

1950  
NEW ZEALAND

---

# The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

REPORT OF THE NEW ZEALAND DELEGATION  
TO THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL  
CONFERENCE, HELD AT PARIS, FROM 19  
SEPTEMBER TO 5 OCTOBER, 1949

---

*Presented to Both Houses of the General Assembly by Leave*

---



# THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

REPORT OF THE NEW ZEALAND DELEGATION TO THE  
FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE  
HELD AT PARIS, FROM 19 SEPTEMBER TO 5 OCTOBER,  
1949

---

The Right Hon. Peter Fraser, P.C., C.H.,  
Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs,  
Wellington, New Zealand

SIR,—

We have the honour to submit the report of the New Zealand delegation to the fourth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, held at Paris from 19 September to 5 October, 1949.

We are very much aware of the honour of our appointment as delegates for our country to this Conference, and the responsibility of our task.

We have the honour to be, Sir,  
Your obedient servants,

JAMES SHELLEY,  
Chairman of Delegation.

J. C. BEAGLEHOLE,  
Delegate.

## INTRODUCTION

THE fourth session of the General Conference of UNESCO was held in Paris from 19 September to 5 October, 1949. New Zealand was represented by two delegates, Sir James Shelley, late Director of Broadcasting (leader of the delegation), and Dr. J. C. Beaglehole, Senior Research Fellow and Lecturer in Colonial History, Victoria University College. They were accompanied by Mrs. D. Croucher, of the staff of the High Commissioner in London, as secretary.

This is the smallest delegation New Zealand has ever had at a UNESCO Conference, and the burden was correspondingly great. Fortunately there was no night sitting, or it would have been unbearable. Mr. D. Cairns, the Secretary of the National Commission for UNESCO in New Zealand, was to have been a member of the delegation, but most unfortunately had to return home shortly before the Conference began. This was all the more unfortunate, as Mr. Cairns had not only been a delegate to the third session of the General Conference at Beirut, but had just spent some time at UNESCO House, acquiring a thorough grasp of the work, and could have given his colleagues a great deal of useful information, without which they were at times working in the dark. As it was, both delegates and their secretary were completely new to UNESCO Conference work.

There was thus re-emphasized two lessons which we wish to put in the forefront of our report. The delegation, indeed, hardly needed to learn them, for the National Commission has been well aware of their significance since the earliest meetings of the Conference. First, if New Zealand is to play a proper part at any UNESCO Conference, its delegation must be adequate—and a delegation of two is quite inadequate. It is not simply a matter of being present at so many formal meetings—as any one who has attended this sort of international Conference and tried to discharge his duties conscientiously knows only too well. There is much informal but none the less tiring work to be done, discussion and consultation and drafting; while, if a country is to get the best out of the Conference, it is highly desirable for its delegates to see something of the members of other delegations, apart from the work of the Conference narrowly conceived. On this occasion this sort of meeting was simply impossible. Again, there is an enormous amount of paper to be read. A great mass of this, important for current discussion, could not be adequately perused.

Secondly, as we have already implied, some continuity of representation is most essential. Although both delegates had been members of the National Commission in New Zealand from its inception and had a good knowledge of the general work and problems of UNESCO, their lack of immediate experience of the General Conference and of all its currents and cross-currents left them at a grave disadvantage. Not all the briefing in the world can offset this disadvantage. When all delegations were new to the work and feeling their way it was not so great; but now, with a large number of able men thoroughly aware of what happened at previous sessions, and picking up the threads of work they have hardly dropped, knowing one another quite well, and knowing as well what questions are likely to prove easy or difficult, and why—now, certainly, New Zealand, if it is to maintain its reputation for useful work, must not relapse into amateurishness. Obviously it cannot afford a large delegation, of even Australian size, and it must fall short of the continuity possible for the United Kingdom or the United States; but it must somehow or other work out a policy rational for all the circumstances. Fortunately for the delegation on this occasion, it had Mrs. Croucher.

We should add that our report is to be read in conjunction with, and taken as a commentary on, the official printed report of the Conference.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

UNESCO may now be taken as a going concern—wherever it is going, and that is not quite certain yet. The arrangements for the Conference were good; every delegation had an office and telephone, some at the expense of double-banking members of the Secretariat; there was a very useful handbook for delegates, and they were offered access to any office or activity they were interested in. The translation services, both simultaneous and consecutive, were excellent; indeed, it is difficult to overpraise the translation service, working always at top speed. The difficulties in the way of running an international Conference really efficiently—reckoning efficiency by high national standards—are immense; and with that proviso in mind, one can say that the UNESCO Secretariat do now run their Conference well.

This fourth session was supposed to be a “short business Conference,” the understanding being apparently that no large matters of policy should be newly brought up. But before the

Conference began to sit, three days had been added on to the period originally planned for, so that it was practically a full-scale Conference. Meetings also had to be longer than originally planned. In addition to the ordinary work, there was the public discussion of a "general subject," for which three special evening sessions, counting as plenary meetings, were set aside.

The usual plenary sessions were held, at the beginning for the establishment of Committees, election of President and Vice-Presidents, adoption of the agenda, and so on; and at the end for the consideration of the reports of Commissions and other matters of final general concern. The detailed work was broken down into agenda for three Commissions: the *Programme and Budget Commission*, the *Administrative Commission*, and the *Official and External Relations Commission*; and two Committees, the *General Committee* and the *Procedure Committee*. The Programme and Budget and External Relations Commissions had two joint meetings. In addition, the Credentials Committee and Nominations Committee met early and disposed of their work rapidly. Of the Commissions, Sir James Shelley sat on that which had the heaviest individual agenda, Programme and Budget. Dr. Beaglehole sat on the other two Commissions, and on the Procedure Committee, of which he was elected chairman; and also on the General Committee (the Conference steering Committee), of which he was a member in virtue of his chairmanship of the Procedure Committee. Dr. Beaglehole attended the meetings of representatives of National Commissions, and did his best to cope with the meetings on the Book Coupon Scheme. In addition to this, he spoke on the "general subject." There was also the usual sub-committees, Drafting Committees, and working parties, on none of which, fortunately, was either New Zealand delegate called to act.

M. Georges Bidault, *President du Conseil* and leader of the French delegation (now Premier of France), was nominated President of the Conference, but declined very gracefully in favour of Dr. E. Ronald Walker, the leader of the Australian delegation and one of the members of the Executive Board. Dr. Walker made an excellent President, hard-working and tactful.

## NEW MEMBERS

Monaco was received and Ceylon was elected as new States members of the Organization (bringing the number of member States to 50).

## PROGRAMME AND BUDGET COMMISSION

*Chairman*: Professor PAULO DE BERREDO CARNEIRO (*Brazil*)

*Vice-Chairmen*: Professor JEAN PIAGET (*Switzerland*)

Mr. P. OGRODZINSKI (*Poland*)

*Rapporteur*: Mr. W. D. PILE (*United Kingdom*)

The Programme and Budget Commission sat during the whole period of the Conference when its members were not in plenary session. The New Zealand delegate attended during the whole of the sittings of the Commission as well as during the plenary sessions, and seized a number of opportunities of speaking on the points which were regarded as important by the National Commission. In general the discussion in the Programme Commission tended in the direction of the National Commission's instructions, and generally in line with the attitude of the United Kingdom delegation.

Since the Conference was intended to be of a restricted business character given over to the consideration of the proposals made at the Beirut Conference, there was a general agreement on many issues to defer consideration of any new major issues until the fifth General Conference at Florence in 1950. There were, therefore, no fundamentally important changes to the programme as presented. There were, however, two points of sharp conflict which occupied much of the time of the Commission. These were (1) the question of when and how to fix a ceiling figure for the Budget, and (2) the question of UNESCO's activities in western Germany.

### THE FIXING OF A CEILING FIGURE FOR THE BUDGET

Before the details of the programme were considered—that is, right at the outset—the leader of the United Kingdom delegation made an able speech advocating the procedure which had been adopted at Beirut and Mexico of fixing the Budget ceiling before considering the programme proposals, on the ground that we must know how much cloth we have before cutting out our garment. It was plain during the whole course of the Conference that the United Kingdom delegation had been instructed by their Government to look very strictly into the question of financial obligation—this became plainer still when, during the course of the Conference, the announcement was published concerning the devaluation of the pound. The New Zealand delegate spoke to this question in support of the United Kingdom proposal, maintaining that the presence in the minds of delegates of a limiting figure would act as a psychological brake upon the tendency to let things go through without sufficiently careful examination.

The United States—by far the largest contributor—opposed the United Kingdom proposal, and wished to leave the fixing of the ceiling figure till the whole programme had been considered. The Director-General spoke strongly against the United Kingdom position. After several sittings, a meeting of the United Kingdom and United States delegations “out of session” agreed upon a working compromise which was adopted by the whole Commission. The arrangement was as follows:—

(1) The whole programme to be discussed in detail by the Commission without reference to any ceiling, and the general attitude of the Commission on each point to be noted.

(2) Towards the end of the Conference a Drafting Committee to consider the recommendations of the Commission and to work out a tentative Budget with a suggested ceiling.

(3) The report of the Drafting Committee to be presented to the Programme and Budget Commission, which would then consider and decide upon the ceiling figure, leaving the detailed figures of the Budget to be adjusted accordingly.

This procedure was adopted, and the Drafting Committee recommended a total budgetary allocation for 1950 of something over 8,000,000 dollars. In Commission a reduction was proposed by the United Kingdom—New Zealand voting with the United Kingdom—but in the end a “target” figure of 8,000,000 dollars was adopted by the Conference.

#### UNESCO'S ACTIVITIES IN WESTERN GERMANY

This question resulted in a heated discussion which had a stronger political flavour than any other of the Conference activities. The policy in the past has been to make UNESCO's facilities available to the whole of Germany, but the Government controlling Eastern Germany has not so far allowed UNESCO work in that territory, although much good work has been achieved in Western Germany. The delegate from Czechoslovakia, followed by the delegates from three other countries, proposed that all UNESCO activities in Western Germany should cease forthwith, on the ground that the unification of the whole of Germany was being menaced by this separate treatment. The speeches were carefully prepared and vigorously delivered both in the Commission meetings and afterwards in the plenary meeting at the end of the Conference. It was held that the UNESCO activities should cease, so as to help to force the controlling Governments to bring about political unity. In opposition it was made clear that it is not UNESCO's policy to



enter into the political arena and that the same treatment was open to the whole of Germany should the East as well as the West wish to take advantage of it. Only four votes were cast in favour of the motion, whereupon the four delegations withdrew from the meeting.

### UNESCO WORK IN JAPAN

There was little discussion relative to the work in Japan. The Chinese delegation did not oppose the work, but maintained that it should be definitely relegated to a low level of priority until the claims of China were more adequately met.

The Conference decided that work in Germany and Japan was to go forward.

### GENERAL

Other points at which the New Zealand delegation made effective contributions were in regard to (1) educational missions, and (2) the suggestion to get States "to adopt practical measures" to prevent broadcasting being "used for purposes contrary to tolerance and mutual understanding."

*Concerning (1)*, the Secretariat proposed three missions during the year; and a proposal to reduce the number to two was opposed by the New Zealand delegate on the ground that this method of personal inquiry and the resulting contacts between individuals was likely to produce the most valuable stimulus to the country concerned, and thus really bring about some action, and was therefore of much higher importance than correspondence and documentary methods, which often resulted only in the increase of paper. The vote, taken immediately after this submission, resulted in a unanimous acceptance of the Secretariat's proposal.

*Concerning (2)*, it was contended by the New Zealand delegate that any attempt to "take practical measures" to restrict broadcasting was equivalent to taking practical measures to restrict the free flow of information, and was in opposition to the general policy of UNESCO. Although the intention of the proposal was appreciated and desired, such a forcible and negative method should not be suggested by UNESCO, but a positive attitude of encouraging tolerance and mutual understanding should be adopted in its place. The Director-General immediately acknowledged the contention, withdrew the proposal, and promised that the Secretariat should look into the possibility of framing a positive proposal along the lines suggested by the New Zealand delegate.

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Report on Technical Assistance to be presented to the United Nations, after a most favourable discussion and the addition of words stressing the importance of collaboration with scientific organizations, was adopted unanimously.

On the whole, the National Commission may regard the findings of the Programme and Budget Commission with considerable satisfaction and may rest assured that the enthusiasm and energy of the Director-General will become more and more effective. The National Commission should realize that the fifth General Conference at Florence will be an important one where many major programme issues will be dealt with, and that as strong a delegation as possible should be sent.

## OFFICIAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

*Chairman* : His Excellency ANTONIO CASTRO LEAL (*Mexico*)

*Vice-Chairmen* : Mr. Y. S. YEN (*China*)

Mr. S. M. SHARIF (*Pakistan*)

*Rapporteur* : Mr. F. CHARPENTIER (*Canada*)

The Commission held five meetings of its own, and two others sitting jointly with the Programme and Budget Commission. The New Zealand delegate, suffering from a clash of meetings, was unable to attend most of these, but not quite all.

The work of this Commission involved some long and very animated discussions, including one, on liaison with member States and National Commissions, at which the Director-General was present and spoke with great emphasis in defence of his plans. The difficulty of keeping in close touch with UNESCO without real continuity of representation and really close examination of certain plans was very clearly illustrated in this particular discussion, on which the New Zealand brief was to support with some reservation the Director-General's plans. The New Zealand delegate in speaking gave a support even more qualified than was suggested.

## REGIONAL OFFICE FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

This has already been established at Havana, in Cuba; and according to the Cuban delegate his Government has been most generous in the provision of accommodation. The Commission did not seem very happy about the scheme on the whole, but accepted the assurances given; the Director-General is to report on the future activities of the Office to the fifth session, in the light of experience. It is really difficult to say at this stage what the

experience will be. The Office is aimed at securing really effective co-operation from the Latin-American countries, and if it does this it will certainly be justified; for the Latin-American countries undoubtedly present a problem. National Commissions need to be vastly stimulated, and payment of contributions is not at all punctual. The Director-General is clearly much exercised about the problem.

#### LIAISON WITH MEMBER STATES AND NATIONAL COMMISSIONS

This is another instance of the problem referred to in the foregoing paragraph, though it stretches more widely. The Director-General got his way, but the programme laid down in the relevant document, and the means of its execution, should have had a far closer examination. The difficulty is to give such a programme really close examination as part of an afternoon's work, with the most vehement appeals coming from the platform. If the full programme is carried out, it will swallow up a good deal of money, and it will certainly fail unless the special "ambassadors" to be appointed to galvanize certain member States are men of really first-rate capacity. The scheme to appoint "national correspondents" in countries where National Commissions have not been set up is a very dubious one indeed. Further visits of secretaries of National Commissions to UNESCO headquarters, on the other hand, can be productive of nothing but good—always premising the ability of the secretaries. A French motion giving blanket support to the plan was carried, 23 to 7, New Zealand voting against.

On the other hand, though the Director-General carried his point, the Commission stressed that the measures should be regarded as experimental. Their working should certainly be closely watched. These remarks are, of course, not designed to minimize the importance of liaison with member States. But liaison must be a two-way thing.

#### INSTITUTE OF CULTURAL CO-OPERATION FOR SOUTH AND EAST ASIAN COUNTRIES

This has hardly got further than an interim report. The Commission was unanimously amiable about it, but did no more than "take note"—to which India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan agreed. It is obviously for the Asian countries concerned to push forward or not, as they think fit.

#### AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNESCO AND THE UNITED NATIONS

There was no wish on anybody's part to vary this.

## RELATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

This was a matter mainly of taking note of already existing flexible relations with certain organizations doing work of some interest to UNESCO, such as the International Hydrographic Bureau and the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. No controversy or new policy is involved, though the United States urged caution in making further agreements.

### PROVISIONAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNESCO AND INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF EDUCATION

The extension of this agreement for another twelve months was unanimously agreed to without discussion.

## RELATIONS WITH THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

This was another matter that caused little discussion. The Organization of American States is a regional organization with objects couched in large general terms, going far beyond the educational, scientific, and cultural; but there are certain bodies such as the Inter-American Cultural Council, the Cultural Action Committee, and the Department of Cultural Affairs of the Pan-American Union with which UNESCO, under its Constitution (Article XI, para. 1), might quite well co-operate. The Director-General had already been in negotiation over co-operation with such specialized organs, and was now directed to continue this work so far as it would help the programme of UNESCO, and to report back to the General Conference.

### NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS APPROVED FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS IN 1949

This was one of the questions which the Commission argued about very fully, with the United States delegate taking the lead. Some alarm was expressed about the list of such organizations becoming unconscionably long, and it was urged that relations with them should be periodically scrutinized. The United States delegate proposed a resolution to this effect, which was referred to a Drafting Committee of the United States, Belgium, and the Rapporteur; and the long resolution which resulted was adopted unanimously. Its effect was to instruct the Director-General to re-examine the existing procedure, in the light of the Commission's discussion, and to report on his results to the next session of the General Conference; and to request the Executive Board to include on the agenda of this Conference a general review of the existing list. Probably the sooner such a review takes place the better.

## REVIEW OF FORMAL AGREEMENTS WITH INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

This also was a formality. Reports are to be submitted to the next session of the General Conference.

## REPORT ON CONTRACTS CONCLUDED WITH INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GRANTS-IN-AID ALLOTTED IN 1949

This, like the non-governmental organizations question, was discussed at length, and by some delegates with feeling. The United States delegate wanted very full returns of grants-in-aid already made, and spoke (as did others) as if no information had ever been given on these matters. In response to questions from the New Zealand delegate, the Secretariat indicated how much detailed information had in fact been supplied to member States. A Drafting Sub-committee (Belgium, Greece, United States, and Rapporteur) took over an American resolution and made from it useful instructions to the Executive Board to study the whole problem, and to the Director-General to give the fullest possible information, in Budget and report, on contracts and grants-in-aid. There was no pressure actually to have the 1950 grants reduced.

## SCHEME FOR A UNION OF ORGANIZATIONS WORKING FOR PEACE

The Beirut Conference had asked for a report on the possibility of welding into one international organization all bodies working for peace. It was found that an International Liaison Committee of Organizations for Peace was already on the point of being established, with which UNESCO could work if necessary; and the Commission had no more to do than to ask the General Conference to take note of that fact.

## LIAISON WITH LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS

There was more discussion over this subject, some delegations perhaps feeling that there was a danger of such liaison getting out of hand, and moving into the field of technical education of workers. This, however, was never intended, and what emerged was merely some rather innocuous resolutions that the Director-General, acting in co-operation with the ILO, should try to make the activities of UNESCO known to workers, and "to consider, after consultation, if need be, with the trade-union leaders and others concerned with problems of workers' education, the possibility of including in the Organization's future programme certain educational, scientific, and cultural activities having a direct bearing on the needs and

interests of labour and likely to ensure its active participation in UNESCO's work." One delegate was rather hesitant about the whole thing—science, he thought, would be difficult for the workers to understand.

#### DRAFT REGULATIONS CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS TO MEMBER STATES AND INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

This question was extremely complex, and it was quite impossible to contribute usefully to its discussion without exhaustive preliminary study. There was, however, a vast amount of discussion. The Australian and United States delegations seemed well briefed, and legal members of the Commission could have gone on talking indefinitely. A Drafting Committee (Australia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, and United States) prepared a resolution incorporating general principles, which general principles the Secretariat is to bear in mind when drafting a regulation which shall lay down the procedure in making recommendations to member States and international conventions; and the Drafting Committee's resolution was adopted unanimously.

#### AGREEMENT WITH THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT ON PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES FOR UNESCO

This was a straightforward matter, merely dealing with a permanent agreement to replace the provisional one so far existing.

#### ACTIVITIES OF UNESCO IN GERMANY AND JAPAN

These important topics, discussed at the joint meetings of Programme and Budget and External Relations Commissions, have already been dealt with under the heading of *Programme and Budget Commission*.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE COMMISSION

*Chairman* : His Excellency M. LEO MUNDELEER (*Belgium*)

*Vice-Chairman* : Dr. YUAN YUNG LI (*China*)

*Rapporteur* : Mr. P. N. KIRPAL (*India*)

The meetings of the Commission were attended by the Deputy Director-General, Dr. Laves, or by other senior members of the Secretariat. The matters on the agenda were very largely financial, and it was certainly these that caused the greatest discussion; those concerning the staff were little canvassed, nor was there much reason for controversy therein.

## I. THE SECRETARIAT

At Beirut the Director-General was asked to overhaul the Secretariat, and to concentrate a larger measure of administrative responsibility on the heads of programme departments. His report was approved, as an interim report, by the Commission, which believed "that the General Conference will look forward to any further report on this subject which the Director-General may wish to make to the fifth session." In other words, the general feeling was, "so far so good." The New Zealand wish to have the administrative machinery stream-lined is shared, very obviously, by other countries; in fact, as the New Zealand point of view was put so very ably by Australia, the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, the New Zealand delegate held his peace rather than add further words to words. But it must be emphasized that in international administration the stream-lining process can probably not go very far, and that efficiency must, unhappily, be less than the efficiency of a first-rate national Civil Service. There are also different administrative habits and dogmas to consider. For instance, to minds trained in a British administrative system the Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget is an institution of very doubtful value; to American minds, one gathers, it is indispensable.

One point must not be forgotten in any estimation of the work of the Secretariat. This is that they are suffering, and will continue to suffer till the holding of sessions of the General Conference returns to normal, from too many conferences. The fact that this one was called a "short business Conference" made very little difference. Full-blown sessions of the General Conference in December, 1948, September, 1949, and May, 1950, impose an intolerable burden, and, indeed, would impose an intolerable burden on the most efficient organization in the heyday of its strength. Considering that the UNESCO Secretariat has never been allowed to settle down, and considering the distractions on the ablest of its officials, it is remarkable what valuable work those officials have done—at a very heavy price in overwork and worry, it is true. This is not, of course, to argue that all work has been well done, or has been the right work. The Director-General has now been given clear power to terminate the services of any staff member whose work is unsatisfactory.

### *Salary and Allowances System*

There was to be joint study of this by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. As the United Nations had not completed its own study, the UNESCO system is to be continued provisionally as at present, except for certain reductions made in allowances to meet the effect of devaluation; the Director-General to report again at the fifth session of the General Conference.

### *Medical Benefits Scheme*

This was approved without discussion, though the subject will be included in the agenda of the fifth session.

### *Joint Staff Pension Fund*

Three members of the Committee were elected—namely, Professor Carneiro (Brazil), M. Guy de Lacharrière (France), and Mr. K. Holland (U.S.A.)—with alternates from Italy, Poland, and the United Kingdom. All those elected were regarded as extremely competent persons.

## II. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS

There were a number of difficult matters involved here, arising from the general question of the payment by member States of their contributions to UNESCO. One very serious matter is that of *unpaid contributions*—on the payment of which the balancing of the Budget, if it is to be true and not fictitious, quite obviously depends, as the auditors have already pointed out. Suggestions were made as to a course of action to be taken by the Director-General, who was asked to report further to the fifth session.

There was then the question of the *rate at which certain member States should pay*, brought up both by Sweden and by the United States. The first of these is over-assessed by the United Nations scale, on which the UNESCO scale is based; the second has been paying more than the  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent., which is the agreed maximum for normal times of the total UNESCO payments that any one State should make. Both requested reductions. The Commission, though very much in sympathy with Sweden, thought that UNESCO should wait until the United Nations had made an adjustment (which it seems likely to do). The United States proposal was a perhaps more difficult one; for, while United States payments have gone much beyond the agreed maximum, and while the American delegation did not ask for the full reduction to which it felt it was entitled, the request came just when the amount of certain other countries' contributions had been increased through devaluation by amounts of about 30 per cent. in their own currency. To the American proposal—specifically, that the benefit accruing from the entry of new member States into UNESCO should be shared between member States contributing in 1949 on a *pro rata* basis—there was no satisfactory alternative, and it was adopted.

The *currency of contributions* was another awkward point. Brazil wished to pay its contribution for 1950 in French francs instead of dollars. No concession was made, owing to the Organization's great need for hard currencies, both for such programme projects



as the Book Coupon Scheme and for the reconstitution of the Revolving Fund (henceforth to be called the "Working Capital Fund"), owing also to the very embarrassing precedent which would be created by such a concession if other member States who now contribute in dollars came forward with similar requests.

Certain other matters dealt with covered the use of loans to the Secretariat for housing from the Revolving Fund; amendments to the financial regulations; the utilization of certain sorts of miscellaneous income, as, for example, in a Publications Fund; and arrangements for the appointment of auditors from an Audit Panel to be set up by United Nations. Finally, a resolution was forwarded to the General Conference (where it was adopted) instructing the Director-General to negotiate with the French Government "with a view to examining the possibility of establishing in Paris the UNESCO headquarters in a building which would meet the increasing needs of the Organization," and providing for the setting-up of a Headquarters Commission to review the problems of development and maintenance of accommodation—this Commission to report to the fifth session of the General Conference.

It should be added that all the questions arising from payment of contributions were referred to a most excellent sub-committee, whose lucid report helped the Commission enormously; and that this sub-committee was unanimous in praise of the work of its own chairman, Mr. W. G. St. C. Smith, of the Australian delegation.

#### PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

*Chairman*: Dr. J. C. BEAGLEHOLE (*New Zealand*)

*Rapporteur*: Mr. M. MANSFIELD (*United States*)

The Procedure Committee, though not dealing with questions of the same scope or magnitude as, say, the Programme and Budget Commission, nevertheless proved a very interesting Committee. Its agenda seemed on the surface to offer no particular difficulties, and, indeed, to be largely formal; but difficulties did arise, and the Committee became the scene whereon one of the constant under-currents of the Conference—the use of Spanish as a working language—again rose to the surface. Matters of procedure are rarely as simple as they sound, and may, indeed, affect a whole Conference. Provision was made for three meetings of this Committee, but a fourth and fifth had to be added, while a Drafting Sub-committee had more than one long session. The Committee profited from the membership of such delegates as Mr. Justice Nicholas, one of the Australian delegation, Mr. Otis Mulliken, of the United States, and Professor Jakob Nielsen, the very able Dane who was its chairman last year, as well as others.

Of the matters referred to the Committee, one only provoked no discussion beyond compliments. This was merely the reporting of a decision of an Arbitral Tribunal that an outgoing member of the Executive Board might not be re-elected unless he were a member of his country's delegation to the session of the General Conference at which the election took place. The decision of the Tribunal was held to be very elegantly argued.

There was more discussion, at the initial meeting of the Committee, on a draft amendment to Article IV of the Constitution, referred from the Beirut Conference. The effect of this amendment was to deprive of a vote at the General Conference any member State in arrears with its financial contributions, unless the General Conference decided otherwise. The discussion was over a further—Australian—amendment that such decision should have effect for one session only, which, in the end, the Committee held was needless. One or two delegations were opposed to this amendment, and one voted against it in General Conference.

A draft amendment to Article V, paragraph 3, of the Constitution arose from the necessity of adjusting the terms of office (normally three years) of members of the Executive Board to the situation arising from the holding of three sessions of the General Conference so close together. Members can be elected only by the General Conference. The question was whether, in order to get into step with sessions held from the present one onwards, some members should be given an extended term, or one slightly shorter than three years. There was a great deal of discussion over the constitutional theory in the abstract, though the difficulties were nullified in reality by the fact that outgoing members were almost bound to be re-elected at this (Paris) session. It was possible, therefore, in the end to persuade the Committee to adopt the common-sense solution (supported by New Zealand), which, in the outcome, was justified by the resignation of two outgoing members two months before the completion of their constitutional term of office. A draft amendment to Article V of the Constitution must now be circulated to member States before it can be adopted by the fifth session, and will need consequential alteration to Rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure.

When it came to discussion of Rule 33 of the Rules of Procedure, it was thought best to call on a sub-committee. This rule was ambiguous, for as it stood it seemed both to infringe the competence of the International Court of Justice where interpretation of the Constitution was concerned, and to leave vague the delimitation of competence between the International Court and a possible Arbitral Tribunal. Some delegations were much concerned about simple majorities and two-thirds majorities, and there were in all

five drafts of amendments, from which the sub-committee (Mexico, Canada, United States, Australia, Greece, and Secretariat) evolved a quite sensible set of clauses, which was duly adopted by the General Conference.

When the Rapporteur's draft report came up for consideration, the Mexican delegate took the floor on the subject of Spanish as a working language of the Conference—carrying on an argument that was in full flood at Beirut. It should be explained that where simultaneous interpretation is in operation, Spanish is in fact used and interpreted, but not in consecutive interpretation; and all Conference documents are produced only in English and French. Discussion was postponed till the afternoon, when the report had been disposed of. It then appeared that there were two schools of thought over procedure—determined, one may suggest, by their opinions on the use of Spanish as much as their reading of the rules. The Mexican delegation wished to have discussed amendments to Rules 52 and 55, those dealing with languages. It was replied that that could not be done, as proper notice had not been given. The Mexican reply was that notice had virtually been given, through a very vague reservation in the Mexican approval of the general procedure of the Conference given in plenary session. The Chairman, having previously carried out some study of the Rules of Procedure, formally ruled that the matter could be discussed, without prejudice, under the heading of "Other Business." Amid a great deal of cross-talk, the Chairman's ruling was disagreed with on a point of order, and put to the vote. The vote being equally divided, and there being no further business, the Chairman was forced, under another rule, to adjourn the meeting. He stated the position to the General Committee, partly to warn them of the confusion and partly to arrange another meeting. The General Committee asked the Procedure Committee to make a study of the rules, and to have the question of substance discussed at this further meeting, the understanding being that it would be examined by the Secretariat and the Executive Board before the fifth session, and then put on the agenda. As it was obviously impossible for the Committee to study the rules at that stage (1 October), the Chairman made the study himself, and got the Committee to approve of a series of questions to the legal Secretariat designed to lead to clarification and co-ordination. The way was thus cleared for the Latin-Americans to become very eloquent on both practical and spiritual aspects of their amendments; the opposing argument, that the question was purely a technical one of the most efficient way to conduct a Conference, being extremely well put by Professor Nielsen. It was thus possible, when everybody had talked himself out, to get passed a general motion recommending to the General

Conference an exhaustive examination of the question of the use of Spanish as a third working language, and the submission of a report to the fifth session, as arranged with the General Committee. The great achievement of this meeting, probably, was to have had the subject discussed in an atmosphere of moderate calm.

*In view of the proposal to place it on the agenda of the next session of the Conference, there is a necessity for some consideration by the National Commission of the New Zealand point of view.*

### ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The terms of office of six members of the Executive Board expired in 1949. Of these, two—Resat Nuri Guntekin (Turkey) and Dr. George D. Stoddard (United States)—did not seek re-election. There was strong support for a Turkish representative, put forward in a circular from the delegation of Iraq, supported by Egypt, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. This possibly had some effect; at any rate, seven nominations were made—a Turk was one of the six elected. The six persons elected seemed to be regarded as strong and useful members, actual or potential, of the Board. Voting was by roll-call and secret ballot.

The following persons were elected (the first four re-elected):—

M. Roger Seydoux (France).

Professor Paulo de Berredo Carneiro (Brazil).

Professor Alf Sommerfelt (Norway).

H. E. Dr. C. Parra-Perez.

Mr. Luther H. Evans (United States).

M. Kudsi Tecer (Turkey).

### THE “GENERAL SUBJECT”

It appears that at Beirut some delegates thought that if the fourth session were purely a “business” one it might lack interest; so, to provide interest, a subject for public discussion was evolved. This subject was phrased, “What are the duties of the State in regard to education, science, and culture for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between peoples and what practical steps should it take in order to discharge these duties?” UNESCO’s member States, through their National Commissions, were invited to study the subject, and to send to the Conference both statements of their conclusions upon it, and speakers among their delegates who would contribute to the general discussion or debate. Some countries took the matter very seriously. In Australia, for example,

use was made of the discussion groups which flourish under the broadcasting system to give it thorough consideration, and a great mass of material was sent Professor A. K. Stout, an Australian delegate with the exclusive task of speaking upon it, to be incorporated in his address. The United Kingdom added Earl Russell (Bertrand Russell) to its delegation as speaker; the United States sent Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr. A large number of statements were sent to the Conference and circulated; these seemed, in their phraseology, to reflect national characteristics very clearly. Norway even suggested a general declaration of the duties of the State in regard to education science, and culture. In the end twenty-six speakers were listed for performance at the three special plenary sessions to be held at the Maison de la Chimie, rue St. Dominique, on the evenings of 27, 28, and 29 September, and lasting from 9 p.m. till midnight.

Naturally this prospect afflicted the General Committee, and others, with alarm, for certain speeches were understood to be already composed and to require upwards of an hour to deliver. A round-table discussion or brains trust had been envisaged by some people, but was regarded as presenting too many difficulties. At various meetings of the General Committee and of the potential speakers the New Zealand delegate proposed three main speakers, one each night, and very short contributions from others; and this proposition failing, offered himself to withdraw. This step was followed by other withdrawals, so many that all were reinstated, and a committee resolved on twenty-minute addresses by three speakers each night, followed by fifteen-minute periods of statement or debate from five to six other speakers. The system thus worked out was designed to give scope to celebrities, and also to a sufficient number of geographical and cultural representatives. Any possible wounded feelings were afforded balm by the prospective printing of full scripts.

Surprisingly enough, this experiment in international co-operation was not entirely unsuccessful, though there was general agreement that any other such experiment in the future must be much more carefully planned and limited. There could be no real debate. The public came and the public stayed. There was simultaneous interpretation over the whole large hall. Dr. Beaglehole spoke on the first night, and what he said appeared to provoke some interest. The whole discussion was recorded, and extracts from Earl Russell's and Dr. Beaglehole's addresses were sent to America for broadcasting.

To a New Zealand audience, probably the most interesting contributions would have been those of Earl Russell (for amusement), and of the Swiss educationist Professor Jean Piaget and the Australian Professor Stout (for instruction). One or two other contributions, no doubt, would have struck it with blank amazement.

The full list of speakers which follows will indicate how truly widespread and serious is the attention to what may be called, briefly, international education :—

*Tuesday, 27 September.*—M. Georges Bidault (France), Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr (United States), Professor Zerega Fombona (Venezuela), Professor Osorio de Almeida (Brazil), Professor G. Vedovato (Italy), Dr. J. C. Beaglehole (New Zealand), M. Jamal Farra (Syria), H. E. Proceso E. Sebastian (Philippines).

*Wednesday, 28 September.*—Professor Jean Piaget (Switzerland), Professor Ferdinand Herzik (Czechoslovakia), Mr. U. Ba Lwin (Burma), Mgr. Jean Maroun (Lebanon), Professor Adam Schaff (Poland), Mr. Roberto Ibanez (Uruguay), Professor Frisch (Denmark), Dr. B. Ernst Buschbeck (Austria), Mr. Tara Chand (India).

*Thursday, 29 September.*—Earl Russell (United Kingdom), Rector Siassi (Iran), M. Eugène Gustave Dupréel (Belgium), Professor Alf Sommerfelt (Norway), Professor A. K. Stout (Australia), Dr. Inès Segura Bustamente (Cuba), M. Jacques Rueff (Monaco), Dr. Mei Yi-Chi (China), H. E. Antonio Castro Leal (Mexico).

#### INFORMAL MEETINGS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NATIONAL COMMISSIONS

There were two of these meetings. Professor Marcel Florin (Belgium) was voted to the chair. Three main topics were discussed : (1) the agenda for the more formal meeting to be held at the fifth session ; (2) liaison between National Commissions and UNESCO House ; (3) the distribution of " paper."

(1) There was a good deal of discussion of the agenda, and of the exact wording of items to be set down therein, under the heading of *Programme Activities of National Commissions*. The effect of this discussion was certainly to make the draft agenda look more logical, and so perhaps it was worth while.

(2) *Liaison.*—The discussion here hinged round a Turkish proposal (seconded by Cuba) for a three weeks' meeting of representatives of National Commissions in the near future. The New Zealand delegate made the point that though it was relatively easy for some countries to send delegates continually to Paris, it was very difficult for a small country like New Zealand, far away and with a small population. As a result, the financial aspect of the proposal was well discussed. This may not have influenced the gathering much, but there was ample opposition to the Turkish proposal from other quarters. The general feeling was that further visits from secretaries of National Commissions should be encouraged, and that there might be a three-day meeting immediately prior to the

Florence Conference, among the delegates to which the different Governments should include members of National Commissions. In the end the proposal was voted down, with the proviso that the Secretariat should report on its possibilities for some future time at the three-day meeting which was now clearly envisaged.

(3) The discussion here was linked up with the liaison question, and linked up too with every other proposal to get lazy National Commissions working. It rose from the mention of collaboration between the Secretariat and the Commissions; Australia and the United Kingdom delegations, obviously well briefed, spoke with deep feeling, as the New Zealand leader had done in plenary session. To the complaints against the flood of documents which poured in on National Commissions, Mr. Menzies, who is in charge of this branch of activity, made a pretty effective reply. His argument was based partly on the technique and the economics of production, and partly on the plea that if National Commissions would not say how many documents they wanted they had to be sent an average number—which was too few for some and far too many, no doubt, for others. At the same time, the matter was recognized as serious at headquarters, and an expert committee was to discuss it. Among the difficulties is that of staffing, for reduction of “wordage” calls for highly skilled editorial work, and competent people are extremely hard to come by in either English or French. This last consideration applies also to printed publications. It must certainly be conceded that the physical appearance of UNESCO publications has improved greatly in the past twelve months.

#### MEETING OF EXPERTS ON BOOK COUPON SCHEME

This meeting covered three days, 4-6 October, and a New Zealand delegate was asked to attend as an observer. The delegation did its best, but could manage no more than one half-day, which was devoted partly to the sins of Customs Departments. The scheme is certainly meeting with increasing success; though, as the working-paper points out, “Experience has shown that negotiations with Governments for participation in the scheme proceed very slowly unless sufficient pressure is brought to bear upon the Governments from consumer groups.” Our present report cannot really add to knowledge of the scheme and its working, but presumably a separate report will be circulated by the Secretariat.

#### SPECIAL CELEBRATIONS

As part of its cultural work, UNESCO this year has celebrated the bicentenary of the birth of Goethe and the centenary of the death of Chopin by activities deemed appropriate. The beginning of the Conference was signaled by the appearance of a symposium

on Goethe in English and French, contributed to by a number of eminent persons of various nationalities; and on the night of 3 October a concert was held at the Salle Gaveau at which were performed works by eleven composers, specially written for the occasion at UNESCO's request, in the different orders of chamber music. The Goethe book was well produced, and the Chopin concert was interesting; but it may be necessary to decide how far this sort of celebration should continue, and where the line should be drawn that would exclude a cultural hero from formal international commemoration. The bicentenary of the death of J. S. Bach falls in 1950, and there may be other suitable dates in the offing; but it is perhaps fortunate for the Secretariat that Handel did not die till 1759, and that Shakespeare and Cervantes were not born till 1564.

In connection with the campaign to popularize the Declaration of Human Rights, UNESCO sponsored an exhibition showing the slow recognition of these rights over the course of centuries. This was opened in the Musée Galliéra on 30 September by M. Yvon Delbos, the Minister of National Education, acting for the President, M. Auriol, who was indisposed. This subject hardly seems at first consideration to lend itself to display, but the display was admirably conceived and most brilliantly carried out. More conventional exhibits were documents of cardinal importance in the history of democratic government lent by member States, particularly France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States; and it was most moving to read the originals of, for example, Jefferson's Declaration of Independence with Benjamin Franklin's marginal notes, and Abraham Lincoln's autograph reading copy of the Gettysburg speech. The architect of this exhibition was an Englishman, Claude Entwistle, though all the work was French.

## RECEPTIONS

There were, of course, numerous receptions, among which the New Zealand delegates made a judicious selection. Among them nothing could exceed the interest of the Government reception in the sculpture galleries of the Louvre, with its sudden darkness and the single miraculously flood-lit figure of the Winged Victory. Here at least was seen one of the supreme triumphs of the human spirit.

The New Zealand delegation, as its contribution to the less formal side of the Conference activities, gave a small luncheon party.

## IMPRESSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A delegation comes away from such a Conference as this with certain well-defined impressions—some superficial, such as those of the close and stifling heat of this particular autumn weather in



Paris, and of the flags and plaster cherubs, the mirrors and large chandeliers of the giant converted hotel which is UNESCO House. There was also a plaster eloquence, a sort of chandelier glitter about a good deal of phraseology—at any rate in plenary sessions ; but this again is superficial. The building is sound enough and stands up. Perhaps UNESCO by this time is beginning to be fundamentally sound, and will stand up. It is certainly a good deal more than mere facade.

One encouraging thing about UNESCO is that it is taken really seriously by serious countries. The importance that the United Kingdom and the United States, for instance, place on UNESCO is reflected in their excellent delegations, and in the care with which they prepare both for the Conference as a whole and for its individual discussions. The British delegation was led by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education, Mr. D. R. Hardman, and included so able a man as Sir John Maud, the Permanent Secretary for Education, as well as several extremely able and experienced colleagues. The Ministry of Education has a considerable section working continuously on UNESCO affairs and continuously in touch with Paris. The American leader was the Hon. George V. Allen, an Assistant Secretary of State ; it included Mr. Luther H. Evans, the Librarian of Congress, Mr. Zuk, one of the outstanding educationists of America, and several other men of great acuteness and experience ; while it was accompanied by advisers, one of whom, Miss Myrna Loy, adviser on the film in mass communication, came at times close to “stealing the show.” A number of other delegates, whose names need not be mentioned in these paragraphs, are well known both in their own countries and in international spheres for their union of scholarship and administrative ability. The Australian delegation was admirable in balance and knowledge. It is these men who give the General Conference its intellectual stiffening, and they would stand out in any assembly. It is by them that New Zealand must measure its own needs in representation ; and we emphasize again the points made in the Introduction to this report.

All these countries have continual close personal contact with UNESCO. Now that New Zealand has a Legation in Paris, it is perhaps relevant to suggest that such contact should be aimed at on our side too, as a supplement to the contact by correspondence of the officers of the National Commission. At the same time, any chance of seconding a really first-rate New Zealander into the Secretariat for a period should not be lost, for the benefit that would accrue to New Zealand in experience and knowledge would be not less than the benefit to an international Civil Service. We had ample evidence of the selfless and really brilliant work done

by Dr. Beeby during his period of office, both from members of the Secretariat and from delegates who have helped to form UNESCO from the beginning; and his work has made New Zealand better known as well as himself. We are convinced that the Government did good service to the country by lending him to UNESCO. Miss McPhee, in the External Relations Division of the Secretariat, is widely known as a devoted, as well as able, officer. Our country should do its best to maintain this level.

Another general impression is that of the success attained in the working of international committees when the political element was absent. The General Committee and some of the sub-committees especially provided excellent examples of this; and it was interesting to observe how often a good and agreed solution emerged from dissident views across the paths provided by the translation service. The multiplicity of personalities, many of them very striking, present at the Conference made this phenomenon itself all the more striking. It owed something to good chairmanship; but a chairman obviously has less immediate and constant control over a meeting which is being carried on in two or three languages, even with good translation, than if every one is speaking the same mother-tongue. There is scope for study in this.

The work of the Secretariat visible in Paris to delegates to a Conference seems to be improving a good deal, and one can but hope desperately for the day when the load of too many Conferences will be lifted. It is difficult to say whether there are too many publications or not; the number is increasing rather than decreasing. Some of them, either produced directly by UNESCO from its own funds, like the new *Catalogue of Colour Reproductions of Painting from 1860 to 1949*, or the work of an independent publisher under UNESCO encouragement, like the *Masaccio* portfolio, are excellent. The general standard of printing and production as noted elsewhere has certainly improved. Probably some waste effort is inevitable at this time, and the fittest will survive.

Of the normal working of such forms of mass communication as radio broadcasting it was difficult to get an idea. At the Conference all concerned were working at great pressure, day and night. The New Zealand delegation was seized on to record broadcasts, as were other delegations or particular persons, and the recording seemed to be done with technical skill.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (880 copies), £52 10s.

---

By Authority: R. E. OWEN, Government Printer, Wellington.—1950.

Price 9d.]