

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

RESTRICTED
E/C.2/W.20/Add.1
4 January 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSULTATION WITH
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
(COUNCIL NGO COMMITTEE)

FURTHER INFORMATION RELATING TO THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL NGO
COMMITTEE SUBMITTED TO THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC
AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, THE CONSIDERATION OF WHICH WAS
POSTPONED TO THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

/FURTHER

FURTHER MATERIAL RELATING TO PART V OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

(Applications of Non-Governmental Organizations Relating to
Consultative Status; E/940/Add.3)

A. International Committee of Scientific Management

(Comité international de l'Organisation scientifique)

(File No. ECA 10/1/0860)

Chêne-Bourg, Case Postale 18277,

Geneva, Switzerland

President: Mr. Assar Gabrielsson (Sweden)

Secretary: Mr. Hugo de Haan (Switzerland)

References:

E/C.2/W.10, pages 34-36

E/C.2/SR.W.38, page 17

E/940/Add.3, Part B, page 3.

The following communication from the Secretary-General of this organization reached the Secretariat on 28 December 1948:

"ECA 10/1/0860

December 14, 1948

Mr. Lyman WHITE

Non-Governmental Organizations Section

Division of Coordination and Liaison

United Nations,

Lake Success,

NEW-YORK

Dear Mr. White,

1. May I acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter of October, 21st, 1948, from which appears

a) That the Economic & Social Council of the United Nations has postponed consideration of the Report of the Committee on Arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations until its eighth session which will begin on 7th Febr. 1949, at Lake Success;

b) That the above-mentioned Committee has decided not to recommend consultative status to be granted to the International Committee of Scientific Management.

I understand from Part B of the Document E/940/Add.3, enclosed with your letter, that such negative decisions may be taken

either because the respective Organizations can be brought more appropriately into consultation with one or the other of the specialized agencies,

/or because

or because these organizations do not meet the requirements laid down in the Council's resolution of 21st June 1946.

2. These requirements are enumerated in the Document E/43/Rev.2, 1st July 1946, as follows:

1. ... to be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Economic & Social Council;
2. ... aims and purposes in conformity with spirit, purposes, principles of the UNO charter;
3. ... not to be discredited by past collaboration in fascist activities;
4. ... to be of recognized standing ... represent a substantial proportion of the ... particular field of interest;
5. ... have established headquarters with an executive officer ... a policy-making body.
6. ... have authority to speak for its members;
7. ... be international in its structure.

3. When you sent us on 1st December 1947 the questionnaire E/Form 3, 16th April 1946, we filled in the data asked for with a view to prove that the CIOS lives up entirely to all the above mentioned requirements, as we were then and still are convinced in good conscience that it does indeed do so.

Should we have failed to convey this conviction and to deliver this proof to the Committee in a satisfactory way, we would consider it our right and our duty to submit such supplementary data and explanatory information as may be necessary to clarify possible misunderstandings and to dispel possible misinterpretations.

In this case we would only request you to specify as to which requirement or requirements CIOS is presumed not to have complied with.

The negative recommendation of the Committee is a verdict so serious in its implications and so far-reaching in its consequences that we cannot believe that its reasons and arguments should not be specified to the defendant, and his appeal admitted, according to normal and fair legal procedure.

Should on the other hand the decision of the Committee not be based on the point of requirements but on the other one, viz. that our Organization can be brought more appropriately into consultation with one or the other of the specialized agencies, I venture to suggest the following arguments for the Committee's consideration:

a) CIOS was, as a matter of fact, connected from 1927 up to 1938 in one way or another with the International Labour Organization. But this

connection was strictly limited to that field of Scientific Management which concerns the "human factor", while its manifold economic aspects and problems were dealt with in cooperation between CIOS (and its former Institute in Geneva) and the Economic organs of the League of Nations.

While the present Secretary of CIOS is a retired official of the ILO, to whom a room in its Geneva premises has been granted as a personal favor, CIOS has since the war not entered into any sort of official connection with the International Labour Organization.

Highly desirous of stressing in its international connections both its basical interests - (economic and social alike) - it does not wish to appear by a one-sided connection with the Labour Organization, to be entangled with Labour politics, without counterbalancing this one-sided connection in a firm contact with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

b) CIOS has been admitted to the benefit of consultative arrangements with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization by the General Conference of UNESCO, at its second session in Mexico, 1947.

This connection is probably justified by the scientific character of our Organization; but it is obvious that the scientific aspect of the Management Movement has, since its more recent developments, been decidedly overshadowed by the social and still more by the economic factors.

While during the earlier years the application of principles and methods of the natural sciences to the art of management and organization were in the foreground of CIOS activities, now it is the practical day-to-day work of Top Management in its economic as well as in its social departments which predominates (see First Set of "Exchange of Top Management Letters" attached confidentially).

4. We are bound to draw from this factual situation the logical conclusion, that our Organization should receive and could well enter into consultation with all three governmental international bodies:

- i) in the first place with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations,
- ii) in the second place with the International Labour Organization,
- iii) in the third place with UNESCO.

Since we know of Organizations, as for example the International Institute of Public Administration in Brussels, and the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, which have consultative statutes with ECOSOC as well as with UNESCO, we do not see why CIOS should not be granted consultation with three: ECOSOC, ILO and UNESCO, if it happens - as it does - that such threefold consultation is in the common interest

of the cause for which we stand according to the Statutes:

Section Paragraph 2. Object of CIOS:

"... application of scientific management methods

(scientific factor)

... where their application may result in a larger return

(economic factor)

and in improved working conditions

(social factor)"

5. Considering these circumstances and arguments, considering further the fact that the forms of the questionnaire which you sent us, according to your letter of January 6th, 1948, on your own initiative, included the printed question as to whether CIOS would apply for consultative status ☒ a question which we answered by a "yes" (covered by President Gabrielssons and the Secretary's signatures) - I venture to beg you to submit the application of CIOS to the Committee on Arrangements for Consultation with non-governmental Organizations for reconsideration in the light of the arguments of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Hugo de Haan

Secretary."

☒ The routine questionnaire has at the top of the page the question - "Do you apply for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council? Yes... No...". The purpose of this question is to ascertain whether an organization definitely wishes to apply.

