunday, April 13th, 1947,
at 9.45 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: H.E. M.V. DORE (CANADA)

Vice Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:
M.P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M.M. FALSKI (Poland)
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. R.N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M.A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvopalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M.L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M.R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M.P. AUGER)

Representative of United Nations and Specialised Agencies:

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Human
Rights Division.

International Labour Office: Mme. MOREL, I.L.O. Correspondent
in Paris.

Item 8 of the Agenda: PROGRAMME Part II, G. (Museums) (continuation)

M. SEYDOUX said that the French National Commission had drawn his attention to difficulties in exchanges between museums resulting from the irregularity and slowness of communications. He had no desire to go back upon the vote that had been taken the day before, but he wished this point to be inserted in the minutes.

Item 8 of the Agenda: PROGRAMME: New text for Part II, Section H (Mass Communications)

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that this new document was intended to replace Section H of the original programme, which had been extremely meagre. This had been due to the fact that the Head of the Section had only lately arrived and had then had to attend the Philadelphia Conference.

Mr. MacLEISH welcomed the new document. He had two points to make. In respect of the field inquiries mentioned in paragraph I, he presumed that Byelorussia and the Ukraine had been included in the list of countries before the Executive Board had decided not to spend money in non-Member States. As regards Mass Communications, there were two aspects of this question, one positive, the other negative. The positive aspect concerned Unesco's use of new means to further its aims which was covered in this document. The negative aspect was not so well covered, however. It concerned the removal of barriers to the free flow of communications and raised certain political questions. He had always hoped that Unesco would take an active part in this matter. The question was whether in the present circumstances - the existence of the so-called iron curtain and the fact that all countries were not members of Unesco - Unesco should take the initiative or not.

Possibly the United Nations might do so, but even they might find difficulties. This was a vital and fundamental question.

Sir John MAUD said that many points which he had wanted to raise had been met in the new document. As regards the question of intercommunication he would like to remind the Executive Board of the old story of Pyramus and Thisbe, who found means of talking to one another through chinks in a wall. Unesco had to find chinks through which mind could speak to mind notwithstanding political barriers. For instance, teachers and those concerned with art and museums in the different countries should be enabled to speak to each other. He hoped that certain ideas worked out at the General Conference would be put into practice - the International Ideas Bureau, the World Feature Story project, the World University of the Air, and the International Forum as a part of education for international understanding.

He would like to move the approval of Section H, subject to the points made by Mr. MacLeish and those which might be made by other delegates.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, replying to Mr. MacLeish, said that the inclusion of certain countries in the list was in fact an oversight. He pointed out, however, that surveys did not imply financial aid.

Mr. MARTINEZ BAEZ agreed with Sir John Maud, but thought that the press was too seldom mentioned in the programme. He emphasised the necessity of an inquiry into the technical needs of the press in all countries.

M. SEYDOUX was doubtful as to possibilities of action. The position was somewhat contradictory. It had been stated that no money was to be spent in non-Member States. Did this preclude any kind of action in those countries? It would be difficult to make Unesco known unless it were possible to spread knowledge of its aims behind the iron curtain. He thought that the technical needs surveys might prove to be one of the chinks mentioned by Sir John Maud. He asked Mr. MacLeish if he would object to keeping the list of countries as it stood.

Mr. MacLEISH agreed, subject to the explanation furnished by the Director-General. Unesco, he said, must operate through these chinks; the problem was to find them. The Executive Board must make it quite clear whether it regarded Unesco as primarily responsible for the removal of barriers or whether the United Nations should attempt to do this.

Dr. OPOCENSKY agreed with Sir John Maud. He was a citizen of a country which was supposed to be behind the iron curtain. He thought it might interest members to know what was happening behind that barrier. As a matter of fact all foreign newspapers and weeklies were on sale in Prague. American, French and English books were to be found at the booksellers, and he had just seen an American film. The Czechs themselves often spoke to the world, but the Western countries did not listen. There was very little news of Czechoslovakia in Western papers. Unesco might do much to spread knowledge of the countries behind the curtain.

M. PHOTIADES thought that M. Opocensky had laid his hand on one of the chinks in the wall. Czechoslovakia was a bridge between East and West.

M. Opocensky might be asked whether a Unesco centre should not be established in Prague.

M. ZANIEWICKI, speaking for M. FALSKI, did not believe that a veritable iron curtain existed against such information. Owing to an extraordinary technical development, "Mass Media", at the present day, was of capital importance in social life; it was obvious that films, the wireless and the press could render great services, but they could also do much harm, if directed along the wrong channels. They possessed destructive as well as creative powers.

If an idea was to be spread across frontiers, it must first be thoroughly grasped. The idea of Unesco was crystallising, in the first period of its existence, and Unesco should therefore confine itself to the diffusion of information on education, science and culture, and in this manner, it would not meet with any obstacles.

Dr. WALKER said that it was impossible to avoid a problem set by the Constitution itself. One of the purposes of Unesco was to promote an international agreement to stimulate the free flow of communications. This had been recommended by the General Conference and the document before the meeting mentioned a convention for this purpose. It was an essential problem, but fraught with political implications. Mass Media had a dual aspect; and untold possibilities for good and evil. This accounted for the feeling mentioned by his Polish colleague. There was also the commercial aspect of the problem. He drew the Secretariat's attention to the necessity of continuing the study of the essential points of a problem which was extremely delicate, affecting, as it did, Unesco's relations with

Cons. Exec. / 2e Sess / S.R. 7 (rev.)

States and with the United Nations.

He proposed the inclusion in the report of a concise text in the following terms:

Proposed
Resolution

"IT WAS RESOLVED

to approve the proposals contained in the new text of H. Mass Communications, as amended in the light of the discussion at the Second Session of the Board, namely:

- 1) I.1. COMMISSION ON TECHNICAL NEEDS:
by the addition of the words "by field enquiries" after the words: "The following areas will be covered in"
- 2) I.2. FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION AND REMOVAL OF BARRIERS -
before A: insert: (moved by Dr. Walker)

"In collaboration with Member Governments and other interested organisations, Unesco will continue to study the problems involved in arriving at such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image, having regard on the one hand to the purposes of the organisation, and on the other hand to the need to preserve the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the culture and education systems of Member States".
- 3) Add after - I.2.C. a second paragraph:

"In cooperation with the United Nations, take positive steps towards the removal of barriers which appear desirable in the light of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information and the Press".
- 4) by emphasising the importance of encouraging the free flow of ideas between all parts of the world;
- 5) by emphasising the importance of the Press, not only in war-devastated countries."

Mr. MacLEISH said that he would agree to the resolution if Sir

John Maud, as mover, would accept.

Cons.Exec./2e Sess/S.R.7 (rev.)

E

Dr. WALKER added that his addition to the motion was not a mere formality but a definite request to the Secretariat.

Sir John MAUD moved that the Executive Board approve the proposals contained in Section H as amended in the light of the discussion.

M. SEYDOUX said that he would vote for the resolution on the understanding that the list of countries given in Part I, paragraph I, remained unchanged.

Dr. OPOCENSKY thought that a further condition was that Unesco should inform the West about the East.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ expressed the wish that more emphasis should be laid upon the needs of the press in the different countries.

M. VERNIERS remarked that the spoken word was an instrument for good and evil. This was also true of Mass Media, Mass Communication was naturally of the greatest interest to educational circles. Unesco's essential role was to teach the public to discriminate.

Dr. KRUYT asked whether the inquiries mentioned in paragraph 1 would be only field inquiries.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL clarified this point.

Sir John MAUD said that three points had been mentioned and two would be added. Emphasis should be laid on the importance of stimulating the free flow of communications throughout the world and the importance of the press should be stressed.

Mr. MacLEISH, speaking as a member of the Executive Board, said that he found it unnecessary to emphasise the fact that Unesco should work in both directions. Such work was the very heart of Unesco and he thought it useless to formulate it in a resolution.

Subject to the points raised during the discussion, Part II, Section H, was adopted.

Item 8 of the Agenda: (b) (i) General Policy to be followed concerning the distribution of relief

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to sub-para. (4) on page 2 of the document UNESCO/Cons.Exec/2e Sess/6/1947, concerning the priority claim of Greece, Yugoslavia and Poland, in Europe. He remarked that it would be impossible to satisfy the needs of Yugoslavia, until that country had become a Member of Unesco.

M. SEYDOUX, referring to Part II of the document wished to ask a question concerning methods of distribution. Who would decide on the destination of the materials and funds to be distributed. Would it be the donor country or the Rehabilitation Section of the Secretariat, for whom this would be a grave responsibility? Or would it be the Executive Board, or a Sub-Committee appointed on their behalf? He suggested a Joint Committee of donor and recipient countries, presided over by a neutral representative.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL considered that the matter could not be decided by the Executive Board, but that they should delegate powers to a Technical Commission who would deal with the question.

M. SEYDOUX agreed that it was impossible to enter into details at present, but thought that the Board should suggest directives.

M. PHOTIADES thought that experience should be taken into consideration in dealing with this problem. He entirely agreed with M. Seydoux's proposal, and added that he himself had not been satisfied with the distribution of certain gifts from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that point (c) of item 8 of the Agenda referred to this question and corresponded with the decisions of the General Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL read a resolution of the General Conference, in accordance with which the first meeting of the Standing Committee suggested the setting up of an Interim Technical Committee of three persons, two representatives of donor countries and one of a recipient country, which should advise and check the Rehabilitation Section of the Secretariat. This Interim Committee had not yet been set up and he therefore suggested that the Board should proceed to its election.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that part (c) of the Item should be connected up with (b) (i).

Dr. OPOCENSKY agreed with M. Photiades regarding the priorities mentioned in sub-para (4) of Part II. He noted that Czechoslovakia had been excluded and, although recognising the greater need of Poland, Greece, and Yugoslavia, he hoped this omission would be rectified.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew Dr. Opocensky's attention to the last

sentence of the paragraph which stated that the needs of other countries would, of course, be given proportionate consideration.

On behalf of M. FALSKI, his adviser said that it was not the extent of countries' "needs" which should be considered, so much as their war losses. It was difficult to establish needs, but easy to estimate losses.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL remarked that it was only a question of words as the estimation of needs had been based on war losses.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Seydoux whether he wished to mention the formation of a Joint Committee.

M. SEYDOUX wished to be informed whether the setting up of an Interim Committee had been adopted by the General Conference or by the Executive Board, and if it was by the General Conference, whether it was possible to go back on their decision.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the General Conference had only decided on its being set up and not on the actual form that it should take.

M. SEYDOUX wished to know whether the form of the Committee was to be decided at once and if so whether his former suggestion of a Joint Committee of donor and recipient countries presided over by a neutral representative, was approved.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought this a good suggestion.

M. SEYDOUX proposed that a Section III be added in the following terms:

Cons. Exec./2e Sess/S.R. 7 (rev.)

E

"A special committee composed of five persons chosen from members of the Executive Board, comprising two representatives from donor countries, two representatives from recipient countries and presided over by a fifth member, should be set up, which would be responsible for advising and checking the work of the Reconstruction Section. It was essential that members of the committee live in or near Paris."

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL wished to emphasise that members of the committee must live in or near Paris.

Dr. WALKER thought this a good suggestion, but assumed that the Committee would be responsible to the Executive Board, as the latter was trustee of the materials to be distributed. He also thought that the competence of the Committee should be limited to the distribution of relief, and that it should not be charged with the equalisation of educational, scientific and cultural resources on a world scale, as proposed in Paragraph 1 (Policy) of the report of the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Commission as accepted by the General Conference.

The Chairman proposed the adoption of the document under discussion, as amended by M. Seydoux, having regard to the comments which had been made.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that before proceeding to the nomination of the Committee he wished to refer to the special fund mentioned in paragraph 4 (Policy) of the report of the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Commission as accepted by the General Conference, and to the receiving of gifts, etc. by the Director-General referred to in Article IX, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations, 1945, Annex, Part I, Chapter I, Article 109, paragraph 3.

Ann. Exec./2e Sess/S.R.7 (rev.)

of the Constitution. He hoped that the Executive Board would allow him to open an account for the special fund and to authorise the Committee to administer it.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the resolution was adopted.

Adopted.

The Board proceeded to the formation of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the election of members was a complicated question as the latter must live in the vicinity of Paris. He proposed Dr. Walker and M.P. Carneiro as representatives of the donor countries, and asked for Mr. MacLeish's opinion,

Mr. MacLEISH agreed to their nomination.

M. SEYDOUX considered it indispensable that the United States should be represented as a donor-country.

Mr. MacLEISH said that he had no intention of insisting on this but, if necessary, his Technical Adviser, Mr. Compton, would be willing to be a member of the Committee.

Adopted.

M. Photiades and M. Auger were proposed as representatives for recipient countries.

M. PHOTIADES suggested M. Parra-Perez as neutral chairman, especially as he was often in Paris.

M. SEYDOUX considered that other countries had suffered greater

losses than France, for example Poland, Greece, China or Norway.

Dr. SOMMERFELT said that Norway had not suffered a great deal and should not therefore be a member of the Committee.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that as M. Drzewieski was Head of the Reconstruction Commission it was unsuitable to nominate another Pole as a member of the Committee.

M. VERNIERS drew the attention of the Board to the war losses of the Netherlands.

Dr. KRUYT thought that a representative should be chosen from Eastern Europe.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL feared that this was impossible as no representative from Eastern Europe lived near Paris.

M. CARNEIRO proposed M. Chen Yuan.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN seconded this proposal.

M. PARRA-PEREZ thanked M. PHOTLDES for proposing him as chairman, but said that his affairs kept him very occupied in Paris and he was afraid he might not find time to participate in the work of the Committee. He asked for more details as to the frequency of Committee meetings.

Dr. OPOCENSKY felt that the Board was losing valuable time and proposed that a Committee of three should be appointed to decide the matter.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that M. CARNEIRO should be chairman, with

Dr. Walker and Mr. Compton as representatives of donor-countries and M. Chen Yuan and M. Photiades as representatives of recipient countries.

Adopted.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that (ii) and (iii) of Item 8 (b) should be referred to the Budget Section.

Item 11 of the Agenda - External Relations.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL called the Board's attention to Unesco document Cons.Exec./2e Sess/18/1947. Referring to Unesco's relations with the International Bureau of Education, he recalled that he had sent a letter on the 6th March to the Executive Board, concerning the invitation of Switzerland, Finland, Austria, Portugal, Italy, Hungary and Roumania to the joint Conference of Unesco and the I.B.E. to meet in Geneva in July. He had so far received 11 affirmative replies. He understood that Dr. Walker and Dr. Sommerfelt took exception to the inclusion of Austria in the invitation, while Sir John Maud was in favour of the inclusion of neutral and enemy countries, on condition that they were invited by the I.B.E.

M. PARRA-PEREZ stressed that his reply was affirmative, but without prejudice to principles involved.

M. CARNEIRO, referring to relations between Unesco and I.B.E. said that there had been many meetings between the two Organisations and that at the last meeting of the Joint Committee, an agreement had been signed and a resolution taken that a Conference on Public Education should be called in July in Geneva. He recalled that unanimity had not been reached by the Board in reply to the Director-General's letter. He wished to plead for the Board's approval of the formation of a Joint Committee and of the calling of

Cons.Exec./2e Sess/S.R.7 (rev.)

such a Conference, at which Member States could submit a report on Education in their respective countries. As the issues raised would be technical and not political, he suggested the inclusion of Austria.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ pointed out that the question was not whether a Conference should be called in July but whether Unesco was to sign the invitations conjointly with the I.B.E. If it did so, this would be a great advantage as, in this manner, the largest participation possible would be achieved. He said that a serious question of principle was involved, and read the following letter:-

"You ask for my opinion on the joint invitation to be issued by Unesco and the I.B.E. to certain ex-enemy countries, some of whom have applied to join Unesco. I venture to point out that, although there are obviously substantial advantages in securing the largest possible membership for Unesco, so that, from this point of view, there would be no objection to Unesco inviting the countries in question, nevertheless the relationship of the Organisation with countries which do not yet belong to the United Nations raises a very delicate problem of external relations. For this reason our Constitution lays down a procedure which is to be found detailed in Article II of the Agreement with the United Nations. All that the Executive Board can propose to the General Conference is the admission of new members and, according to the said Agreement, the Executive Board can only act if the Economic and Social Council has raised no objection to the request of a country to join Unesco or if the Council allows more than six weeks to pass without taking a decision on this request. Accordingly I think that, having due regard to the principles which inspired these arguments, it is my duty as a member of the Executive Board not to support the adoption by Unesco of a step which might later be regarded as an important precedent, and this quite apart from my view on the question of substance involved in the invitation by Unesco."

M. VERNIERS pressed for the adoption of M. Carneiro's suggestions.

He considered it a great opportunity for Unesco to cooperate with outside organisations, and observed that this would be of great benefit to the Education Section.

Cons. Exec./2e Sess/S.R. 7 (rev.)

E

Dr. OPOGENSKY supported M. Carneiro's proposals, and said that it was a grave matter to exclude countries from cultural collaboration, and that such an inimical attitude would be unwise for a young organisation like Unesco. He made, however, one exception: the country excluded by the Joint Committee.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to his reply to the Director-General's letter, said that he had been of the opinion that Unesco could not join with the I.B.E. in sending out invitations, but that he now left it to the Executive Board to decide.

M. PARRA-PEREZ repeated his support of M. Carneiro, and affirmed that he did not disagree in principle, although he did not wish this decision to be one of long-term policy.

Mr. MacLEISH asked for a repetition of M. Carneiro's proposal.

M. CARNEIRO proceeded to read the resolution of the Joint Unesco-I.B.E. Committee of the 28th February, 1947:

"The Joint Committee decides unanimously that the Tenth International Education Conference shall be convened jointly by Unesco and the I.B.E.

Invitations to the Conference, issued in the name of both Organisations, shall be sent direct to the States Members of the United Nations and to such non-Member States as the I.B.E. and Unesco may decide to invite.

With regard to the latter category, the Joint Committee is of the opinion that, besides Switzerland, which is the host country of the Conference, invitations should be confined to Portugal, Finland, Austria, Hungary, Italy and Roumania.

With a view to the timely despatch of the invitations, the Joint Committee considers that the parties should agree before 20th March 1947 on the final list of countries to be invited."

Cons.Exec./2e Sess/S.R.7 (rev.)

E

M. CARNEIRO pointed out another aspect of the question. If Unesco did not participate in the invitations, the I.B.E. would have to propose the Conference alone, which would give a strange impression. He stressed the difficulty in respect of Switzerland, which was the host country, and was also on the point of joining Unesco. She would therefore be in a delicate position vis-à-vis the Conference, if she were not invited by Unesco.

M. SEYDOUX said that the question of sending invitations to the non-Member States was a delicate one. He suggested that if the Executive Board could reach unanimity, it would be advisable to accept the resolution of the Joint Committee that Unesco should send out invitations. If there was no unanimity, he thought it preferable to accept Sir John Maud's proposal, (contained in his telegram to the Director-General).

The CHAIRMAN asked if there were unanimity on M. Carneiro's proposal.

M. CARNEIRO proposed that a vote should be taken on a concrete point, i. e. - whether Unesco should send out invitations, and that this would have no general application to Unesco's relationship with non-member States.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ said that, supposing the vote was favourable, and an invitation was sent to Spain, would the invitation be addressed to Franco?

M. CARNEIRO said that it was understood that Spain was excluded.

Sir John MAUD expressed his desire to vote for M. Carneiro's motion.

Dr. WALKER asked that the motion should be divided, treating Austria as a separate subject. He added that, as the Executive Board was acting on the behalf of the General Conference, at which Governments were represented, the Executive Board should have been acquainted with the views of the Governments before deciding to invite Austria.

Dr. SOMMERFELT seconded Dr. Walker's proposal.

M. CARNEIRO said that France, Belgium and Brazil were represented at the Mixed Commission and had already sent letters to the Director-General in the spirit of Dr. Walker's suggestion. He would like to tell the Board informally that he was acquainted with the views of a few Governments.

M. SEYDOUX thought that unanimity was now possible on the basis of M. Carneiro's suggestion.

Dr. WALKER recalled that it was a matter of order that members of the Board should be asked whether they considered the division of motions desirable. Peace was not yet signed with Austria by several Member States.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a vote should be taken to invite all the States mentioned by M. Carneiro with the exception of Austria.

Adopted unanimously.

The Chairman proposed another vote on the invitation to Austria.

Adopted by 15 votes to 3.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to the draft agreement with the International Studies Conference and requested the Board's authorisation to make certain minor changes, as requested by that Organisation.

Approved

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL drew the Board's attention to Unesco document Cons.Exec./2nd Sess/2/1947.

Mr. MacLEISH asked whether Item 8 (b) (iii) could now be barred.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the question of policy had been covered, but that budgetary questions had still to be discussed. Returning to Item 11 (a) (i), he hoped that it would be followed as a guide for future action.

M. SEYDOUX proposed that it should be approved.

Adopted.

Mr. MacLEISH said that documentation should not be discussed here, but that Member Governments might express their difficulties concerning the obtaining of documents.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed to speak to M. de Blonay on the subject.

Unesco document Cons.Exec./2e Sess/7/1947 was then studied.

Sir John MAUD proposed that it should be approved.

Mr. MacLEISH seconded him.

Adopted.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to Item 11 (a) (iii) of the agenda,

and read the following resolution:

"IT WAS RESOLVED:

That, in implementation of Article VIII of the Constitution Member States should, for the year 1947, be invited to submit a report on:

1. Participation of the State concerned in enquiries and other projects coming within the 1947 programme of the Organisation;
2. Initiative taken by the State concerned to implement at the national level, the provisions of the Constitution, in particular as concerns the setting up of a National Commission or Cooperating Body;
3. Additional initiative taken by the States concerned in accordance with the general aims and purposes of the Organisation."

Dr. OPOCENSKY requested that on future occasions resolutions should be presented in advance to members of the Board in writing.

Sir John MAUD agreed with Dr. Opcensky, but moved the passing of the resolution.

Dr. OPOCENSKY hoped that this was the last time they would be called to approve a resolution without having had time to study it beforehand; otherwise he agreed with Sir John MAUD.

Approved.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Board to decide whether there would be an evening meeting.

It was decided that there would be a meeting.

(The meeting rose at 1 p.m.)

UNESCO/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./S.R. 8/1947
(rev.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the eighth meeting, held at Unesco House,
19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e), on Sunday, April 13th, 1947 at 2.45 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:

H. E. K. V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman:

Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)

M. CHEN YUAN (China)

M. M. FALSKI (Poland)

H. E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)

M. R. E. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)

Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)

The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U. S. A.)

Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)

H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)

H. E. M. C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)

M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)

Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy:

M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. P. AUGER)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies:

United Nations:

Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Human Rights
Division.

International Labour Office:

Mme. MOREL, I. L. O., Correspondent in Paris.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in order to conform to the decision taken in the morning and to secure a better disposal of the Agenda, the first part of the meeting would be devoted to completing the examination of Item 11 (External Relations) and the second part to the consideration of Item 7 (Finance). The evening meeting would deal with Item 5 (Questions concerning the Executive Board).

Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the United Nations Rights of Man Division, promised to be brief, as they had a very full Agenda and limited time. He wished to convey the best wishes of his colleagues at Lake Success, especially M. Laugier's. Everyone at the United Nations realised the need for the closest cooperation with the Specialised Agencies and Lake Success was prepared to pursue it to the utmost. Prof. Humphrey himself, during his stay in Paris, had so far played a passive part, but hoped to profit by his visit to establish personal contacts with members of the Secretariat when the session was over. He felt it a privilege to follow the discussions and he would carry back with him to Lake Success a keen appreciation of the work done by Unesco.

11 (b) - Relations with the United Nations (1) General Directives.

M. THOMAS, who had recently attended the session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, said that he had been warmly welcomed there. The Council had on the whole been favourable to the establishment of continuing relations with Unesco and some of the delegations had supported the Organisation very actively. The document drafted by the Secretariat on

forms of these relations had not been discussed in detail but the Council had accepted its principles. Whenever a project on the Agenda of the Economic and Social Council fell within the province of a Specialised Agency, the Council referred it to the latter; if several Specialised Agencies were concerned, the Council would coordinate their work; where no Specialised Agency is concerned, the Council takes action itself. This plan he thought satisfactory and logical. Besides the official relations with the Economic Council, the Trusteeship Council and the Secretariat, relations with the United Nations could be still further improved by personal contacts between members of Unesco and the United Nations who dealt with the same questions; this procedure would avoid misunderstandings due to distance. The Trusteeship Council was now in full operation and there too was a problem of coordination of work which could be easily solved.

Item 11 (b) (i) was adopted.

11 (b) (ii) Representation of Unesco at Meetings of the Economic and Social Council and of other United Nations Organs.

Mr. MacLEISH proposed the adoption of the resolution passed by the Standing Committee, which had decided to submit it to the Board in the following terms:

"It was decided

That in matters of joint interest to the United Nations and to other United Nations organisations or agencies, joint study and action should be undertaken whenever possible. Further, that in no case should action be undertaken in such fields of common interest without previously informing the other Agencies which may be concerned."

Adopted.

Dr. WALKER thought that it would be a good thing if the Executive Board could be represented at these meetings by one of its members when questions within its field came up for treatment, Unesco Secretariat being also represented.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL mentioned that he had asked M. Auger, at present in the United States, to represent the Executive Board at the meetings of the Atomic Commission. M. Auger had not yet been able to send an account of this mission.

Dr. WALKER had not known that M. Auger represented the Board. He did not think it necessary to take an immediate decision on this point; it was enough to frame a general rule and a more systematic arrangement could be made later.

M. PHOTIADIS asked Mr. MacLEISH if he could help the Board in the matter of its representation in the United States, not only on United Nations Commissions, but also on other Organisations. Mr. MacLeish said that this point could be considered when they dealt with the functions of the Executive Board.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that Mr. MacLeish had represented the Board on the Rights of Man Commission.

11 (b) (iii) - Subsidiary Agreement on Information

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that an agreement had been concluded with the United Nations Department of Public Information, which had raised a few formal objections. Unesco had also desired to amend this document. The Director-General asked for the Board's opinion as to the desirability of circulating the new text to member Governments before it was submitted to the Executive Board.

Mr. MacLEISH proposed the following resolution:-

It was resolved

"That the draft subsidiary agreement on information, as amended following the later negotiations with the United Nations, should be circulated to Member Governments for comments prior to submission to the Executive Board, by correspondence, in its final form."

M. SEYDOUX supported this proposal, which was adopted.

11 (b) (iv) Support of Unesco by delegations of States Members attending Sessions of the United Nations organs and agencies.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, on the strength of a report from M. Thomas said that these delegations were prepared to support Unesco's views.

It was necessary to establish a better method of coordinating Unesco's work with the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies. The delegations of States Members of Unesco, being familiar with its programme, could in any case support it in discussions with the United Nations.

The Board adopted the following resolution:

"The Executive Board expresses its appreciation of the attitude displayed by certain delegations of Member States at the last Session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The Executive Board also expresses the wish that representatives of Unesco States Members at the United Nations, being fully aware of the programme of Unesco, should accord their support in any discussions held, or decisions taken, at the United Nations on matters falling within the competence of Unesco."

11 (c) - Relations with the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that the Board had already decided to appoint some of its members to sit on a joint Committee with the World Health Organisation. The same procedure could be adopted

Cons. Exec./23 Sess./S. R. 8 (rev.)

E.

whenever similar joint Committees were established.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ, who had been nominated to sit on this Joint Committee, asked to be given very exact instructions, in view of the divergency of views between the Unesco Secretariat and the Interim Commission of the World Health Organisation.

It was decided that a text should be prepared that evening by agreement between the members of the Board appointed to take part in the meeting and the Secretariat. This draft would be submitted to the approval of the Executive Board.

11 (d) National Commissions and National Co-operation Organisations

The CHAIRMAN said that this Item required an examination of document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./12/1947.

Mr. MacLEISH thought that this was an excellent and very well drafted document. Nevertheless it should be added that the National Commissions needed to be developed as quickly as possible and drawn into Unesco's orbit. But that went almost without saying.

Dr. SOMMERHOLT supported Mr. MacLEISH. He pointed out a small mistake on page 7 of the French text. M. Olaf Devik was not a Minister but an under-Secretary of State.

It was resolved

- "1. That the document (Cons.Exec/12) be transmitted to Member States after amendment by the Executive Board and that Member States be recommended to create the National Commissions and co-operating bodies as speedily as possible, in conformity with the resolution of the General Conference;
- "2. That the Secretariat, if requested, should give States Members all the necessary help - excluding financial help - in establishing a National Commission or cooperating body. This help may include the temporary loan of a member of the Secretariat;

- "3. That, as had already been done by the National Commission of the United States, a document should be circulated to the Governments of States Members indicating the matters in which the National Commissions can actively co-operate in the execution of the programme."

Messrs. MacLEISH and OPOCENSKY supported this proposal, which was adopted.

Sir John MAUD said that, since the drafting of the details in regard to the United Kingdom, great progress had been made in the matter in his country. The Minister of Education had announced the setting up of a permanent advisory council under his own presidency, on which would sit the delegates who had taken part in the General Conference in Paris. This council had secured the services of Mr. R. A. Butler as Secretary who, during and since the war, had contributed more than anybody else in the United Kingdom to the creation of Unesco. Seeing that he was a member of the Opposition in Great Britain, they could reckon upon continuity in British policy towards Unesco, even if there were a change of Government.

The document thus amended was adopted.

11 (e) - Relations with other Organisations (Document Unesco/Cons. Exec./2e Sess/16/1947.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the complexity of this question demanded a particularly flexible procedure. The first thing was to establish principles for entering into relations with non-governmental organisations.

Dr. WALKER remarked that this activity marked an important stage in Unesco's work and one which justified the highest hopes.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL added that Document 16 contained a list of organisations with which they hoped to enter into immediate relations.

Dr. WALKER pointed out that for the present action must be confined to cooperation which called for no financial assistance nor any formal agreement. In the latter case the Executive Board would have to be consulted and the list subjected to much closer study. More information would be required in order that opinion might be based upon more exact data and he thought it better that agreements should be concluded one by one on their merits.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that he was not asking the Board to approve agreements with all the organisations on the list, still less to furnish them with immediate financial aid. All that was asked for was authority to negotiate for supplying help to certain organisations. This aid could take different forms, e.g. an office attached to Unesco, financial assistance or representation at conferences. Document 16 consisted of three different parts: first General Principles, then the Organisations themselves, some of them those with which immediate agreements might be concluded, and others with which it would be necessary to enter into conversations with a view to cooperation in the future. He added that the list submitted to the Board was much too long because there had not been time to make even an initial selection.

Mr. MacLEISH said that the general policy raised the whole question of the Executive Board's function, for its members sat on it as individuals. It was necessary therefore to provide for consultation with Governments and no agreement could be approved until the latter were in possession of more detailed information about these organisations, some of which were recent creations. The United States Government did not know enough about

Cons. Exec/2e Sess/S.R. 8 (rev.)
E.

them to form an opinion and he thought it better to defer all action until governments were more fully informed.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, while agreeing that this seemed a just procedure, was afraid that it would prevent any financial aid being given to organisations during the current year.

Dr. SOMMERFELT had asked for the opinion of his Government which, while leaving him free, had approved the proposal of the United States. This, in his opinion, would not involve more than a month's delay.

M. SEYDOUX observed that this was a very short time for distant countries. How, moreover, would the Board's decision be taken? By a majority of the Government opinions expressed? Article XI of Unesco's Constitution gave the Secretariat wide powers to collaborate with non-governmental international organisations. Further, Article V, para 10 fixed the powers of the Executive Board in this matter. The legal aspect of the question was not clear.

M. VERNIERS pointed out that, although a month was not long, it was enough for communication by telegram. He thought it was important to make at once a first selection from the organisations on the list, having regard perhaps to the date of their seniority. Thus pre-war associations which had given proof of their value might be primarily fixed upon.

M. PHOTIADES said that the question was a very delicate one. Anyone could set up a non-governmental international organisation and ask for Unesco's help. Unesco should not allow them to diffuse propaganda based upon its recognition or assistance.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL recalled that one of Unesco's aims was precisely to create new organisations and support those which it thought useful.

Sir John MAUD thought that they could not reach a final solution at the meeting but that the Board could, none the less, advance the question. The Board consisted of 18 members so that the majority of Member Governments of Unesco was not represented at its discussions. The General Conference had held that the Board could assume certain responsibilities; it could therefore take decisions, but must be able to inform the Governments before these decisions became final. For this reason he agreed with Mr. MacLeish that they should try to reduce the time limits for transmission as far as possible. He thought it wise to apply the procedure, used that morning in connection with another question, of forwarding the comments of Governments to members of the Board through the post. He therefore suggested that they should approve document 16 with the following amendment; (Paragraph 6) to ask the Secretariat to use discretion in opening negotiations and to be content for the moment with semi-official contacts; to distribute the information obtained from Governments together with any draft agreements with organisations that seemed qualified; and then to transmit to the Executive Board the comments presented by Governments, the final decision being taken by correspondence within a maximum period of two months.

Mr. MacLEISH withdrew his proposal in favour of Sir John Maud's.

Mr. PARRA-LEREZ also supported Sir John Maud's proposal. If the Board had certain powers, this was only with the consent of the Member Governments, an elementary truth that should be kept in mind. He also agreed with Mr. MacLEISH concerning the reservations of his

Government. Although members of the Board did not represent the Governments, they were citizens of their country and it was their duty to inform the Board of what those countries thought.

Dr. WALKER agreed, but asked for explanations concerning financial aid. The resolution in the footnote on page 3 of the document made mention of this aid, which, if the document were adopted, would thus be approved.

Dr. KRUYT supported the Director-General's view. The resolution clearly stated that this financial aid could only be given if immediate action seemed to Unesco to be essential. This procedure would, therefore, only be employed in exceptional cases. They must trust the Director-General and give him some latitude.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL quoted the case of the International Committee of Historical Sciences and the International Museums Council, which justified this attitude.

Sir John MAUD observed that he was in a rather awkward situation, since his proposal suppressed this resolution and recommended a speedy procedure of consultation with member governments, the decision resting with the Executive Board. He re-read his proposal in the following terms:

"IT IS RESOLVED to

"approve the document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e.Sess./16/1947 dated 8th April, 1947, replacing 6. (Organisations with which Unesco proposes to enter into active cooperation), page 3, with the following:

1. 'Before the making of any formal agreement is considered by the Board, the draft agreement, together with necessary information as to the organisation, its aims, character, officers, etc., shall be circulated to the Governments of Member States of Unesco for their comments;
2. At a date not earlier than one month after the circulation of any such draft agreement to Governments, the opinion of members may be obtained by correspondence, members

being supplied with any comments that Member States may have made;

3. If this procedure is followed, the agreement shall not be made unless at least twelve members of the Board signify their approval."

Further, Sir John Maud saw no reason why the Director-General should not be authorised to grant specific financial aid for 1947, provided this did not involve a permanent agreement about which governments had not been consulted.

Mr. MacLEISH accepted this procedure on condition that the granting of financial assistance did not prejudice a future agreement.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that M. de Blonay had just drawn his attention to a resolution by the General Conference requiring a formal agreement for any financial assistance.

Sir John Maud's resolution was put to the vote.

M. SEYDOUX asked whether the majority could be thus amended to twelve members, when the normal rule for the Board was a simple majority.

M. PHOTIADES thought that this observation should be kept in mind when they came to the functions of the Executive Board.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that they could take an immediate decision on this matter. It was an important question and he preferred the two-thirds majority.

The Board agreed, and Sir John Maud's proposal was approved.

The examination of document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e.Sess./16/1947 being concluded, M. PARRA-PEREZ asked leave to refer briefly to the Pan-American Union. Twenty-one countries belonged to this union, which came into being as the result of agreements concluded during the past fifty years between various American countries and of a regional agreement

Cons.Exec./2e.Sess./S.R.8 (rev.)

envisaged by the United Nations Charter following the San Francisco Conference. It was essentially non-political and even included an intellectual co-operation section. It was important that Unesco should act in coordination with this Pan-American Union and M. Parra-Perez asked the Director-General what negotiations had so far passed between Unesco and the Union.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that, if the Pan-American Union was not mentioned in Document 16, this was only because it was an inter-governmental organisation and not a non-governmental body. Unesco was in permanent relations with it, and the Union had sent an observer to the Unesco General Conference.

The Board next passed to the examination of document Unesco/Cons. Exec./2e.Sess./18/1947 - Relations with non-member states.

Mr. MacLEISH asked whether the Executive Board could not submit to the General Conference a recommendation concerning the admission of Italy, Switzerland and Austria, whose requests to join Unesco had been approved by the Economic and Social Council. He thought that, although they had not yet received any official information from the Economic and Social Council, they might nevertheless draft this recommendation.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that they would consider the drafting of this text.

At the request of Dr. WALKER, who apologised for not having had time to study Document 18, its examination was put off till the next meeting.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL reminded the Board that it had instructed him last December to prepare a note on Unesco's relations with ex-enemy countries. He wished to read the following statement on the matter:

Cons. Exec./2e.Sess./S.R.8 (rev.)

"Ex-Enemy Countries.

1. The Executive Board at its first session instructed the Director-General to prepare a memorandum on the problem of the opening-up of ex-enemy countries to the educational and cultural influences of democratic countries.
2. Accordingly, the Director-General on 28th January wrote to the French, British and United States Governments suggesting that

'it would seem desirable to explore immediately the means by which Unesco facilities and activities may be related to similar efforts already undertaken by the Allied Control Commission in Germany' (and Austria).
3. The Director-General also enclosed for comment by these three Governments a draft letter to the Control Commissions enquiring through what channels he might

'explore the prospects for co-operation between the Commissions and Unesco'.
4. In his letter to the three governments the Director-General further suggested that their respective representatives on the Allied Control Commissions might be notified that the matter would shortly come before the latter, so that favourable action might be facilitated.
5. The British Government replied on 17th February that they saw no objection to the proposed course of action and they were prepared duly to notify their own representatives on the Control Body.
6. The United States Government replied on 4th March in a similar sense respecting Germany, but pointed out that the proposed action in respect of Austria might now be regarded as undesirable, since Austria had applied for membership of Unesco.

7. The French Government replied on 11th April that it saw no objection to representatives of Unesco making contact with the French members of the German Control Council, but that the latter remained solely responsible for practical measures inside Germany."

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion of Item 7 of the Agenda (financial questions) and asked the Director-General to submit to the Executive Board his report on the financial situation. The Director-General called upon the Deputy Director-General.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that they had before them three sets of documents:

- 1) Two documents (Nos 9 and 11) referring to Unesco's financial position.
- 2) One document (No. 5) referring to the scale of contributions by States Members for 1947.
- 3) One document (No. 23) referring to contributions of new Member States.

Taking these three questions one by one, the Deputy Director-General said that document No. 9 gave the financial situation as it stood at the end of the Preparatory Commission's existence and that document No. 11 was a financial statement of income and expenditure from 1st January to 28th February 1947. For various reasons it had been impossible to present statements of the financial position on 31st March, 1947, and this would anyhow only have a relative interest. What appeared from the present figures was that, apart from the sums advanced to it by the United Nations, France and Great Britain, Unesco had at last received money which it could regard as its own property. The situation could be summed up as follows:

Unesco had received from the United Nations:

End of December 1946 : an advance of 250,000 dollars
28th February 1947 : " " " " " "
2nd of April 1947 : an advance of 200,000 dollars

To cover the cost of the Preparatory Commission, Unesco had received by way of advances:

366,664 dollars from the United Kingdom
750,000 dollars from the French Government,

which sums still appeared on its books and would have to be the subject of later adjustments.

Apart from these loans Unesco had received, as an advance of the contribution for 1947:

41,666 dollars from Czechoslovakia on 21st February,
and as an advance payment to the Revolving Fund:
40,000 dollars from the United Kingdom on 7th February,
73,944 dollars from the United Kingdom on the 28th March,
11,284 dollars from the Union of South Africa on 25th March.

Unesco could hope shortly to receive sums from other sources. It would report this to the Executive Board at the earliest possible date.

The Deputy Director-General wished to recall to the Executive Board that M. Georges Peissel, formerly of the French Ministry of Finance, had taken over the duties of Unesco Comptroller on 1st April. Finally he asked members of the Board to submit any comments they liked on the report of the financial situation.

Dr. WALKER said that the Australian authorities in London had received instructions to pay Unesco 88,000 dollars, which represented its payment to the revolving fund and half its contribution for 1947. This sum would reach Unesco shortly.

Dr. OPOCENSKY was pleased to be confronted with real figures, but asked for details of rent which Unesco was to have received from Unrra and Ecito for the offices sub-let to these organisations. No mention was made of these sums.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the agreement with Unrra on this question had been reached only a month ago. The negotiations with Ecito were still not completed. Unesco could not really decide anything before it knew the rent which it would have itself to pay to the French Government.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, the reports in documents 9 and 11 were declared to have been received.

On the basis of document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e.Sess./5/1947, the Deputy Director-General then passed to the second part of his statement: Scale of Contributions by Member States. He reminded the Board of the General Conference's Resolution that the Scale of Contributions for 1947 should be based on the United Nations Scale adjusted to conform with Unesco membership. At that time however the United Nations had not fixed their own scale of contributions, so that the Conference had been unable to take a decision and had had to instruct the Executive Board to study the problem later. The Deputy Director-General recalled the difficulties met with in January of this year when the Standing Committee had had to determine whether it should fix for contributions a ceiling above which no government should go - a question which mainly interested the United States. Detailing the facts set out on pages 1 and 2 of document 5, the Deputy Director-General explained how they had established the two scales A and B annexed to this document. For the reasons given on page 3 the Secretariat considered scale B to be preferable to scale A.

M. PHOTIADES expressed his preference for Scale B. The Greek Government, he said, was ready to pay its contribution as soon as possible. But he would like to know one thing: if certain governments paid their contribution according to the percentages laid down in Scale B and if other countries joined Unesco later, they would find themselves with a surplus. What would then become of the excess percentages which would thus have been paid by various countries?

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that these surpluses would be credited to those countries for 1948. If a country had contributed a higher percentage in 1947, any excess paid would be deducted from its 1948 contribution.

M. PHOTIADES approved this procedure.

In reply to a question by Dr. OPOJENSKY as to the expediency or otherwise of adopting a ceiling which no government would be allowed to exceed, the Deputy Director-General said that it was for the Executive Board to decide this point.

The CHAIRMAN, in answer to a remark by Dr. SOMMERFELT said that in scale B Poland's contribution was fixed at 1.16 and not 0.16, as typed by mistake in the English text of the document.

Sir John MAUD declared that the establishment of a scale of contributions was not a matter that could be settled by negotiations between the Secretariat and the different governments. In order to reach a solution but for which Unesco could not have survived, they had had to take their stand on simple principles. Sir John thought that the Executive Board should now take its decision as quickly as possible. One reason why the United Kingdom had not yet paid its contribution was that it did not know the amount. So far Unesco had been saved by the

Cons. Exec./20 Sess./S.R. 8 (rev.)
E.

generosity of the United Nations and the French government but it could not continue to live from hand to mouth.

Unosco must be grateful to the United States for having fixed their share of the expenses at 44.03 per cent, a quota appreciably higher than their contribution to U.N. At the same time Sir John was of the opinion that, while retaining this figure of 44.03 per cent for the United States and accepting the basis upon which it had been calculated, they could adopt different basis in calculating the contributions of other countries. He himself was in favour of scale B and the United Kingdom was prepared to settle its contribution, which, according to that scale was 14.07 per cent.

Dr. OPOCENSKY also acknowledged the generosity of the United States and declared that if the members of the Board were unanimously in favour of scale B, he would not oppose its adoption, but would persuade his government to agree to it.

Dr. WALKER was ready to approve Scale B subject to a treasury verification of the estimates.

Mr. MacLEISH did not feel entitled to vote on this question and asked leave to abstain.

Scale E was put to the vote and was unanimously approved (Mr. MacLeish abstaining).

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL then passed to sub-paragraph C of Item 7 of the Agenda: "Revolving Fund". He recalled that the Standing Committee had authorised the Director-General to reduce the Revolving Fund to a million dollars. The Board was asked to approve this decision, the Standing Committee not possessing the necessary competence in this matter.

Sir John MAUD asked whether, independently of this sum of a million dollars, which would be paid in 1947, the other two millions would have to

be paid in 1948 or be paid by successive instalments in 1948 and 1949. In some countries, the United Kingdom for example, the financial year did not correspond to the calendar year and this might raise certain difficulties. If the United Kingdom had to pay a contribution to the Revolving Fund in 1948, it could not do so before the 1st April as its financial year ended on 31st March.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that the question to be decided at the moment was whether the Executive Board agreed to the reduction of payments to the Revolving Fund in 1947 to a million dollars. Of the three millions originally estimated, the Standing Committee thought that it needed for 1947 only one million. They could decide later the moment for paying the other two millions.

The Executive Board approved the reduction of the Revolving Fund for 1947 to a million dollars.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL then passed to the study of document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./23/1947, reading the text of it.

M. PHOTIADES having observed that the terms of the document would encourage countries not to join Unesco until the last quarter of the year, the DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that a state which joined Unesco in the last quarter would still have to pay 40% of its annual contribution for only a quarter of the year. This could hardly be called encouragement.

Sir John MAUD asked for an amendment in paragraph 1. Instead of the words "...would be to apply the United Nations administrative scale", he suggested "...would be to apply the United Nations administrative scale with increases calculated on the same principle that governed the establishment of scale B".

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL admitted the justice of Sir John Maud's request and agreed to this amendment to paragraph 1.

Dr. OPOCENSKY asked whether "new members" meant countries which had not signed the Unesco Constitution or those which had signed but not yet ratified it.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL answered that the term "new members" included both categories, but that there was all the same a distinction between the two categories of countries in paragraph 3 of the same document.

Dr. OPOCENSKY asked further how it was proposed to allocate the sums derived from the contribution by new member states to the expenses of the Preparatory Commission.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that, according to paragraph 5, "any adjustments of Member States' contributions or assessments on account of admission of new members will be made at the beginning of the new financial year." Nothing therefore would be paid to the Revolving Fund by reason of the admission of new members.

After observations by Dr. OPOCENSKY and M. SEYDOUX on the apparently privileged position which document 23 conferred upon countries which had signed, but had not ratified the Constitution, Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ proposed the adoption of document 23. This document was adopted.

(The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the ninth meeting, held at Unesco House,
19, Avenue Kleber, Paris 16e, on Sunday April 13th, 1947 at 9 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:

H. E. M. V. DORE (Canada)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)

M. CHEN YUAN (China)

M. M. FALSKI (Poland)

H. E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)

M. R. M. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)

Dr. H. R. KRUYT (Netherlands)

The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)

Sir John MAUD (Gt. Britain)

H. E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)

M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)

Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Dr. E. R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputies:

M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. P. AUGER)

Mr. P. N. KIRPAL (India) (Deputy for Sir S.
RADHAKRISHNAN)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies:

United Nations:

Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Rights
of Man Division.

International Labour
Office:

Mme. MOREL, I.L.O. Correspondent in Paris.

Item 5 of the Agenda: Questions Concerning the Executive Board

The CHAIRMAN proposed that they should start the discussion with (h) Travel and Daily Allowances, Document UNESCO/Cons.Exec/2eme Sess./20/1947.

A question at once arose in connection with the Preamble which began:

"Pending the establishment of detailed regulations...", which implied that there would be articles to approve of later.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that the United Nations had very detailed regulations on this subject which might serve Unesco as a model. For the moment they had had to content themselves with establishing basic principles, leaving formal details for later on.

The CHAIRMAN assumed that these travel expenses would be based upon the cost of a first class ticket by the shortest route from the individuals place of residence to the place of the meeting.

Dr. WALKER asked whether the price of sleepers was to be refunded.

In this connection the DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL presented the Secretariat's apologies to the Board for the very belated refund of last Session's expenses; the delay was due to difficulties in the matter of financial control and to the appointment of a new Comptroller. The cost of sleepers would be refunded.

Dr. J. OPOCENSKY observed that the per diem allowances were not paid for the day on which the home journey was completed and he asked how a Delegate was expected to live if he reached his home at midnight.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought the simplest way was to follow the United Nations' regulations

Sir John MAUD proposed the adoption of Point (h)

This item was adopted unanimously.

(g) Secretarial Expenses of the Members of the Executive Board between Meetings.

Mr. MacLEISH asked why the Agenda was being taken backwards. He would also like to know whether the meeting was public, to which the CHAIRMAN replied that it was. He wished to raise a question which seemed to fit in at this point of the discussion. It concerned the very working of the Executive Board, which consisted of individuals and not of representatives of Governments. This had consequences which were disquieting for Governments and embarrassing to members of the Board. Most of the members were officials of one kind or another, but that did not prevent them from serving Unesco as individuals. To explain the matter, Mr. MacLeish cited his own case and announced his intention of resigning as soon as his present mission was completed and his report on the Session filed in Washington. The reason for this decision, at which he had arrived after painful self-examination, was an unexpected sequel to the provisions in the Constitution. On his return to the United States after the General Conference Mr. MacLeish had for several months been entirely absorbed by the work of Unesco. Being regarded in his country as America's representative on the Board, he had been besieged on all sides by requests for information on the nature and work of Unesco, requests which he had felt bound to satisfy. Three or four months of unpaid work had been taken up in this way and he had found it impossible to earn his living by other means. He was very glad to have used his energies in the service of Unesco but he could not go on doing so. Although he had cited his own case, the problem was not peculiar to himself and he saw no possible solution for it. If Delegates were representatives of their Governments, contacts with Unesco would be simplified but other difficulties would arise. The problem could not of course be settled at the present meeting but it would

have to be examined, and the Constitution possibly amended. The question was whether the interests of the ideal, which were secured by the individual character of Delegates, really outweighed the practical advantage of a change in that character. Until the question was settled, Unesco would be unable to meet the needs and demands of Governments and Mr. MacLeish proposed to devote a quarter of an hour of the next day's meeting both to this question and to the steps to be taken to replace him.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. MacLeish's decision caused the deepest consternation among his colleagues. He too wished to speak on this question. Like Mr. MacLeish he also did not represent his country, and his duties at the Brussels' Embassy left him no leisure to inform his Government of all that took place on the Board. This was a very important question and must be carefully examined, preferably in a secret meeting next day.

M. PHOTIADES remarked that various questions of this personal kind needed study and fully justified a secret meeting.

M. CARNEIRO asked Mr. MacLeish whether all the decisions to be taken by the Executive Board on this item of its Agenda depended upon the question raised and whether they should not examine them simultaneously and abstain from an immediate decision.

Mr. MacLEISH agreed with M. Carneiro that the question should be considered as a whole, but he saw no reason for a secret meeting. The question was very important from the public point of view and affected the whole Constitution of Unesco. Having been led to this conclusion by his personal position, he readily agreed that it serve as a starting point for discussion. The choice of his successor must naturally be dealt with at a secret meeting.

M. VERNIERS had asked leave to speak under stress of strong emotion, but after what had been said he changed his mind and reserved the right to speak at the next day's meeting which he would wish to be secret in order that the question could be thoroughly gone into, subject to its resumption at a public meeting. The Delegates would unanimously deplore the loss of Mr. MacLeish, who had occupied so important a place in Unesco's work from the very beginning and had constantly given proof of his intense interest in the aims and work of the Organisation. But his personal case exemplified a general situation which it was in the interests of that work to clarify. It was essential that all members of the Council should enjoy an absolutely stable situation.

M. CARNEIRO had also been preoccupied with the question raised by Mr. MacLeish in a form that stirred their feelings because his very presence among them was at stake. Like all his colleagues M. Carneiro had often wondered how far he was independent of his Government in his work on the Executive Board. He was conscious of a permanent mental and moral conflict in acclimatising himself to the atmosphere of the Board and putting out of sight that of his position in regard to his Government. Each according to his temperament might thus feel compelled to break away or to surrender. He thought that there were two solutions. One to accord to the Board the same status as the International Court of Justice, which grouped together international officials who devoted all their time to their duties. Two, the members would be more officials of their country acting as permanent Delegates to Unesco. Personally he preferred the first formula, the Board's independence being linked with the independence of each of its members. The present situation was ambiguous and M. Carneiro would like to see the

Cons. Exec./2e Sess./S.R.9. (20v.)
E.

question studied and, if necessary, brought before the General Conference as a request for the amendment of the Constitution.

Sir John MAUD observed that the question was linked up both with point (b) status of the members of the Executive Board etc. and with point (g) now under discussion. So far as concerned the United Kingdom Miss Wilkinson's death had been a fatal blow for Unesco and the decision now imparted to the Board by Mr. MacLeish was a new and equally serious blow in this first year of Unesco's life. He was reluctant to ask his colleagues to reconsider a decision which must have been taken after painful reflection. He thought that Mr. MacLeish would forgive the Board for passing a resolution which might perhaps be idle but which it was possible would save Unesco from losing one of its outstanding members. According to this resolution "the Executive Board

- 1) Records its profound regret at the statement of Mr. MacLeish that he finds it necessary to resign from the Board;
- 2) Records its deep sense of the contribution which Mr. MacLeish has made to Unesco both as a member of the Board and before his election to membership;
- 3) Asks Mr. MacLeish to reconsider his decision or at least postpone his resignation until the meeting of the next General Conference.

Sir John Maud asked the Board to adopt this resolution before passing on to a discussion of the Constitution, which discussion must be carried upon with unhampered minds. That Constitution, be it good or bad, was the Constitution of Unesco which they are endeavouring to apply.

M. VERNIERS said that Sir John Maud had admirably expressed what he himself wished to put to the Board and all he would do therefore would be

to support the resolution and especially its third paragraph.

M. SEYDOUX, explaining that he could only speak as a deputy, called in so to speak at short notice, could nevertheless as a friend of M. Auger and colleague of M. Léon Blum affirm their great admiration and sympathy for Mr. MacLeish. Sir John Maud had expressed with tact, intelligence and warmth the feelings of all his colleagues. At such an important moment in the life of Unesco, whose situation was much more difficult than 18 months back - or even a few months back - the Board could not risk losing a collaborator of Mr. MacLeish's calibre. M. Seydoux felt sure that he was interpreting the views of his leaders and of all interested circles in France in begging Mr. MacLeish to reconsider his decision very seriously.

The CHAIRMAN put the resolution to the vote.

It was adopted unanimously.

Mr. MacLEISH confessed to a serious error of judgment. He had thought that the only way of raising this very important question of substance, was frankly to explain his personal position, but he had never intended to provoke so friendly a discussion of his case instead of a discussion of the general question. He had thought very long before arriving at this decision but, moved deeply by the words of his colleagues, he promised to think yet again and to bring the matter up again the next day. He ventured to stress the value of a discussion on the general merits of the question.

Dr. WALKER was delighted to think that there was still hope of retaining Mr. MacLeish on the Board and agreed with him that the substance of the question should be examined. He wished to contribute an idea or two concerning the independence necessary to the members of the Board.

Cons. Exec./2a Sess./S.R.9. (Rev.)

E.

He thought that the international experiment initiated with the establishment of Unesco should be given a real chance to prove its worth. There were two separate problems. The first was to ensure permanent contact between all member governments and the Board. Even if all the Board's members represented their Governments, the Governments of many member States would derive no benefit from this close contact with the Board and the problem would still remain unsolved. The solution depended in his opinion upon the Director-General and his staff for, although the Constitution did not define what were to be the relations of Governments with the Secretariat, it remained with the Director-General, in association with the Board, to find a solution acceptable to all the member governments of Unesco. The eighteen governments of the Board members would of course apply to the latter for information, but they had to devise a method of continuous relations between the Secretariat and all the Governments. These were "external relations," though Dr. Walker did not like the term "external", which really applied only to the Secretariat and not to the original States Members of the Organisation. He thought the second problem was that the men who had drafted the Constitution, on the one hand, and those who, on the other, had agreed to sit on the Board had not realised the heavy obligations involved. Unfortunately the cares and duties of daily life could not be ignored and, in a country like the United States, the task of furnishing information was evidently extremely burdensome, for a person. Those among his colleagues who were officials did not encounter the same difficulties, though, as Mr. Carneiro had pointed out, they were faced with other problems. It was the duty of the Board to consider the problem of alleviating the financial cares of those of its members who did not occupy official posts; he cited the precedent of the Chairman of the Governing Body of the I.L.

who received an entertainment allowance and Dr. Walker saw no objection to refunding small personal expenses (secretarial etc.) to members who had no official position. But the question needed serious study. The Executive Board was a new institution, with a new form of its own, and its duty was to find a modus operandi without breaking faith with its Constitution.

M. PHOTIADES recalled the beginnings of the Organisation and its work in London during the air raids, when the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education were working to create Unesco. All their hopes had been fixed on it and they viewed it, if not more generously, at any rate with greater understanding. Admittedly members of the Board were international representatives of all the member governments including those which were not on the Board. Out of delicacy - or was it weakness? - the question of how to safeguard this indispensable independence of the members had not been raised at the time of the General Conference. M. Photiades announced in conclusion that he too had resigned his post, not his post on the Board, but that with his Government for reasons which he proposed to explain the next day. He thought he saw a solution which he would put before them at a secret meeting.

M. VERNIERS believed that the Board had reached a crucial point. Its members were of two kinds, private individuals independent of their country and officials, who in their turn were divided into

- (a) officials appointed by their government to deal solely and exclusively with the affairs of Unesco and furnished by that government with all the necessary help, secretaries, etc.
- (b) officials saddled with heavy administrative burdens and - as in his own case - already absorbed by their work and having further

to ensure the work of Unesco. Despite their energy, brains and devotion they could not long support so heavy a burden. The Secretariat must solve this problem if the work they had undertaken was to be accomplished. Nevertheless M. Verniers was not unhelpful.

Sir John MAUD noted that all the members of the Board were determined to find the necessary balance between relations with Governments on the international plane and relations with the peoples (artists, scientists, teachers, etc.) on that same plane. He thought that it was still too soon to rewrite a Constitution which it had taken a year of effort to frame and which had only been applied for six months. He appealed to his colleagues to beware of an emotional impulse and not to upset that Constitution for fear of losing a colleague who was dear to all of them. Six months of work was not enough to provide a true perspective. For that reason Sir John Maud opposed the amendment of the Constitution at that stage but thought that they should preserve a balance between the two elements on the Board (amateurs and professionals - private citizens and officials). Members of the Board must in no case be full time officials of Unesco and those considerations prompted a division of work between the Board and the Secretariat. On that account he was also opposed to the appointment of a sub-committee to consider the need for amending the Constitution. He suggested they should ask the Director-General to prepare a report for the next meeting of the Board on the possibility of granting entertainment allowances, as suggested by Dr. Walker, to relieve the burden of certain members who were not at the same time officials. It was for the Secretariat to keep Governments regularly informed of the results of Unesco's first six months of work and this duty of the Secretariat should be

developed. In no circumstances must the Board have heavy administrative work thrust upon them.

Sir John Maud's proposal was approved.

Certain members of the Board (MM. Sommerfelt and Verniers), having experienced difficulties at the frontier in regard to their identity cards, asked that these documents should be expanded and that the frontier authorities should be notified of their existence and validity.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL asked M. Seydoux to take up this question with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

a) Organisation of the Secretariat of the Executive Board

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL hoped that members of the Board were satisfied with what had been done for them at the present session. M. de Blonay and two members of his staff had undertaken the work of organisation and had achieved much better results than on previous occasions, particularly as regards the minute writing and distribution of documents.

The CHAIRMAN congratulated M. de Blonay on his organisation of the Board's Secretariat.

Dr. OPOCENSKY associated himself with the Chairman's words, but added that the Secretariat of the Board should be entirely independent of the general Secretariat and that M. de Blonay could not be both head of External Relations and responsible for the Secretariat of the Board.

M. PHOTIADES explained that according to Article V para 7 of the Constitution, the Executive Board was to choose its officers. The wording of this article was very clear and the Executive Secretary of the Board was the Director-General. To avoid all confusion they must therefore find another title.

M. SEYDOUX did not agree with MM. Opocensky and Photiades. The Executive Board included a Chairman and Vice-Chairmen but not a Secretariat, and Mr. Opocensky's proposal would entail serious disadvantages, financial in the first place, since it would mean the creation of a new post. He was glad to note that Sir John Maud agreed with him on this point. He did not favour making the Board an autonomous organ without contact with the Secretariat, since - together with the General Conference - they constituted the three mainsprings of Unesco. The General Conference, the most important of these mainsprings, had its staff secured by the general Secretariat and he did not think that the Board should go further than the Conference. He himself had taken part in many international conferences and he had seldom seen things so perfectly organised as in the present case.

M. PHOTIADES replied that he was very well pleased with the work of the Secretariat under M. de Blonay's brilliant direction and that he too had not desired to make the Executive Board all powerful. He would however like to get rid of the title "Secretary of the Executive Board", which tended to assimilate the Board to a conference.

Mr. MacLEISH, supported by Sir John MAUD, proposed that this incident should be closed and that point (a) should be adopted.

M. OPOCENSKY was sorry to disagree with Mr. MacLeish. The latter's proposal seemed to him to conflict with the Constitution, which said expressly that the Executive Board was responsible for the discharge of its work - and that implied an independent Secretariat.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that he had been acting as Secretary and had merely asked M. de Blonay to help him in his work.

When M. OPOCENSKY continued to maintain his view, M. SEYDOUX

suggested that they might close the discussion without immediately determining the legal question but fixing upon the formula: "the Secretariat put at the disposal of the Executive Board". The Board agreed and point (a) was adopted.

Point (b) having been discussed with point (g), the Board proceeded to point (c): "Attendance at meetings"

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that the question at issue here was the presence of experts and he read a draft resolution providing that each member might be assisted by at most two experts who could attend private meetings, to which neither Press nor public were admitted, but not secret meetings, at which only members and their alternates would take part. The resolution was as follows:

"It is resolved that each member of the Executive Board may be assisted at public meetings of the Board by no more than two experts or advisers. Such experts or advisers will also be entitled to attend private meetings where press and public are not allowed. Members of the Board alone or their Alternates will take part in secret meetings."

The Board expressed its agreement.

(d) Division of work amongst the members of the Executive Board

M. VERNIERS said that he had submitted a proposal for the examination of the Board, but that chance had played into his hands, since specialists qualified to help the Secretariat in the execution of its programme were present on the Board. He suggested that members of the Board should be selected to make direct contacts at the beginning or end of sessions with the members of the Secretariat who were responsible for this or that part of the programme. They would not interfere, but would place their abilities at the Secretariat's service.

Mr. MADRISH observed that the troublesome discussions of a few moments before applied in part to this point (d).

M. C. RIBEIRO pointed out that, although M. Verniers' idea was a very interesting one, the Board was required to act as a unit of eighteen members and that its authority existed only as that of an indivisible group. It seemed to him unwise to take over some of the responsibilities of the General Conference. Moreover, past experience had shown that the Director-General was always able, if need be, to apply personally to a particular member of the Board and to ask for his direct assistance in a specific matter.

M. VERNIERS did not press his point, remarking that he had raised the question because point (f) provided for the setting up of committees of the Board. He wished to add that, like all his colleagues, he was at the Director-General's disposal whenever he might be required.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked M. Verniers and assured the Board that he would continue, as in the past, to appeal to the competence of the different members.

(e) Respective competencies of the Executive Board and of the Standing Committee

M. OPOCENSKY read a proposed addition to article 3 of the decision of 9th December 1946.

The CHAIRMAN said that this matter could be examined the next day with the kindred question of the Standing Committee.

The meeting rose at 11.45 p.m.

Paris, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the tenth meeting, held at Unesco House,
19, Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e), on Monday, April 14th, 1947,
at 9.45 a.m.

Present :

Chairman: H.E. M.V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:
M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)
M. CHEN YUAN (China)
M.M. Falski (Poland)
H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)
M. R.N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)
Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)
The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)
Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)
H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)
H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)
M. A. PHOTIADES (Greece)
Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)
Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)
M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)
Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy: M.R. SEYDOUX (France)(Deputy for M.P. AUGER)

Representative of United Nations and Specialised Agencies:

United Nations: Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the
Human Rights Division.

International Labour Office: Mmc. MOREL, I.L.O. -
Correspondent in Paris.

Item 9 of the Agenda: Presentation of 1947 Budget (UNESCO/Cons.Exec./2e Sess. /15/1947.)

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL presented the first Unesco budget. This document, he said, had been put together in very trying circumstances. It had been difficult to prepare a budget for a programme not yet approved. The budget, the recruitment policy and the programme had all to be prepared at once. One of the greatest difficulties had been the deadlines fixed by the Meetings of the Executive Board and the Standing Committee. It must be understood that this was not a criticism, but he wanted the members of the Board to be aware of the heavy burden of having these meetings. He would have liked to have presented the budget a month later. The time had been far too short.

The Deputy Director-General then reviewed document 15, drawing attention to the explanatory notes.

The budget presented differed from that submitted to the Standing Committee at its meeting on February 21st, 1947. The figures had been revised in the light of further study. They were for the most part still only rough estimates. The experience of the Preparatory Commission had been of little help. Activities were still in transition from a planning to an operational stage, which would call for a different type of staff and organisation.

Basic decisions had still to be taken which would affect the operating costs, in particular the development of a personnel classification system and on which depended the determination of firm salaries and other incidental expenses. Furthermore, the absence of key personnel in certain higher posts contributed to uncertainty as regards requirements and programme direction.

In the light of these limitations, the budget could not be regarded as an operating budget. Estimates would have to be adjusted with developments. The General Conference had given the Director-General authority to make transfers within the budget during 1947. It was impossible to over-emphasise the importance of this point. As soon as the budget was approved, the Director-General would establish a budget system, priorities, financial controls, etc.

The speaker then explained the various chapters of the budget.

Chapter I (Conferences and Meetings) covered the costs of all meetings, including those of experts of the Executive Board and the Standing Committee.

Chapter II (Personnel Services) included costs of salaries and wages, fees, provident fund and health insurance, representation expenses, travel of staff on mission and children's allowances.

For 1947, it had been impossible to divide salaries into permanent and temporary categories. The present staff was wholly on a temporary basis due to the policy inaugurated by the Standing Committee in February, that no permanent contracts should be offered until the Governments and National Commissions had been given an opportunity to put forward candidates. A table of permanent posts could therefore only be prepared after the classification plan had been established and in the light of the experience gained. Temporary staff was of course more expensive than the permanent staff.

Chapter III (Common Services) included communications, rents, utilities and maintenance, printing, insurance, equipment and supplies, motor vehicles etc.

Chapter IV (Grants and Subsidies) covered travel grants, scholarships and fellowships, grants-in-aid.

Travel grants were for students and teachers who might attend experimental courses in connection with the proposed study centres.

The sum allocated for fellowships and scholarships would be used for the establishment of a centre service for exchange of persons.

The sums allocated to grants-in-aid were based on requests from organisations working in the international field. These requests had been carefully scrutinised. It had been decided in the discussion of the day before that no grant should be made before the conclusion of an agreement to be approved by the Executive Board.

Chapter V (Expenses on initial recruitment) included travel of staff on initial recruitment, installation allowances, residence allowances, etc. These items were peculiar to international organisations bound by the requirements for equitable geographical distribution. They were primarily related to the original establishment of the organisation and should not be considered as regular personnel costs, since they would be practically non-existent in future budgets. The policy of temporary appointments considerably increased the total of chapter V.

Chapter VI (Preparatory Commission) covered the total cost of the Preparatory Commission and of the convening of the first General Conference.

Chapter VII (Re-education of ex-enemy countries). Unesco's programme on this point was still being prepared and under discussion. A sum of \$50,000 had been set aside for 1947.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL then gave certain explanations with regard to the annexes of Document 15.

As regards the next General Conference, he drew attention to the fact that the choice of Mexico City imposed a heavy burden on the 1947 budget. Every effort was being made to reduce costs of transport by recruiting staff in the Western hemisphere, but it was impossible to hold the Conference without the attendance of a portion of the staff of the Secretariat. The expenses of Conferences and technical services and of the general services were contingent upon the degree of activity of Unesco as a whole. In the organisation of the Secretariat, some centralisation and also a certain amount of decentralisation had seemed indicated. This explained certain peculiarities in the grouping of the items. It had been necessary to translate the programme into operating and working terms.

M. PHOTIADES congratulated the Deputy Director-General on his presentation of the budget. He reserved, of course, his right to make certain comments. He thought that it was clear to everyone now in how far the work of the Budget Commission of the Conference had had to be completed. The Deputy Director-General had suggested that members should draw their Governments' attention to the difficulties of preparing the document, saying that if he had a month more, it would have been easier. The speaker thought that this question would have been facilitated if the Deputy Director-General had been appointed two months earlier. This was of course no one's fault.

Mr. MacLEISH pointed out that the time allotted for the discussion of the budget had already been exceeded. He congratulated the Deputy Director-General on his masterly presentation. One or two items, however, would have to be discussed. To gain time, he moved the adoption of the budget.

Mr. OPOCENSKY was somewhat concerned with the question of transfers in the budget. He considered a Financial Committee should be set up to deal with this question.

Mr. MARTINEZ BAEZ drew attention to a remark made by the Deputy Director-General to the effect that the meetings of the Standing Committee and the necessity of preparing so many documents had held up the work. But this was the case in all organisations. The Executive Board was not an obstacle to Unesco's work, but an integral part of the organisation.

Certain items, he thought, were somewhat costly. As regards the salaries, he realised that the cost of living was high in Paris and considered the staff should be adequately remunerated. Grants-in-aid, he thought should be carefully scrutinised. The sum for the Mexico Conference seemed to him very high and he hoped that the total would not be spent.

He supported the motion submitted by Mr. MacLeish.

Dr. WALKER also seconded the motion. He considered that it would be necessary to come to some decision in respect of grants-in-aid.

As regards the procedure for transfers in the budget and the authority conferred upon the Director-General, he remarked that the Conference Regulations made this subject to the approval of the Executive Board. This could take place through submission to the Executive Board or, preferably, to a Financial Committee fairly familiar with the budget, which could also assist the Director-General in the preparation of the 1948 budget.

He submitted the following resolution :

"Transfers within the Budget

In implementation of Regulation 28 of the Financial Regulations,

the Executive Board agrees to adopt the following procedure:

1. The Director-General will submit to the Finance Committee of the Board for prior approval any proposed transfers of expenditure as between Chapters of the Budget or as between the Services distinguished in Annex C; except in cases of extreme urgency, as provided in 2.
2. In cases of extreme urgency the Director-General is authorised to make, on his own authority, such transfers as are necessary to meet unforeseen costs in the execution of the approved programme, provided that in all such cases the details of the transfer, and the reason for it, shall be communicated immediately to the Members of the Finance Committee.
3. The Committee shall review any such transfers at its subsequent meeting.
4. Application of the Undistributed Appropriation to particular heads of expenditure shall be governed by the same procedure as other transfers.
5. The Finance Committee will report to each meeting of the Board on any transfers effected under this procedure".

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a distinction should be made between Mr. MacLeish's and Dr. Walker's proposals.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL was glad to note the framework of Dr. Walker's resolution. He stated that the 1948 Budget was already under consideration, and that the Financial Regulations had provided for a Committee which was responsible to the Executive Board, and the latter to

Consc.Exec./2e Sess./S.R.10 (rev.)
E.

the General Conference, to examine that budget. Members of the Board must have full knowledge of the carrying out of budgetary questions.

Referring to his earlier observation that the Executive Board and Standing Committee held very frequent meetings, which gave rise to much documentary work, he wished to emphasise that this had not been intended as a criticism; it was necessary, in view of the responsibilities of the Executive Board, that frequent meetings should be held, and therefore members of the Executive Board, must be kept informed of all budgetary developments. He referred to the text of Dr. Walker's resolution which stated that no transfers should be made between the major chapters, nor between service and service, without the approval of the Financial Committee. He proposed that the Committee should consist of three members, all living in or near Paris, so that they could meet frequently.

M. PARRA-PEREZ wished to add his congratulations on the magnificent work accomplished by the Deputy Director-General. He also appreciated the latter's explanation of his apparent criticism of the Constitution. He supported Mr. MacLeish's proposal, because he considered that the Executive Board was at present unable to exercise the necessary control on the Budget. Measures must be taken to ensure that they could do so. He suggested the formation of a Control Commission outside the Executive Board and the Secretariat, to be appointed directly by the General Conference itself. In that way the competency and time required would be procured. He then read the following draft resolution:

"That the Executive Board shall consider a draft constitution for a Control Committee, to be submitted to the next General Conference. The members of the above-mentioned Committee shall be not more than five in number and shall be appointed by the Conference. They shall be nationals of different States and shall be specially qualified to deal with financial questions."

M. SEYDOUX also congratulated the Deputy Director-General, and said that he would of course vote for M. MacLeish's proposal. He commented on the Deputy Director-General's reference to the over-frequent meetings of the Executive Board and Standing Committee, and also on Dr. Martinez-Baez's remarks. He thought that the truth lay between the two opinions. Referring to the Personnel Budget, he considered that certain salaries for junior appointments were often not sufficiently high and wished for a further explanation of this question. With regard to Grants-in-Aid, he approved the allocation of these to international scientific organisations for transport expenses and publications, but not for administrative purposes, as organisations tended to increase their staff unnecessarily, which presented a danger to Unesco's budget. Otherwise, M. Seydoux approved the Budget.

On behalf of M. FALSKI, his representative had pleasure in congratulating Unesco for the first time on an excellent piece of work. He wished, however, to make certain suggestions to the Director-General and the Deputy Director-General. He noted that 2½ million dollars had been allocated for Personnel Services and only 2% of that sum for the salaries of experts. He recalled that before the war the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation had assigned up to 20% of personnel expenses to the fees of experts. Their system of officials working with the support of experts had shown very good results, and he thought the Board should study that possibility again. Instead of engaging experts as civil servants

the Committee of experts on statistics had obtained really remarkable results. He did not wish the salaries of the subordinate staff of the Secretariat to be reduced but, at the same time, thought it was impossible to compare the price of living in New York and Paris and that the cost of living in Paris had perhaps been exaggerated. With regard to the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Section, he noted that 56,000 dollars had been allowed for Travelling Expenses of Personnel and only 25,000 dollars for actual relief. 635,000 dollars had been allocated to the Natural Sciences Section, and he considered that they were too privileged, as Unesco's aim was not the progress of science but the promotion of peace and reconstruction. The sum allocated to the Natural Sciences Section was equal to the amount allowed for the 3 main projects of Unesco put together.

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN noted that the 2 hours allowed for the discussion of the budget had now reached their conclusion and he therefore proposed its adoption, subject to the condition that transfers could be made by the Financial Committee.

Sir John MAUD referred to Scylla and Charybdis and compared Unesco to a boat passing between them, with a precious cargo of live beasts, who must be creative. Scylla represented financial ruin, and Charybdis administrative death by strangulation. It must be made plain that the Financial Committee and the Secretariat must exercise flexibility. As Dr. Laves had said, it was not an operating Budget and therefore must not be treated ruthlessly by the Financial Committee, as if it were a Parliamentary Budget. He said that the selection of organisations to receive grants-in-aid must be left to the new Financial Committee and suggested that no further time be spent on the question. He hoped that the Secretariat and Financial

Committee would consider their remarks when administrating the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the adoption of the Budget as proposed by Mr. MacLeish and amended by Dr. Walker.

Mr. MacLEISH admitted that he was troubled by Sir John Maud's reference to grants-in-aid and that, as the Financial Committee would only consider the question from the general aspect, he thought they should not forego discussing it.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of the resolution, excluding the question of grants-in-aid.

Adopted.

Dr. WALKER, referring to M. Parra-Perez's draft resolution, considered that the present stage of development of Unesco warranted its being left till later on.

Mr. PHOTIADES said that if Auditors were to control the accounts, the question could be left until the General Conference.

M. PARRA-PEREZ observed that he had proposed that the Executive Board should commence a study on the formation of a Control Committee.

The CHAIRMAN read M. Parra-Perez's resolution, and proposed to refer the project for study.

Agreed.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL observed that auditors, Messrs. Price, Waterhouse, had been appointed in January and that their reports would be ready for the General Conference, and were at all times available for members of the Executive Board.

M. PHOTIADES thanked the Deputy Director-General for his reply, which he wished to have recorded in the minutes.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to proceed with the nomination of the Financial Committee and proposed Dr. Walker, Dr. Martinez-Baez and himself. He excused himself for this last choice, but said that as he was a chartered accountant, he was especially interested in the question.

Adopted.

Item 10 of the Agenda - Organisation of the Secretariat

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to the chart on page 2 of Unesco document Cons.Exec./2e Sess/15/1947/Supplement, and said that he would ask Dr. Laves later on to go into details. He drew the Board's attention to the fact that External Relations, Public Information and the Legal Counsel had been placed in relation to the Director-General's Office. It had been considered necessary to separate Public Information from the general programme projects. On the left-hand side of the chart, the Programme Sections, not all of equal importance, had been separated out. The Museums and Libraries Sections had been kept separate, each with its own director. On the right hand side of the chart, were the three large general projects. The General Services, technical side, were at the bottom.

Sir John MAUD thought that what the Director-General had said led on to the recruitment of personnel and suggested that they should go into secret session.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ admitted the necessity of secret sessions, but requested the presence of interpreters and minute writers.

The CHAIRMAN said that if the secret session were agreed upon, they would be acting as members of the Executive Board only, and he hoped that the Director-General would understand.

It was agreed to go into secret session.

(The meeting rose.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the eleventh meeting, held at Unesco House,
19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e) on Monday, April 14th, 1947, at 5 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:

H.E. M.V. DORE (Canada)

Vice-Chairman:

Dr. M. MARTINEZ SAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)

M. CHEN YUAN (China)

M. M. FALSKI (Poland)

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)

M. R.N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)

Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)

The Hon. A. MacLEISH (U.S.A.)

Sir John MAUD (United Kingdom)

H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)

H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)

M.A. PHOTIADES (Greece)

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)

Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

M.L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy:

M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M. F. AUGER)

Representatives of United Nations and Specialised Agencies.

United Nations:

Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of the Human Rights
Division

International Labour Office:

Mme. MOREL, I.L.O. Correspondent in Paris.

The Executive Board proceeded to the study of document Unesco/Cons.
Exec./2e Sess./30/1947 - Draft Resolution on applications for admission to
Unesco by Austria, Italy and Switzerland.

Dr. WALKER asked that separate resolutions should be submitted to the General Conference for each of the three countries. After all, any further applications to join Unesco would have to be the subject of individual consideration. Moreover, as regards Austria, it was possible that some countries might not agree to her admission to Unesco until the peace treaty had been signed.

Dr. Walker's proposal was approved.

On Sir John MAUD's proposal, document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./11/1947, which had been held over from the previous day, was adopted.

Sir John MAUD apologised for having to leave early and would like the date of the next session of the Executive Board to be fixed before he left.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that it was intended to hold a session of the Board during the summer and another just before the Mexico Conference. The next session might perhaps be fixed for the middle or end of July.

Dr. KRUYT remarked that he and a number of other members of the Board would have to be in London between the 16th and 25th of July to attend a Congress.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that this would be taken into account in fixing the exact date for the Board's next session.

Sir John MAUD reiterated his regrets at not being able to stay to the end of the session and congratulated his colleagues upon the constructive work they had done.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Executive Board should resume their study of paragraph 5 of Section A of Part II of document Unesco/Prog./1/1947 - Re-education of ex-enemy countries.

He recalled that M. Falski had submitted a draft resolution on this subject which appeared in the minutes of the fifth meeting and ran as follows:

"the enquiry as to the possibility of opening up ex-enemy countries to programmes of Unesco shall be limited in the first period to the attentive observation of the real spirit and tendencies of their populations relating to the ideal of peace and international understanding;

"no activity in favour of ex-enemy countries shall be undertaken by the Secretariat without a decision of the Executive Board".

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL feared that, if this resolution were adopted, it would considerably hamper Unesco's work. He would prefer the resolution originally submitted by the Netherlands according to which Unesco was to endeavour to open up ex-enemy countries to the educational and cultural influences of the democracies.

Dr. KRUYT shared this view. He thought M. Falski's notion likely to restrict Unesco's work in ex-enemy countries unduly. The longer they waited before undertaking positive action in those countries, the more difficult it would be to obtain results.

On a suggestion by M. Falski's representative, the Chairman proposed that they should vote separately on the two parts of the Polish resolution.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that to accept the first part of the resolution would encroach upon the powers of the General Conference and tie its hands. It rested with the General Conference to decide upon the policy to be pursued in ex-enemy countries.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ begged his Polish Colleagues not to press for the adoption of this resolution, which raised many difficulties and tended to restrict Unesco's activities. The most important thing was to find means to improve the state of mind at present prevailing in ex-enemy countries.

M. FALSKI's representative explained the idea behind this draft resolution. Nobody who, like himself, had travelled in Germany could fail to perceive that its re-education was not yet possible, and one must not foster

the illusions that Unesco could free Germany from its secular prejudices. It was essential to ensure that money and the efforts of Member States were not expended unnecessarily, but since the resolution covered all ex-enemy countries as well as Germany, he saw no objection to eliminating the first part of the resolution, if the Executive Board agreed to approve its second part.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thought that the Board could approve the second part. The Secretariat had never/intended to incur expenditure in ex-enemy countries without referring the matter to the Executive Board. A credit of 50,000 dollars had been voted in the budget for work to be undertaken in ex-enemy countries, and this work would all be submitted to the approval of the Executive Board.

M. PHOTIADES expressed agreement with the Director-General. He was glad to hear his Polish colleague speak of ex-enemy countries in the widest sense of the term.

After M. FALSKI's representative had withdrawn the first part of the resolution, the Executive Board submitted for the approval of members the second part as follows:

"No activity in favour of ex-enemy countries shall be undertaken by the Secretariat without a decision of the Executive Board".

In this form the resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN then turned to document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess/15/1947 - Budget for 1947 - and asked the Executive Board to examine the paragraph in Chapter IV which dealt with Grants and Subsidies to International Organisations. (Paragraph 4).

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL pointed out that this question was dealt with in the following documents:

Document 15 on the Budget for 1947;

Annex E of that document, which gave the allocation of credits in the Budget and in particular mentioned the sums provided for Chapter IV, which the Executive Board was at present considering:

Document 29 - Grants-in-aid to International Scientific Organisations;

Document 27 - An explanatory "hierarchical" list of International Scientific Organisations - which the Director-General regarded as essential to a statement of the question at issue from its scientific aspect.

Dr. WALKER appreciated the analysis in document 15 and hoped that the document would be approved. The whole question was to decide which organisations should receive Unesco grants.

Document 29 was important by reason of the principles set forth in it and the proposals it contained. Pages 6, &c. contained a list of Scientific Organisations to which Unesco proposed to allocate Grants-in-Aid. Many of these organisations belonged to the International Council of Scientific Unions with which Unesco had concluded a formal agreement. Dr. Walker thought that attention should first be given to the grants for these organisations and he proposed that the Executive Board should agree upon approving the Grants-in-Aid to the different organisations belonging to I.C.S.U., to the exclusion of others.

Dr. KRUYT supported this proposal.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ recalled that the allocation of Grants-in-Aid to various organisations was an essential feature of the work Unesco meant

to do. He pointed out however that the Executive Board had previously agreed upon the need for eliminating from its Budget any expenditure which did not correspond with the ultimate aim of Unesco, viz. the maintenance of peace. Dr. Martinez Baez was glad that Unesco proposed to allocate the greater part of its grants to international organisations belonging to I.C.S.U. At the same time he noted that it was intended to grant subsidies to organisations like the International Bureau of Weights and Measures and certain international scientific unions which he thought were engaged in very special work not closely related to the main objective of Unesco.

Furthermore, among the organisations which did not belong to I.C.S.U., Dr. Martinez Baez noted that Grants-in-Aid were proposed for the International Union against Cancer, for the International Union against Venereal Diseases and for the International Congress of Mental Hygiene Committee, all of which were medical science organisations. In view of the difficulties Unesco had encountered in the sphere of medical sciences, Dr. Martinez Baez hoped that they would postpone any decision about the granting of subsidies to these organisations until after the meeting of the Joint Committee of Unesco and the World Health Organisation.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL explained that the organisations against which a blank sign appeared in the third column could not now, in the light of previous discussions, be taken into consideration, since they did not come under the I.C.S.U./Unesco agreement and there could therefore be no question of allocating to them immediate Grants-in-Aid.

Dr. CARNEIRO supported Dr. Walker's proposal; the work of the Board would be greatly facilitated if, in this list of Grants-in-Aid, they were to approve all those intended for organisations covered by the

I.C.S.U./Unesco. agreement.

Mr. MacLEISH was also prepared in principle to support Dr. Walker's proposal. He understood from what the Director-General had said that for the present the Executive Board had only to approve the Grants-in-Aid allocated to organisations belonging to ICSU. He would like however to make a few reservations:

Originally the question of Grants-in-Aid had not been regarded as a matter of urgency. Could they not therefore wait for the meeting of the General Conference when these proposals could be submitted to it.

He was also struck by the large figure for Grants-in-Aid to organisations concerned with Natural Sciences. He feared lest the adoption of this figure might reduce the sums which could be granted to other organisations.

Finally he saw that the list of organisations for which Grants-in-Aid were provided included the International Committee for Bird Preservation and the International Office for the Protection of Nature. He asked whether these grants could not be suppressed as it had already been agreed not to incur expenditure on work that was already being done or might be done by other United Nations Agencies. It was known that the Economic and Social Council was calling a Conference on the Conservation of Nature soon.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL did not think they could postpone the granting of subsidies until the General Conference.

The high figure referred to by Mr. MacLeish was the result of a policy decision taken by the Natural Sciences Sub-Commission which had agreed that a substantial part of the credits allocated to the Natural Sciences Section should go towards the granting of subsidies. Thus the

budget of this section set aside for subsidies the sum of 275,000 dollars. That amount could be reduced to 260,000 dollars now that they had decided to exclude organisations not belonging to I.C.S.U. In this way 15,000 might become available for the other Sections. There still remained a certain disproportion between this figure of 265,000 for the Natural Sciences Section and the figure of 165,000 (to which might be added the 15,000 dollars that had become available) provided for all the other Sections put together. But this was due entirely to the decision of the Natural Sciences Sub-Commission just mentioned.

With regard to the detail referred to by Mr. MacLeish concerning the International Committee for Bird Preservation and the International Office for the Protection of Nature the Director General saw no necessity to exclude those organisations. However, as the Grants-in-Aid in question were small, their elimination would not matter much, and he would not oppose it.

Dr. CARNEIRO proposed that a vote should be taken on Dr. Walker's proposal.

A short discussion followed between Mr. MacLeish and Dr. Walker as to the removal from the list of the International Committee for Bird Preservation and the International Office for the Protection of Nature. Mr. MacLeish thought that the whole question depended upon whether these organisations were being looked after by other United Nations Agencies. It was agreed to approve Dr. Walker's proposal on condition that the Executive Board should subsequently strike out the two organisations if they really fell within the province of some other Specialised Agency.

Dr. WALKER's proposal was adopted with that reservation.

Mr. MacLEISH reminded the Board that he would not be able to be

present at the next day's meeting. However, now that the question of Grants-in-Aid was settled, he saw no disadvantage in leaving his colleagues to continue their work without him. He therefore thought that there was no need on his account for the Board to meet again in the evening and he saw no objection to the next meeting being fixed for the following day.

The next meeting was accordingly fixed for Tuesday 15th April at 9.45 a.m.

(The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.)

PARIS, May 7th, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Second Session

Summary Report of the twelfth meeting, held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris (16e) on Tuesday, April 15th, 1947 at 9.45 a.m.

Present:

Chairman:

H.E. M.V. DORE (Canada)

Vice Chairman:

Dr. M. MARTINEZ BAEZ (Mexico)

Members:

M. P. CARNEIRO (Brazil)

M. CHEN YUAN (China)

M. M. FALSKI (Poland)

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey (Egypt)

M. R.N. GUNTEKIN (Turkey)

Dr. H.R. KRUYT (Netherlands)

H.E. Dr. Jan OPOCENSKY (Czechoslovakia)

H.E. M.C. PARRA-PEREZ (Venezuela)

M.A. PHOTIADIS (Greece)

Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN (India)

Dr. A. SOMMERFELT (Norway)

M. L. VERNIERS (Belgium)

Dr. E.R. WALKER (Australia)

Deputy:

M. R. SEYDOUX (France) (Deputy for M.P. AUGER)

Representative of United
Nations and Specialised
Agencies:

United Nations:

Prof. John HUMPHREY, Director of Human Rights
Division.

International Labour
Office:

Mme MOREL, ILO Correspondent in Paris.

World Health
Organisation:

Dr. Vansile HYDE

Dr. A. CAVAILLON

Dr. de RUIJA SOUZA

Dr. Melville MACKENZIE

Item 11(e) of the Agenda: Relations with other Organisations - Summary Report of the 8th meeting, held on Sunday April 13th, 1947.

M. SEYDOUX said that in the Provisional Summary Report of April 13th, 1947, page 9 of the French text (page 10 to 11 of the English text) there was a reference to the majority required by the Executive Board in the matter of grants to non-governmental organisations. The proposal had been for a two-thirds majority. M. Seydoux had suggested that this was contrary to the rules of procedure of the Executive Board, which provided for a simple majority. M. Photiades had expressed the view that this observation should be kept in mind when the functions of the Executive Board were discussed.

M. Seydoux noted that the point had not been raised in the course of the further discussion.

The CHAIRMAN replied that this matter would be considered later in connection with the Executive Board.

Report on Decisions taken at the Secret Meeting held on Monday, April 14th, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN requested the SECRETARY to read his report on decisions taken the previous day in secret meeting.

Item 10. Organisation of the Secretariat

(a) and (b). The Executive Board considered the document Unesco/Cons. Exec./2e Sess./15, 1947, submitted by the Director-General on the organisation of the Secretariat, as well as the document Unesco/Bur.Pers./7, 1947, on the Proposed Method of Recruitment and Appointment for the next few months.

In the course of the discussion, the following main points were made:

(a) that the present organisational plan was not yet entirely satisfactory in that too great a number of officials had direct access to the Director-General and the Deputy Director-General, whose span of control was thus too great.

(b) that care should still be taken to avoid the crystallisation of the Secretariat in water-tight, specialised sections;

(c) that the number of permanent staff members should not be too great;

(d) that the composition of the staff is not yet satisfactory from the point of view of geographical distribution, Asia as well as Latin-America being most inadequately represented;

(e) that people belonging to the various geographical and cultural areas should be truly representative of the countries from which they come.

The Director-General was invited to take these various points into account.

In conclusion of this discussion, it was decided:

1. to approve document Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./15, 1947;
2. to approve the document Unesco/Bur.Pers./7, 1947, subject to the modification, that contrary to the suggestion contained in the fifth paragraph:

"No appointment may be made to a key post before the next meeting of the Executive Board or the Standing Committee, unless the Director-General has communicated with the members of the Executive Board and allowed a reasonable period for consideration of the proposed appointment."

Item 10 (c)

After consultation with the Executive Board, the Director-General announced his intention to appoint Professor Jean THOMAS as Assistant Director-General, and to entrust to M. Jean Jacques MAYOUX, former Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, the direction of the survey on the international aspects of philosophy and humanistic studies, to be made with special emphasis on their role in Unesco's programme.

Item 5 (b) Question concerning the Executive Board

Mr. MacLEISH reported that, to his deep regret, he did not feel able to reconsider his decision to resign from the Executive Board, which he had communicated to them the previous day.

The Executive Board decided:

1. to accept with deep regret the resignation of Mr. MacLeish, while thanking him for his invaluable services to the cause of Unesco;
2. to elect, in accordance with Article V, A, para.4 of the Constitution

Mr. Milton EISENHOWER, as a substitute who shall serve until the next session of the General Conference, which shall elect a member for the remainder of the term.

Item 8 (a) Programme:

"Contrary to the decision taken at a previous meeting, the Executive Board decided, following a suggestion of the Deputy Director-General, that the project "International Studies Centres" would not be included in the programme of the Social Sciences Section, but would remain within the project "Education for International Understanding", it being understood that its substantive character would not be affected by this decision."

Item 11 (o) of the Agenda: Relations with the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations (Unesco/Cons.Exec./2e Sess./31/1947)

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ announced the presence at the meeting of representatives of the Interim Commission of the World Health Organisation and extended his welcome to the visitors. Their presence he hoped, would make it possible to solve the differences of opinion between the two organisations and enable them to work for the common benefit.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL associated himself with this welcome. He thought that the discussion on document 31 might now proceed.

After a brief exchange of views, it was decided to go into secret session.

The public session was resumed at 11.30 a.m.

Item 10 of the Agenda: Organisation of the Secretariat

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL requested the approval of the Executive Board on ten new appointments, which he proceeded to read.

Dr. OPOCENSKY asked the Director-General whether a list of the posts had been circulated to Member Governments.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that it had, but in view of the

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that it had, but in view of the urgency of the matter, he had not been able to wait for replies but had filled the posts in accordance with the powers delegated to him by the Executive Board.

Dr. OPOCENSKY formally moved that the Executive Board should be consulted before nominations were made, and that the Director-General should wait for replies from Member States before making nominations.

Dr. WALKER begged Dr. Opocensky to realise the difficulties of organisation. It was impossible to run the Secretariat without staff, and it was the responsibility of the Director-General to make essential appointments in case of urgency. He hoped that in future an exhaustive study would be made of applications from Governments, but that in the meantime, firm instructions had been given that adequate geographical distribution should be ensured, and he proposed that the Director-General's report should be approved.

M. CARNEIRO associated himself with M. Opocensky's opinion, which raised a grave problem that had often been debated. The sending of lists to Governments, without waiting for their replies, was perhaps a necessary, but an undesirable, measure. This practice should be stopped, as it indicated that Unesco was aiming at appearances rather than at realities.

Dr. OPOCENSKY agreed to accept the Director-General's nominations, on the condition that this procedure should not be repeated in future.

M. SEYDOUX suggested that, when necessary nominations had to be made by the Director-General and urgent replies were required from Member

States, telegrams should be sent to permanent delegates in Paris, e.g. to the Embassy.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL thanked M. Seydoux for his proposal and wished to state that, in sending out lists of posts to Member States, it had been stipulated that it would not be possible to fill them till the 31st December 1947 or early in 1948. When, therefore, he appointed a person, in a case of urgency, it was understood by that person that his post would come up for competition at the end of the year. In cases of urgent nomination, he had been authorised by the Standing Committee and the Executive Board to make appointments in order to carry out the programme. He hoped not to be obliged to exercise these powers again, but, at the same time, he hoped that the possibility would not be excluded, as it would hold up the programme. He assured the Board that he would make no major appointments on his own initiative.

M. VERNIERS seconded Dr. Walker's proposal and requested Dr. Opocensky not to insist on a refusal of the Director-General's nominations, but only apply his objection to future procedure. He wished to stress the great difficulties confronting the Secretariat and the contradictions involved. Unesco was required to recruit people of high qualifications, yet could not offer them permanent situations. It was urgent that the Secretariat should carry out a certain programme before the Mexico Conference, yet it was desired to impose delay in recruitment on the Director-General. He therefore wished the Director-General to continue to make nominations, in case of urgency, on his own initiative, but requested him, in future, to wait for replies from Member States regarding their candidates, as far as possible.

Dr. OPOCENSKY reminded M. Verniers that, in this particular case, he had already agreed to the Director-General's report, but wished to safeguard the future. He seconded M. Seydoux's proposal, but wished the matter to be put to the vote.

M. PIOTIADES was of the opinion that, in the absence of three of their colleagues, no vote should be taken. He suggested a tacit agreement between M. Opocensky, M. Seydoux, the Director-General and members of the Board, without a vote being taken.

Dr. WALKER proposed that the Director-General's report be received. It was understood that the Director-General should only fill high positions with the approval of the Executive Board, but that in an emergency he could make minor appointments, after consultation with the Nominations Committee. This procedure would be followed in future, and it was not necessary to approve the nominations which the Director-General has made, but only to receive his report. He thought they should vote, in spite of the absence of three members, which was a situation which might often occur.

M. SEYDOUX agreed with M. Opocensky's opinion and proceeded to read the following resolution:

The Board considers that the procedure for nomination, as laid down in Article 8 of the Staff Regulations, should be adhered to.

Nevertheless, during the transitional period until the next General Conference, the Director-General, in conformity with the resolution passed by the Standing Committee, will be authorised to proceed with the appointments mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Staff Regulations, without waiting for the results of consultations with the Governments of States Members. Whenever possible, he will act upon the advice of the members of the Executive Board sitting as a Nominations Committee.

Dr. WALKER was not prepared to accept M. Seydoux's proposal and thought there was some misunderstanding. The Director-General was required by Conference resolution to submit appointments to high positions to the Board for approval, and in making minor appointments he was required to take into account the views of a Nominations Committee to be appointed by the Executive Board. The Executive Board had designated the Standing Committee to act for the time being as a Nominations Committee, and the Standing Committee had agreed that it would not pronounce on individual candidates for minor positions, but would only lay down the general principles of recruitment to be followed in the filling of such positions. Acting as the Nominations Committee, the Standing Committee had decided that, as a general rule, lists of positions were to be sent out to Member Governments in order that a thorough canvass might be made of suitable applicants. This procedure was quite different from M. Seydoux's motion, which would merely require the Director-General to consult Governments regarding the suitability of one of their own citizens who had already been provisionally selected by the Director-General. This latter procedure was, of course, necessary in cases of emergency where it was not possible for the Director-General to follow the procedure laid down by the Standing Committee, but the emergency procedure should not in principle replace the general procedure. Dr. Walker again suggested that the Director-General's report on nominations should be received.

M. CARNEIRO suggested a compromise. The Director-General's urgent appointments were always of short duration, i.e. 3 to 6 months, which meant that distant countries were prevented from participation and that therefore a just geographical distribution was not ensured. As, however,

this procedure had been adopted, the Board was committed to it and must give the Director-General a free hand.

The CHAIRMAN, stressing the necessity for speed, proposed that a vote be taken.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to a point made by Dr. Walker, assured the Board that if an urgent appointment was to be made, he would consult the Government concerned, but, in other respects, he hoped that they would confirm his powers. He would take M. Seydoux's proposal into consideration, but would prefer that it should not be a formal one.

M. SEYDOUX acceded to the Director-General's request on condition that his proposal should be accepted as a recommendation of the Board.

Dr. OPOCENSKY asked if this would be included in the minutes, and received an affirmative reply.

Agreed.

Items 8(b) and 9 of the Agenda.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to Grants-in-Aid, asked for the Board's authority to allocate a maximum sum of 10,000 dollars to the International Studies Conference.

Approved.

Item 12 of the Agenda - 2nd Session of the General Conference.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL stated that Mr. Mathews had just returned from a visit to Mexico via the United States, and had reported on very favourable negotiations with the Mexican Government. A fine High School building had been selected as the site of the Conference, and hotel

reservations for Personnel. Efforts had been made to recruit staff locally through the United States or Mexico. Referring to the Unesco Month, he said that excellent suggestions had been made by the Mexican Government. There had been a favourable advance in technical negotiations. It was impossible at present to fix the exact date of meeting, but he suggested a maximum period of four weeks as from Wednesday 5th November. If possible; it would be preferable to make it shorter, starting from the 7th November. The Mexican Government desired to have it early in November and it must not continue after the 3rd or 4th of December, in order that staff might return home for Christmas.

Adopted.

Referring to paragraph (c) (working languages of the Conference), the Director-General requested the Board's approval of the inclusion of Spanish as a third language.

M. CARNEIRO proposed that every time the General Conference was held away from Headquarters, the language of the host country should be added as a third language.

Dr. SOMMERFELT did not agree with M. Carneiro and said that the adoption of Norwegian as a working language would present technical difficulties.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL called attention to Rule 33 of the Regulations of the General Conference.

M. SEYDOUX recalled that if the Luxembourg Conference had nearly failed, it was owing to the use of three working languages. He did not,

as to which of Unesco's major activities were to be demonstrated in this exhibition. The question was being studied and he awaited the Board's suggestions.

Dr. WALKER, referring to the report on the 1st Unesco Month, noted that on page 14 the Secretariat had considered submitting a very limited programme for the approval of the Executive Board at its April Meeting. He hoped that this would be ready for the next meeting of the Executive Board. He thought the programme should be restricted to activities which could be handled without distorting other work on Unesco's programme. He saw a danger in the activities destined to appeal to the public, alongside the Conference. The public might think that Unesco only consisted of these exhibitions and lectures. He requested the Director-General to ensure that these activities were closely linked with the actual work of Unesco.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL agreed with Dr. Walker that the last Unesco Month had been too successful and multifarious, but as the host government was responsible, it must be left in their hands.

Agreed.

Item 13 - Third Session of the General Conference.

Dr. SOMMERFELT said that the Norwegian Government would like to be acquainted with the recommendations of the Executive Board on this subject. The question of holding the Conference in Paris every other year had been discussed and the Norwegian Government was in favour of this and therefore, extended its invitation to 1949.

H.E. Shafik GHORBAL Bey referred to the Egyptian Government's

however, reject the proposal that Spanish should be used at the next General Conference, but considered that each annual conference must be studied separately.

M. PARRA-PEREZ remarked that it was important to give special consideration to the use of Spanish as a working language, as there were about twenty Spanish-speaking delegations at international general conferences. This was not the case with several other languages which, although they were the languages of highly populated nations, were only employed at such meetings by a single delegation or a very small number of delegations.

Dr. OPOCENSKY asked the Director-General if the Secretariat had arranged for transport to Mexico of delegates and personnel.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL replied that nothing definite had as yet been arranged, but that Mr. Mathews and M. Montagnier were working on the question and that within three weeks a detailed report would be circulated to all Member States.

Referring to the Unesco Month he said that the Mexican Government had arranged many celebrations in connection with the Conference. The General Conference had adopted two resolutions, the first being that the host country should undertake the organisation of celebrations and exhibitions, representing their own and adjacent countries. The Mexican Government had organised an Exhibition of Modern Mexican Paintings, and also an exhibition which illustrated aspects of Mexican education, folklore, dancing, music. Secondly, that publicity should continue to be given to Unesco by an exhibition organised by the host country and the Secretariat to illustrate the progress of Unesco's programme. The question had arisen

invitation to hold the Conference in Cairo in 1948. He said, however, that he would be happy to go to Oslo in 1948 or 1949.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL expressed his appreciation of two such interesting invitations, but stressed the great cost of holding Conferences away from Paris. Although technically preferable to hold them in Paris every two years, it was certain that it was more valuable for Unesco to hold them elsewhere. A decision must be postponed until the results of the Mexico Conference could be observed.

Dr. SOMMERFELT, while seeing the Director-General's point of view, said that a postponement of the Board's recommendations would inconvenience the Norwegian Government.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL regretted the impossibility of taking an immediate decision which, owing to technical and financial difficulties, must at least be postponed until the next meeting of the Executive Board. In any case, the General Conference would make the final decision.

M. CARNEIRO advocated the holding of the General Conference every two years in Paris, and stressed the huge expense involved and the technical difficulties of holding it elsewhere. Furthermore, Paris had been selected as Headquarters for cultural reasons, and if Conferences were held away too often, the advantage of the choice would be lost.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the matter should be referred to the next meeting of the Executive Board.

Item 6 of the Agenda - Administrative Questions.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL referred to the excellent work done

by the Personnel Office on whom a heavy burden had been laid during the past three months. There had been rapid changes of staff on 28th February, and every member of the staff had to be notified of his station. Also recruitment machinery had to be worked out which was difficult and complicated. The classifying of posts within the Secretariat was already under way and would take another four weeks to complete. They had also to prepare the description of posts for Member Governments and for this purpose had to know the range of salaries and responsibilities and the date of filling the post. He wished, in conjunction with the Director-General, to proffer especial thanks to Mrs. Longley.

With regard to the Medical Benefits Scheme and Allowance Regulations Unesco documents Cons.Esec./S.P.12/1947 and Cons.Exec./S.P.11/1947 had been provisionally accepted by the Standing Committee, subject to changes by the Secretariat and proposals of Member Governments. Some Governments had already responded, but the majority had not. The question had been studied whether Unesco's commitments would not exceed its resources. Some changes had already been made, concerning which he did not intend to go into detail. This system was already working and the staff acquainted with it. He requested the Board's approval of the documents, bearing in mind that the Director-General must be authorised to make changes in accordance with experience. It was impossible for the Secretariat to guess at future changes which might prove necessary. Referring to Unesco document Cons.Exec./2e Sess/22/1947, Staff Regulations 11 and 21, he said that a report would be made to the Executive Board and the General Conference.

Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ requested the Director-General to have Unesco documents Bur.Pers./2/1947 and Bur.Pers./3/1947 on the Rules of the Medical

Cons.Exec./2e Sess:/S.R.12(rov)

E

Benefits Scheme communicated to Member Governments and suggested, if necessary, that they should be submitted again at the next Executive Board Meeting.

He had one observation to make as regards Maternity cases and the age limit for children. He thought the benefits were not as generous as they should be and proposed that the two documents should be considered as a minimum, but that it should not be necessary to conform to them in cases of urgency, or especially deserving cases. For example, owing to war circumstances, a member of the staff might have a dependent child over 21 years of age.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it had been hoped to make the Medical Benefits Scheme more generous, but, owing to lack of funds, in order to do this it would be necessary for employees and the Organisation to make larger contributions. The matter would have to be considered and they were being advised and helped by experts of the French Government. As a warning he wished to state that if the Executive Board allowed the Director-General to make special payments in difficult cases, it would place considerable burdens of responsibility on his shoulders and there would probably be many applications from the staff. He hoped the question could be held over until a report was made to the Executive Board at the next meeting.

M. VERNIERS would have seconded Dr. MARTINEZ BAEZ in saying that the benefits should be as generous as possible, but after hearing the Deputy Director-General's observations, he would draw attention to document 11, section III, page 3, on the subject of Education. There would not be many cases of this kind and they therefore deserved special consideration.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL said that it was already under

consideration that the age should be raised to 25, but that the United Nations had turned this down.

M. SEYDOUX wished to ask two questions, important for France. Did the principle of just geographical distribution apply to all posts in the Secretariat, even down to the small ones? Secondly, there were many French candidates for lower posts, and he wished to know whether the lists would be carefully studied and qualifications examined before any French person was appointed to Unesco.

The DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL stressed the difficulty of making an equitable geographical distribution and was sure that M. Seydoux would be the last to suggest national quotas. As to how far, up or down, it would be applied, this could not be put in writing, but the Director-General was aware of its importance. Due to the location of Headquarters, it was normal that a large number of French people should be employed. Referring to the second question, all possible use was being made of the lists of candidates and the Director-General saw them and interviewed people in Paris. French persons had the advantage of having access to the Secretariat as other nationalities did not.

He wished to take the opportunity of thanking the French Government for their help in the Medical Benefits Scheme, and in making special arrangements from which the French Staff would benefit.

The DIRECTOR-GENERAL, referring to paragraph (c), (Records of Conferences and Meetings) read the following resolution:

In view of the expense entailed in the hiring of verbatim reporters, the Executive Board recommends that, during all

meetings no Verbatim Reports shall be taken, except at Plenary Sessions of the General Conference, and that Summary Reports shall be considered sufficient for all other meetings, Commissions and Committees.

Adopted.

Dr. WALKER wished to thank the Secretariat for the efficient arrangements made for this meeting of the Executive Board.

(The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.)