



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 12:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) (<i>concluded</i>)	
Draft resolution on international cultural and scientific co-operation (<i>concluded</i>)	411
Completion of the Committee's work	412

Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) (A/3154, A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.600) (*concluded*)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC CO-OPERATION (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. CURRIE (Canada), replying to a comment made by the Ukrainian delegation at the 759th meeting, said that his Government encouraged exchanges for truly cultural purposes. However, the invitation that had been addressed to writers from the Ukrainian SSR had come from a small, Communist-dominated group whose views did not represent those of the country as a whole or those of Canadians of Ukrainian origin. The reasons for the invitation had been political rather than cultural. It would do no service to the cause of international co-operation to encourage visits which would have the effect of antagonizing the deep feelings of a large number of Canadians.

2. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan) said he would support the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1). Cultural values were the common heritage of all mankind and were the monopoly of no country; accordingly, international cultural exchanges were only right and proper. Moreover, cultural values were objective, and countries which paid them due homage would not take advantage of them to engage in propaganda which would result in lowering the regard in which they were held.

3. Unlike the Greek representative, he did not believe that a distinction between Eastern and Western cultural values was artificial or equivocal. His delegation therefore saw no objection to the retention of the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution.

4. Mr. ETEZADY (Iran) said that his Government was keenly interested in all forms of community development, and spared no effort to raise the level of living of the Iranian people. Several practical measures had already been taken in that field. A large number of estates had been parcelled out. A seven-year agricultural credit scheme had also been worked out whereby long-term low-interest loans were made to people who intended to take some part in community development. In addition, communities received expert advice which

helped them in their work. The Government and private undertakings were continually holding useful exchanges of views which made it possible for the scope of the programmes to be broadened. Thirty-five miles from the capital, the experimental village of Mamzan had been built, and others were to be built with the help of private business. The Government was endeavouring to arouse the interest of the people in community development and to make them aware of the part they could play in improving their living conditions; it had worked out ambitious community development schemes and was encouraging the work that was being done under technical assistance programmes and by private business in that field.

5. The Iranian delegation had voted in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.599/Rev.1), but had not been able to support the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.603) to paragraph 4 (*e*) of the text, the wording of which would have implied that the United Nations was seeking to impose the idea of community development on certain States.

6. He supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1) whole-heartedly.

7. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said she would vote in favour of the revised Czechoslovak draft resolution, which would help to strengthen the cultural and scientific bonds between States.

8. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) thanked those delegations that had spoken in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1). He had had no difficulty in accepting the amendments proposed since they had in no way modified the idea underlying his text.

9. Mr. KRISPIS (Greece) asked that the third paragraph of the preamble be voted on separately.

10. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1).

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

11. The CHAIRMAN put the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.598/Rev.1) as a whole to the vote.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

12. Mr. KRISPIS (Greece) said he had abstained in the vote on the third paragraph of the preamble because there was no generally accepted criterion under which a distinction could be made between Eastern and Western cultural values; the suggestion that there was a difference between them might give rise to difficulties in implementing the resolution.

13. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) associated himself with the Greek representative, and added that without the third paragraph of the preamble the text of the draft resolution would reflect the competence of the General

Assembly more accurately; the paragraph in question related rather to the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. He had voted for the draft resolution as a whole since he considered it satisfactory.

14. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said she had voted for the Czechoslovak draft resolution because it was in accordance with the desire of peoples throughout the world for closer co-operation. She would not insist on the Committee's studying the suggestion her delegation had made at the previous meeting.

15. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay), Mrs. GERLEIN DE FONNEGRA (Colombia), Mr. AGOLLI (Albania), Mr. BAHADUR (Nepal) and Mr. TALAAT (Egypt), who had been absent during the voting, requested that their delegations be regarded as having voted in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

16. Mrs. BILAI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said she would like the Ukrainian delegation to be recorded among those that had voted in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution. Contrary to the view expressed by the Canadian delegation, she considered that the visit of a Ukrainian group to Canada on the occasion of the centenary of Ivan Franko would have been of a purely cultural nature.

17. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) asked for the Syrian delegation to be regarded as having voted for the Czechoslovak draft resolution. He hoped that the benefits of international cultural co-operation would spread to the field of film production, and that an end could be put to the campaigns of slander that were being directed against certain cultures and certain ways of life. That objective could be attained without endangering freedom of artistic expression, and no effort should be spared to achieve it.

18. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to remarks made at the 758th meeting by the United Kingdom and United States representatives, said that he had accused no one and had confined himself to stating the facts. He hoped that the current slowing down of cultural exchanges between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union was only temporary. Unlike the United Kingdom representative, however, he considered that their suspension had been due, not to the events in Hungary, but to the fact that the United Kingdom had been preparing at the time to take action in another part of the world.

19. With regard to the United States representative's observation, he did not consider that the Soviet delegation's position on the matter had been negative. On the contrary, the Soviet delegation had shown a particularly constructive spirit by stressing the importance of removing the obstacles which hampered cultural relations among nations.

20. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom), replying to the USSR representative, quoted from a letter sent by the Chairman of the Soviet Relations Committee of the British Council (as published in *The Times* of 22 January 1957), in reply to a letter mentioned by the USSR representative in an earlier statement. The letter clearly set out the reasons why the Soviet action in Hungary had prejudiced the development of cultural exchanges between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. So far as the United Kingdom was concerned, effective exchanges were possible only if public opinion showed a measure of good will towards the Soviet Union. However, after the events in Hungary, which

had deeply shaken the British people, that good will had temporarily lapsed. Moreover, it was only fair to recall that, as the letter published in *The Times* clearly indicated, there were certain obstacles in that field, which had always come from the Soviet side, for example, with regard to tourist travel.

21. The allegation that cultural exchanges between the two countries had been interrupted because the United Kingdom had been preparing to take action in a certain part of the world was absolutely unfounded.

22. Mr. GREENBAUM (United States of America) said he hoped that the USSR representative's statement indicated a change of attitude on the part of the Soviet Government. Exchanges of ideas, information and persons helped to reduce international tension and should be promoted to the greatest possible extent. From that standpoint, the draft resolution the Committee had just adopted on the proposal of Czechoslovakia was constructive, and the United States delegation had been glad to vote in favour of it.

23. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked for a full account of the debate on the question of the right of Afghanistan to produce opium for export to be included in the Committee's report on agenda item 12, and hoped that it would be transmitted to the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

24. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) thanked the delegations which had shown sympathy towards Afghanistan and had supported its request. He hoped that the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs would consider the Afghan request on its merits. If no satisfactory decision was taken, the Afghan delegation would reserve the right to raise the question again at a later date.

25. Mr. CURRIE (Canada) said that if the Committee's report recorded the favourable opinions which had been expressed on the Afghan request, it must also mention opposing views. The Canadian delegation therefore felt obliged to state its position on the question itself. It considered that it would not be in the interest of the international control of opium, world production and stocks of which were already in excess of legitimate medical and scientific requirements, to add Afghanistan to the list of the countries entitled to produce opium for export.

26. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said all comments made on the Afghan request would appear in the report as a matter of course, whether or not they were favourable to Afghanistan; he hoped that the name of the delegation would be given in each case.

27. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala), Rapporteur, said that all comments on the Afghan request would be recorded in the report.

Completion of the Committee's work

28. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan), Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands), Mr. GREENBAUM and Mrs. LORD (United States of America), Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Colombia, Costa Rica and Cuba, Miss RADIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), Mr. BRATANOV (Bulgaria), Mr. LIMA (El Salvador), Mrs. MARZUKI (Indonesia),

Mr. MACCHIA (Italy), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), Mrs. LEIVO-LARSSON (Finland), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Iceland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Mr. MUFTI (Syria), Mr. YAGI (Sudan), Mr. MAHMUD (Ceylon), speaking on behalf of the Commonwealth countries, Mr. CHAUDHURI (Pakistan), Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan), Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel), Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. ETEZADY (Iran), Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania), Mrs. GARDINER (Liberia), Mrs. KOWALIKOWA (Poland), Mr. BRENA (Uruguay), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela, Mr. KALIAN (Yemen), Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. SAGAZ (Spain), Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia), Mr. AMATYAKUL (Thailand), Mrs. BILAI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. TALAAT (Egypt), Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey), Mr. BAHADUR (Nepal), Mr. HAUCK (France), Mr. MARTINS DE CARVALHO (Portugal), Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) and Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) paid a tribute to the outstanding ability which the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur had shown during the debates and thanked the members of the Secretariat for their assistance.

29. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala), Rapporteur, associated herself with the tribute paid to the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, whose skill and tact had helped to ensure the success of the Third Committee's work. She also congratulated all the members of the Secretariat on their competence and devotion to duty, and expressed her deep appreciation of the kind words addressed to her by members of the Committee.

30. The CHAIRMAN associated himself with the Committee's praise of the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, who had done a great deal to promote the smooth working of the Committee, and also with the thanks addressed to all the members of the Secretariat, whose assistance had been most valuable. He was grateful to the members of the Third Committee for the kind words they had addressed to him, and thanked them for having done so much to help him in his work as Chairman.

31. It was a matter of satisfaction to him that the Committee had carried out its work, which was generally acknowledged to be very delicate, with considerable devotion and enthusiasm. The drafting or re-drafting of certain articles of the International Covenants on Human Rights had not been an easy matter for a Committee of eighty members; indeed, the whole question of drafting texts in organs with a very large membership deserved study; and such study might lead to consideration of changes in the working methods of the General Assembly and its Committees. The Third Committee had had to proceed with great prudence in considering the draft Covenants, since they raised questions of social progress with which many regions of the world had become concerned only recently. But even if some of the articles drafted might have to be revised, the Committee had nevertheless done very useful work. On the day when the Covenants entered into force, the United Nations, especially the Third Committee, would be able to congratulate itself on an accomplishment of the first magnitude, which would be a milestone in the history of the social, cultural and humanitarian progress of the world.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.