



United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

UNRESTRICTED

A/AC.28/SR 11
2 September 1949

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Thursday, 1 September 1949, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Item 5 of the agenda:

(c) Educational conditions (A/AC.28/W.12,
(A/AC.28/W.13, A/AC.28/W.15)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. GERIG	United States of America
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. HOOD	Australia
	Mr. RYCKMANS	Belgium
	Mr. de OURO PRETO	Brazil
	Mr. TIEH-TSENG LI	China
	Mr. SVEISTRUP	Denmark
	Mr. de MARCHENA	Dominican Republic
	Mr. FARRAG	Egypt
	Mr. GARREAU	France
	Mr. SHIVA RAO	India
	Mr. SPITS	Netherlands
	Mr. LAKING	New Zealand
	Mr. GRAFSTROM	Sweden
	Mr. SOLDATOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. STOLK	Venezuela

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. CORTESAO

United Nations Educational Scientific
and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Mr. HILL

World Health Organization (WHO)

Secretariat:

Mr. HOO

Assistant Secretary-General

Mr. BENSON

Committee Secretary

ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA: (c) EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS (A/AC.28/W.12, A/AC.28/W.13, A/AC.28/W.15)(discussion continued)

Mr. STOLK (Venezuela) recalled that at the previous meeting some representatives had questioned both the Committee's competence to adopt the kind of resolution submitted to it by the Drafting Sub-Committee and the General Assembly's competence to make recommendations to the administering Powers.

On the first point, Mr. Stolk remarked that the provisions of the draft resolution in question were in conformity with the Committee's terms of reference as defined in paragraph 2 of Resolution 219 (III). There was consequently no doubt that the Committee was entitled to examine and adopt the text submitted by the Sub-Committee. Rightly or wrongly, the General Assembly had in fact given the Committee a certain task it was bound to carry out.

Regarding the second point, Mr. Stolk referred to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter which stated that "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state". The question therefore was clearly to define the scope of the words "domestic jurisdiction" and "intervene".

The decisions of the International Court of Justice seemed to imply that as the Powers responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories had assumed certain specific obligations in respect of those territories, under Article 73 of the Charter, they were not justified in maintaining that the Sub-Committee's recommendations pertained to a question which was essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

As regards the word "intervene", Mr. Stolk recalled that from the discussions at San Francisco it appeared that recommendations drafted in general terms and not addressed to any country in particular did not constitute intervention in domestic matters.

/Mr. GERIG

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) stated that his delegation was in the main inclined to share Mr. Stolk's view on the legal aspect of the question. On the practical aspect of the problem, he agreed with Mr. Ryckmans that discrimination, the use of languages in schools, illiteracy and a number of other questions examined by the Committee were matters which did not concern only Non-Self-Governing Territories. Adoption of the Sub-Committee draft resolution, however, might induce other United Nations organs to examine those problems on a world-wide plane. He therefore felt that the Committee should continue to consider the text and the proposed amendments thereto, especially as the draft resolution imposed no obligation on the Powers responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Mr. GARREAU (France) approved the explanations of Mr. Stolk and Mr. Gerig, but wished to stress that Article 73 of the Charter constituted merely a moral commitment by the Powers concerned, and that the Charter provided no penalties to ensure respect for that commitment. In accordance with the spirit of that same Charter, the General Assembly was entitled to keep itself informed of the achievements resulting from that commitment. As for the Special Committee, it was empowered under its terms of reference to offer recommendations on technical questions. That was why the French delegation had never opposed the substance of the Egyptian proposal. As the Sub-Committee had succeeded in removing the drafting defects to which he had objected, he could give the Sub-Committee's draft resolution his unqualified support.

The French delegation, however, had proposed two modifications in the text for the sole purpose of making it more acceptable to the representatives of the United Kingdom and Belgium. If those two representatives could not accept the text as amended, Mr. Garreau would be prepared to withdraw his suggestions.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) recognized the Committee's right to adopt resolutions on technical questions, but objected to any implied directives or instructions to the Powers in the resolutions. The first part of the Sub-Committee text had precisely that shortcoming, and the amendment proposed by the French representative did not alter it.

As regards the second part of the draft resolution, he would not object to it provided the words "in collaboration with the Administering Members" were deleted, as Mr. Garreau proposed.

After a brief discussion in which Mr. LAMING, Mr. RYCKMANS, Mr. GARREAU, Mr. TIEH-TSING LI and Mr. SHIVA RAO took part, the representatives of France and India withdrew their amendments to the first part of the draft resolution. In addition, Mr. Garreau withdrew his proposed amendment to the second part and stated that he would vote for the New Zealand amendment.

The CHAIRMAN announced that in accordance with the Australian representative's request at the preceding meeting, he would put the two parts of the text to the vote separately.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) asked whether the Sub-Committee's draft resolution was to be voted on by parts or divided into two separate draft resolutions. For his part, he would prefer the latter course.

The CHAIRMAN put the question to the vote.

It was decided, by 14 votes to none, that the Sub-Committee's text should be divided into two separate resolutions, one to contain the first part and the other the second part of the Sub-Committee's resolution.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendment to the first part, replacing the words "take the necessary steps" by the phrase: "take, where necessary, steps..."

The amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN put the first resolution, as amended, to the vote.
The resolution was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment, to delete the second sentence of the second resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Belgian amendment, to invite UNESCO to undertake a general study of the use of languages which were not widespread as languages of instruction.

There being 4 votes in favour and 4 against, the proposal was not adopted.

/Mr. HOOD

Mr. HOCD (Australia) withdrew his amendment, adding the following phrase to the third paragraph: "and with eventual reference to the Economic and Social Council".

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the New Zealand amendment, supported by France, to delete the words "in collaboration with the Administering Members" and to add the following final paragraph: "expresses the hope that, in accordance with the obligation accepted under Article 73 (d) of the Charter, the Administering Members will collaborate with UNESCO in the conduct of such a study."

The New Zealand amendment was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendment, to add to the third paragraph the words: "taking account in such a study of the experience of other States in this matter."

The amendment was adopted by 11 votes to one, with one abstention.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the first sentence of the second resolution should be put to the vote separately.

The sentence was adopted by 14 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the last two paragraphs of the second resolution.

The two paragraphs were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the second resolution as a whole to the vote.

The second resolution as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to 2, with one abstention.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) explained that he had voted against the resolution because he considered it unreasonable and inconsistent to invite UNESCO to undertake a study of a worldwide problem in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN thought that the amendment proposed by the United States had been designed to meet that objection.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) wholeheartedly supported the Belgian representative. With regard to the United States amendment, he thought that a similar clause should have been included in the first resolution.

Mr. COMESAO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) assured the representatives of the United Kingdom and Belgium that he would convey their views to the Director-General of his organization.

Draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic concerning the eradication of illiteracy (A/AC.28/W.13)

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) wished to replace paragraph (c) of his original text by the following:

"(c) to recommend that the Secretary-General collaborate with UNESCO in any necessary studies on the basis of the information transmitted under Article 73 (e), of any relevant supplementary information and of any relevant studies undertaken by the Trusteeship Council with regard to Trust Territories."

He pointed out that his proposal was of a general nature, that it dealt with technical matters, and that it was therefore entirely in accordance with the Committee's terms of reference.

Moreover, it proposed no immediate measure and imposed no obligation on the Powers responsible for Non-Self-Governing Territories. Its object was simply that UNESCO should make a preliminary study, with a view to a large-scale campaign against illiteracy, and draw up a plan of action to that end.

Mr. GERIG (United States of America) proposed the addition of a paragraph (d), as follows:

"(d) to invite UNESCO to take into account in such a study the experience of other States in this matter."

/Mr. de MARCHENA

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) agreed to include that paragraph in his draft resolution.

Mr. GARREAU (France) asked the representative of the Dominican Republic to explain what he meant by a plan of action.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) explained that the plan he had in mind should provide the Committee with material on which to formulate a resolution on the matter. The plan might also be based on information concerning the fight against illiteracy which UNESCO might request from Member States generally.

Mr. de Marchena cited the remarkable plan of mass education drawn up and carried out in Mexico under the direction of Mr. Torres Bodet, formerly Minister of Education and now Director-General of UNESCO. It had had splendid results and might be followed in several countries.

Mr. GARREAU (France) asked the representative of the Dominican Republic whether the fight against illiteracy in each Non-Self-Governing territory was to be carried out with the assistance of foreign teams or with local personnel.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) gave a short summary of his own country's experience in the matter. The Dominican Republic had benefited from the advice of a team of Chilean professors. It would, in turn, be ready to put technical advisers at the disposal of any country anxious to profit by its experience.

Mr. STOLK (Venezuela) supported Mr. de Marchena's proposal. He thought, however, that it should be shown more clearly to whom the plan of action indicated in sub-paragraph (a) was to be addressed; whether to the General Assembly, to the Powers responsible for the Non-Self-Governing territories, or to the General Assembly for transmission to those Powers.

He also proposed that the word "reduce" in paragraph (a) should be changed to "suppress".

Mr. GARREAU (France) said that the Dominican Republic draft resolution differed intrinsically from the two resolutions just adopted by the Committee. Though he agreed with the substance of it, he could not accept it as it stood.

/The execution

The execution of such a plan as that envisaged in the draft resolution raised a question of local administration, since the Administering Authority would have in part to surrender its sovereignty over the territory concerned in favour of the specialized agency carrying out the plan. He did not consider that such a system was necessary, or even acceptable, in view of the fact that experts from the Administering Authorities had already been investigating the question of fighting illiteracy in the various Non-Self-Governing Territories for a considerable time.

For that reason he thought it would be better to postpone consideration of the draft resolution in its current form, or to set up a small committee to consider it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) agreed with the French representative's view. UNESCO was the most qualified body to undertake a study of the question. It might properly be asked to decide what were the most effective and least burdensome means of carrying out a useful campaign against illiteracy, using the experience of certain countries in order to avoid repeating mistakes of method. He therefore considered that the proposal in paragraph (a) of the draft resolution was not opportune; moreover, if UNESCO were to draw up a plan for a particular territory in accordance with that provision, it might find it impossible to carry it out, since its own statute did not allow it to take any positive action without the approval of the Administering Authority concerned.

He would gladly agree that UNESCO should be asked to make a general study, and that all the Members of the United Nations should then be invited to apply the methods which it recommended.

In general, therefore, he endorsed the spirit of the draft resolution under discussion, but could not accept the text as it stood.

Mr. SHIVA RAO (India) said that recently great efforts had been made to stamp out illiteracy in India. In that connexion he pointed out that a study centre would shortly be established in New Delhi to deal with the question of education in the rural areas.

He thought that the fruits of those experiences, combined with any observations UNESCO might have to offer, would be very useful and would help to solve the problem. He shared the Belgian representative's point of view as to the advisability of profiting from the experience of certain countries. That was why he supported the United States proposal to add a new paragraph (d) to that effect to the Dominican Republic draft resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that illiteracy was a problem to be found not only in Non-Self-Governing Territories but also in some sovereign States. However, it was obvious that the Committee was not competent to invite UNESCO to undertake a study of the question on a world-wide basis, although that was the form in which such a study would produce the best results. Nor was the Committee competent to ask UNESCO to carry out a study limited to Non-Self-Governing Territories. In any case such a resolution would be superfluous since it was UNESCO's purpose to study the problem.

The best solution would therefore be to ask UNESCO to keep the Non-Self-Governing Territories in mind if it undertook a general study of illiteracy.

He could not accept the draft resolution as it had been presented.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) felt that the French representative's objections were not justified. The plan envisaged in the draft resolution was far from being carried out, and, besides, to carry it out would require long and detailed studies. Actually all that was required was to ask a specialized agency to consider means of fighting illiteracy in collaboration with the Powers concerned. Nor could there be any question of a world-wide plan, since the Committee was not competent to formulate any such recommendation. Should the draft resolution be adopted, any plan that UNESCO might draw up would have to be approved by the General Assembly, which, in its turn, would recommend its implementation to the various governments. Therefore, there should be no fear of UNESCO infringing upon sovereignty.

With regard to the wording of his proposal, he would accept the amendments suggested by the representatives of Venezuela and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of the United States, wondered whether, in the interest of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Committee could not recommend to the General Assembly that it propose a study of the problem on a world-wide basis. The General Assembly was in fact fully competent to take such a step.

Mr. STOLK (Venezuela) pointed out that the General Assembly had given the Committee specific terms of reference, limited to Non-Self-Governing Territories. Mr. Gorio's proposal went beyond the limits of those terms of reference. In any case the General Assembly would take note of the Committee's report, which would set forth the viewpoints on the advantages of a study on a world-wide basis and each delegation would be free to raise the question there.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) considered that, in view of the importance in the Non-Self-Governing Territories of certain problems which also arose in certain independent States, the Committee could properly recommend that the specialized agencies should study those problems as such.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the representatives of the administering Powers showed a lack of logic. When the discussion touched on questions the normal solution to which might run contrary to the interests of their Governments, they argued that the Committee was not competent to deal with them and make recommendations to the General Assembly, which in its turn would not be competent to consider them. In other circumstances, such as the current instance, those same representatives on the contrary argued that the Committee was competent to recommend measures affecting all sovereign States Members of the United Nations. There was a manifest contradiction between those two attitudes, which could only be explained by the need to maintain an indefensible position.

The USSR delegation unreservedly supported the principle of the Dominican Republic's proposal, namely, the need to take steps to stamp out illiteracy in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It felt, however, that an important amendment should be made to the proposed text. The state of education in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was due to the fact that the Powers responsible ^{had not} made all the necessary

/ efforts in

efforts in the field. It would be a mistake to believe that the situation was due to lack of a plan or method of solving the problem. Consequently if the Committee adopted a resolution such as that submitted by the Dominican Republic, it would give the interested Powers an excuse for not taking concrete measures immediately on the pretext that a study was under way and that a plan would have to be drawn up. The Committee should therefore make effective recommendations and put the Powers administering the Non-Self-Governing Territories under an obligation to take the measures needed to stamp out illiteracy without delay.

He hoped that the Dominican Republic proposal would be so amended as to make it of more practical use and better adapted to the immediate interests of the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Mr. CORTESAO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) thought that he could answer the comments of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom by drawing attention to a resolution adopted by the Third General Conference of UNESCO on 4 December 1948. Under the terms of that resolution UNESCO would continue to collaborate with the United Nations and, through the interested Powers, with the Trusteeship Territories and the Non-Self-Governing Territories. That showed that UNESCO would never undertake any action without previous agreement with the Powers administering Non-Self-Governing Territories.

He pointed out that the question of illiteracy was one of the primary preoccupations of UNESCO. He was not in a position to define the method UNESCO would take to carry out the task the General Assembly might entrust to it if it should adopt the Dominican Republic proposal. But he could assure the members of the Committee that UNESCO would never take any initiative not completely in conformity with the resolution previously mentioned.

Mr. GARREAU (France) quoted some press articles by Mr. Torres Bodet, Director-General of UNESCO, which said that UNESCO would make a special study of the question of illiteracy in the under-developed countries and that a study of that subject would be submitted to the next General Conference.

Thus UNESCO was drawing up a plan to fight illiteracy in the under-developed countries, without limiting itself to Non-Self-Governing Territories. If UNESCO were asked to make a special study with regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would seem that such a study should logically be a part of the general study under way.

He unreservedly supported the substance of the Dominican Republic proposal. He objected to its wording only because it should be brought into line with realities, in other words it should take account of the general plan of UNESCO to fight illiteracy in the under-developed countries as a whole.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) considered that the explanations given by the representative of UNESCO made the Dominican Republic proposal unnecessary; the problem was being studied by UNESCO, in which all the States members of the Committee were represented.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked whether the UNESCO representative could explain whether the adoption of a resolution based on the Dominican Republic proposal would duplicate or harm the work already undertaken by UNESCO.

Mr. CORTESAO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that UNESCO was studying a general problem. Its work would not therefore be hampered by the adoption of the Dominican Republic proposal.

Mr. GARREAU (France) pointed out that since UNESCO was interested in the problem of illiteracy in the under-developed countries, it would necessarily deal with that question in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Nevertheless he saw no reason not to point out that the Committee was interested in the problem of illiteracy in those territories, within the framework of UNESCO's study.

In answer to a question from the representative of the Dominican Republic, Mr. Garreau added that he would be happy to collaborate in the drafting of a new proposal based on the Dominican proposal.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the establishment of a sub-committee to draft a new resolution.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that, in view of past experience, it would be useless to have recourse to a special drafting sub-committee for that particular case. He suggested that the representatives of the Dominican Republic and France should hold informal consultations to draft a joint proposal. Alternatively he suggested that a real drafting sub-committee should be established to deal with all cases arising.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.