

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/AC.6/SR.460  
8 October 1968

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

Forty-fifth session

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 22 July 1968, at 3.20 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Population and its relation to economic and social  
development (item 5 of the Council agenda) (continued)

Economic planning and projections (item 6 of the Council agenda)  
(continued)

International Education Year (item 27 of the Council agenda)

|                  |             |        |
|------------------|-------------|--------|
| <u>Chairman:</u> | Mr. BILLNER | Sweden |
| <u>later,</u>    | Mr. VARELA  | Panama |

Note: The list of representatives attending the session is found in Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-fifth Session, prefatory fascicle.

GE.68-19722

POPULATION AND ITS RELATION TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (item 5 of the Council agenda) (E/4454, E/4486/Add.1, E/4493/Rev.1 (paras. 152-166), E/4551; E/AC.6/L.389)  
(continued)

Mr. MACURA, (Director, Population Division) said that the special consultant appointed recently by the Secretary-General to help the Population Division in drawing up programmes was Mr. Richard Symonds from the Development Institute at Sussex University. Mr. Symonds had wide experience of international affairs.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should start discussing the draft resolution which would be presented to the Council. The Committee had before it two working documents for that purpose: the original draft resolution in the report of the Population Commission (E/4454, chap. XI), and proposals for amendments to the draft (E/AC.6/L.389). He asked whether the Committee preferred to study the draft as a whole or to discuss each paragraph separately.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that his delegation had read the proposed amendments with some surprise; he would like to know when the working group which apparently had submitted the document had been set up, and who its members were. He thought the document should be presented by its authors before the discussion began.

The CHAIRMAN explained that in order to simplify the submission of amendments to the Commission's draft, he had invited the delegations concerned to meet informally, with a view to presenting joint draft amendments as early as possible. It might therefore be said that the working group mentioned in the document in question was made up of the delegations which had responded to the invitation. The document embodied the results of their discussions, and it was to be hoped that it would obtain the approval of the great majority of delegations.

Mr. FIGUEROA (Argentina) thought that in order to conform to the rules of procedure, one of the authors of the proposed amendments should be asked to present and explain the document containing them, which suggested both additions to and omissions from the Commission's original draft. That would no doubt help delegations to define their positions as quickly as possible.

Mr. BOYD (Panama) endorsed the French and Argentine representatives' observations. The examination of the draft resolution as a whole would be simplified if it was known who the authors of the amendments were and if one of them introduced them in the usual way, along with the document without a symbol containing the amended text of the draft resolution. His delegation objected emphatically to some of the proposed amendments, which were not in keeping with the recommendations made by the Commission in 1965 and 1966.

Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) endorsed the observations of the three preceding speakers. It did seem difficult to discuss amendment proposals without knowing who had made them, particularly if they did not accurately reflect the discussions. The proposed new draft resolution had omissions and displayed a certain bias which his delegation might wish to challenge.

Mr. PAOLINI (France) emphasized that his delegation, like many others, had a very keen and direct interest in the draft resolution in question. He therefore regretted that he had not been invited to participate in the working group. Since the group had proposed a great many amendments which had only been submitted to the Committee on Monday, 22 July, during the 459th meeting, explanations seemed indispensable. Texts of that kind must be examined and adopted subject to the conditions laid down in the rules of procedure.

Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela) expressed surprise at the reaction of some delegations. As everyone knew, the Chairman had several times suggested that delegations should consult together in order to prepare a draft text likely to meet with general approval. His own delegation, although it had not been formally invited to join a working group, had exchanged ideas with other delegations, as a result of which a preliminary document had been drafted. However, having heard various opinions expressed, in particular by the delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States, India, Sweden and Upper Volta, his delegation had contacted the delegations of Latin American countries, and in the course of another informal meeting had explained the criteria on which the position of those countries was based. Following the meetings certain clear proposals had seemed to be emerging, particularly since for the most part they reflected amendments suggested during the debate in the Committee itself.

However, one change suggested during the informal discussions should be mentioned which had not been incorporated in the text proposed in the document without a symbol. At the end of operative paragraph 4 (b) of the resolution the words "and where appropriate, of religious and cultural considerations", should be added.

It would no doubt be useful if one of the representatives of the informal working group would explain the amendment proposals, after which his delegation could specify which changes had been introduced on behalf of the Latin American countries.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Indian representative to present the amendment proposals: he would then ask the delegations to meet informally once more and to prepare a text acceptable to all. The discussion of item 5 would be postponed until that text had been put in order.

Mr. DUBEY (India) explained first of all how the documents before the Committee had come into being. At the end of the discussion of agenda item 5 the Chairman had asked delegations to confer informally in order to draw up a new joint draft resolution. After discussing the matter, several delegations had produced a text which they had submitted to other delegations which might have substantial comments to make. Various amendments had been suggested and a new draft had taken shape - the one in the document without symbol before the Committee. Thus it could not strictly be said that a working group had been set up, but such discussions were provided for within the framework of the Council's work. The text prepared was obviously open to discussion.

He indicated the differences between the draft resolution proposed by the Commission in its report and the revised draft proposed in the document without a symbol.

In the first preambular paragraph, the phrase in brackets in the Commission's draft had been omitted, since apart from the fact that it did not add very much, some countries preferred that the needs of developing countries should not always be associated with population problems.

The first part of the second preambular paragraph had likewise been omitted, since it referred to an idea of a general kind which was not called for in a paragraph stressing the population problem.

The third paragraph of the revised draft came before the third preambular paragraph of the original draft; it had been thought important to stress not only the fact that the United Nations and its agencies were aware of the problem, but also that their awareness had already been translated into action. That new paragraph seemed to make the old third paragraph superfluous, but some delegations had preferred to keep it; it stood therefore as the fourth paragraph of the new preamble.

The idea contained in the fifth paragraph of the new preamble had not appeared in the Commission's original draft, but several delegations had declared themselves in favour of inserting it.

The sixth paragraph of the new preamble was based on the fourth paragraph of the Commission's draft; several delegations had thought that in its new form it was a more accurate reflection of the unanimous conclusions of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, which they had thought were not stated accurately enough in the paragraph of the original draft, particularly from the general point of view of population control.

The new seventh preambular paragraph had been added in order to take into account the meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination which had been held after the Commission's draft resolution was drawn up.

Finally, in the English version of the last preambular paragraph, the word "one" had been replaced by the article "a", which had a less restrictive force.

Operative paragraph 1 had not been changed at all, and paragraph 2 had been changed only very slightly. The same applied to operative paragraph 3, where the word "favourable" had simply been removed as not seeming strong enough.

Operative paragraph 4 (a) had been slightly condensed, since it had seemed useless to list all the activities, particularly as some appeared to be unimportant, and were in any case covered by the reference to the resolutions. As the Venezuelan representative had just pointed out, the words "and where appropriate, religious and cultural considerations" should be added at the end of sub-paragraph (b). Sub-paragraph (c) had not been changed, while (d) had been removed and replaced by the succeeding paragraph. Several delegations had considered that the wording of sub-paragraph (d) left much to be desired, and that it would be best to make it into a new paragraph 5.

Operative paragraph 6 of the Commission's original draft had been deleted; it seemed no longer valid, and in any case it was covered by the wording of the preamble.

Operative paragraph 7 of the Commission's draft had likewise been omitted, since some delegations had expressed reservations about it, while others had pointed out that, essentially, it merely repeated what had already been said in other United Nations resolutions, particularly the Council's resolutions.

Apart from the oversight pointed out by the Venezuelan representative, he wondered what other omissions were referred to by the representatives of Argentina and Upper Volta who, unless he was mistaken, had taken part in the informal discussion.

Mr. FIGUERERO (Argentina) explained that he had never intended to imply that his delegation had not participated in the informal discussions, and that the new draft resolution contained certain amendments which did not necessarily have his delegation's approval. But at any rate the explanations just given would be very useful to his delegation.

Mr. MABILANGAN (Philippines) also thanked the Indian representative for the explanations he had just given about the unofficial document before the Committee. As to the omission pointed out by the Venezuelan representative, he recalled that it involved the only amendment proposed by the Philippine delegation during the informal meetings, and was intended to take account of the views expressed in paragraph 165 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4493/Rev.1). The adoption of that amendment should therefore not give rise to difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the discussion of agenda item 5 was adjourned pending the preparation of a new text.

ECONOMIC PLANNING AND PROJECTIONS (item 6 of the Council agenda) (E/4515 and Add.1)  
(continued)

Mr. ORDNUMG (Czechoslovakia) said that he congratulated the Committee for Development and Planning on its admirable report (E/4515), which contained a cogent description of the problems facing African planners. He also expressed satisfaction at the important work carried out in that field by the Economic Commission for Africa, the Centre for Development Planning, Projections and Policies and the Conference of African Planners held in December 1967.

Among the findings of the report, he noted the point that if planning was to yield results, it should not be conceived solely as a set of planning techniques but rather as a complex of policy measures devised with a view to the promotion of economic and social development. He was also glad to see the emphasis given in the report to the importance of national planning and the need to map out a strategy for development in a very wide sense, namely, one which provided for the transformation of social and economic structures and institutions. The report likewise indicated that the setbacks often encountered in plan implementation in Africa resulted from the fact that development plans were based on an insufficient number of carefully prepared projects; it was also clear that the most pressing need was to bridge the gap between planning at the project level and at the sector and country level and that technical assistance programmes should be designed to that end.

The importance which the report attached to the problem of co-operation and multinational economic planning was not exaggerated, considering the political and economic divisions which characterized the African continent. The problem of industrialization, and particularly the establishment of strategic industries, could only be tackled through multinational co-operation. In fact, although considerable headway had been made in trade liberalization, it had to be recognized that there were still serious inadequacies in the harmonization of economic policies or the co-ordination of national planning in Africa, and he subscribed to the opinion expressed in paragraph 69 of the report, which attached crucial importance to multinational planning and the co-ordination of national plans in integration efforts. In that context, it would be highly useful if the Committee for Development Planning decided to consider at a subsequent session the problems encountered in multinational planning and co-ordination in various parts of the world. In that connexion, the experience of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) might be of benefit from the point of view of institutional arrangements.

He also fully shared the opinion expressed by the representative of the USSR, who had stressed the importance of the public sector for the success of planning. In the developing countries' present conditions the public sector seemed to hold out the only chance of the effective development of strategic industries and the necessary infrastructures. At the present stage, not only planning, but also management was gaining in importance in view of the increasing role of the public sector. It was to be hoped that the Committee for Development Planning would be able to study the question later.

Turning to chapter 3 of the World Economic Survey, 1967 (E/4488/Add.3), he said that the Survey gave an objective description of the main features of the economic reforms at present in progress in Czechoslovakia. It should be pointed out, however, that in spite of the changes made in its planning system and economic structure, Czechoslovakia had no intention of abandoning the principle of central planning, but rather of bringing about a more effective control of the economic process in order to speed up its economic development in line with the long-term targets fixed by the central administration. It had to be admitted that negative tendencies had emerged in spite of the strict control over economic activity which had previously been maintained: diminishing returns on investments, slower rate of technical progress, productive enterprises ill-adapted to home and foreign markets. Thus the growth rate of the national

income had dropped to 2 per cent during the first half of the present Development Decade. Having analyzed the reasons for that unsatisfactory state of affairs, Czechoslovakia had arrived at the somewhat paradoxical conclusion that in order to make central planning more efficient, economic decisions would first have to be decentralized. That was why one of the main features of the present reforms consisted in giving wide powers to enterprises and shielding the productive sector against direct State intervention. In the present state of the Czechoslovak economy, the normal play of the market would be the most effective means of meeting the needs of the national economy and ensuring the maximum efficiency of all enterprises. However, the Government retained substantial powers of intervention (fiscal, monetary and commercial, credit policy) to guide the economy in the direction fixed by the national development plan. Moreover, in certain fields of activity, the national administration would continue to be directly responsible for the preparation of programmes and projects.

Finally, as the head of the Czechoslovak delegation had said in the 1536th plenary meeting, one of the aims of the new economic policy would be to bring about the full participation of the Czechoslovak economy in the international division of labour. That was indeed essential for a country with limited resources and a relatively small home market. The economy would thus be thrown open to the changing influences and conditions of the world market, from which they had long been shielded by protective barriers in the shape of various subsidies, now removed by institutional reforms. The effect of those measures should be to stimulate technical progress in the industrial sector and to bring about favourable changes in the economic structure.

It was clear that the production costs in certain branches of industry were so remote from those prevailing in world markets that the stimulus referred to above might be purely destructive. They would therefore have to proceed with extreme caution, using plans prepared in advance which made allowance for the political and social repercussions of each new move and which respected the right of citizens to work - one of the basic principles of all socialist regimes.

The Czechoslovak Government was therefore fully alive to the difficulties and uncertainties connected with the establishment of a new economic system which, while based on efficient central planning, took advantage of the market machinery. Mistakes were bound to occur, but it would perhaps be possible to learn from them.



Mr. SEYRAFI (Iran) said that he had been most interested to study the findings of the Committee for Development Planning. It was important to note that the establishment of precise development plans based on econometric methods and other modern techniques were not enough to ensure that the targets would be reached unless the developing countries made an effort to introduce social and economic reforms, to adopt co-ordinated policies and to create an appropriate institutional framework. Furthermore, the importance of the international context should not be under-estimated; developing countries, if they were to progress faster, should have access to more external resources and technical know-how throughout the period necessary for their development. He welcomed the fact that the Committee for Development Planning attached particular attention to economic co-operation between the developing countries. As the Iranian representative had pointed out during the general discussion, Iran co-operated with Pakistan and Turkey in establishing enterprises of common interest within the framework of co-operation for regional development.

While endeavouring to employ modern methods and planning techniques, Iran sought to modify the existing conditions, tendencies and structures. For example, the income of two-thirds of the Iranian population derived from low-yield agriculture, and the structure of foreign trade showed Iran to be essentially a producer of raw materials; those two characteristics were to be eliminated.

In recent years, Iran had attempted primarily to establish the economic and social infrastructure needed for rapid development. The diversion of resources to the more productive sectors and the adoption of consistent economic policies had made it possible not only to reach the targets fixed under the Development Decade but even to outstrip those laid down in the national plan. From 1960 to 1967, the average annual growth rate of the gross national product at constant prices had exceeded 7.5 per cent, while a target of about 9 per cent had been set for the next five years. It was hoped that savings would rise from 18 to 25 per cent of the gross national product by the end of 1972. Agrarian reform had yielded promising results. Agricultural production had risen rapidly and the new five-year development plan was designed to expand agriculture sufficiently not only to cover the population's needs but also to develop the agro-industries.

In the field of industry properly speaking, excluding the oil industry, the average annual growth rate had amounted to about 13 per cent over the previous seven years. Although the private sector was encouraged to take part in industrialization, the main role in that field had been entrusted to the public sector, particularly for heavy industry. The industrial development plan was aimed at using natural resources through the establishment of export-oriented industries such as the petrochemical and aluminium industries, which would make it possible to change the structure of exports.

The fourth development plan also gave considerable weight to regional development and provided various incentives for that purpose.

Iran pursued an economic policy of co-operation with all the advanced countries, irrespective of their social and political system; it also co-operated with other countries in the developing world, whose problems and tasks it shared. The difficulties in that field could only be overcome through international action carried out by both the advanced countries and the United Nations. The United Nations should give greater weight to operational activities and the advanced countries more attention to the developing countries' need for external resources. He might have occasion to comment again on that aspect of development.

Mr. KOROLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached great importance to the agenda item under discussion; it considered that planning had a paramount part to play in the development of the developing countries. He noted that for some years United Nations agencies had rightly been concentrating on the technique of development plans and planning methods. Such work had facilitated study of specific questions such as the administrative aspects of planning and exchanges of information between the Governments of African, Asian and Latin American countries. However, there were still serious deficiencies to be remedied in planning methods. For instance, two aspects of planning were at present separated although they were intimately connected: the technique of the preparation of projects and their implementation. During the implementation of projects fresh problems arose which must necessarily be taken into account in preparing new plans.

The documents produced by the Centre for Development Planning, Projections and Policies showed that a great many goals had not been reached in the developing countries. Some of these failures could be accounted for, but the basic cause was that the development of the developing countries was determined not by plans but by factors beyond control. For instance, various facts suggested that the growth rate of the gross national

product in some countries depended not on the progress of economic development, but on market fluctuations and sometimes climatic conditions. Clearly, in order to cope with such complex problems the developing countries must widen their planning basis.

The studies conducted by the United Nations sought a solution by concentrating on particular problems, but effective results clearly could not be achieved without profound modification of the socio-economic structures, especially the broadening of the public sector. The developing countries would have to use the methods employed by the Soviet Union between 1920 and 1930 to broaden the planning basis and limit market fluctuations through central control. That method, which was of great importance to the preparatory work for the programme of the second Development Decade, should be studied by the United Nations.

Furthermore, the profound differences between the developing countries must be taken into account. The Director of the Centre for Development Planning, Projections and Policies had already stressed the need to adopt a selective approach in dealing with the problems of the various developing countries and to accord greater importance to regional and sub-regional investigations. However, in his opinion, the Centre did not take specific conditions sufficiently into account. The differences between the developing countries concerned not merely geographical location or per capita income, but economic and social structures and economic policy. The situation in all the sectors of the national economy of each country should therefore be analysed.

Global development indicators were useful for long-term projections, but macro-economic analysis was necessarily limited owing to the lack of homogeneity in the developing countries.

In the Soviet Union macro-economic models were first prepared and used somewhat as a "draft"; then they were expressed in specific terms and targets were assigned for each republic, region and city right down to factory level. After they had been examined sector by sector the plans were adopted for each enterprise and then revised in reverse order from factory up to republic level and then for the country as a whole. In that way macro-economic indicators were supplemented by figures and specific data.

Each country had different problems which called for different solutions, and that made it difficult to set a mean for all countries. Consequently, a more specific analysis of the problems peculiar to each country should be undertaken and detailed plans forming part of long-term socio-economic programmes should be drawn up.

Mr. ALI (International Labour Organisation) (ILO) fully agreed with the conclusions of the report by the Committee for Development Planning, which saw planning not solely as a technique but as the vigorous pursuit of harmonized policy measures for economic and social development, and considered that the principal solution to the problems of speeding up progress lay in a proper strategy, particularly in the expansion of the critical sectors, the transformation of social structures and institutions, the mobilization of resources and the development of human capacities and initiative.

In pursuit of that goal the ILO employed various methods, in particular the machinery of conventions and recommendations, and undertook technical co-operation and research. It devoted a large part of its effort to problems of development and the employment of human resources. Guidelines for national and international action in the field of employment and training had been laid down by the International Labour Conference in the 1964 Convention and Recommendation Concerning Employment Policy, and in the Vocational Training Recommendation of 1962. In the field of technical co-operation, the ILO was engaged in employment and manpower planning, the development of management techniques and vocational training. In research, its activities included many studies, particularly special studies on the technical problems of manpower planning, and also articles on employment in development plans published in the International Labour Review in January and March 1968.

In the field of planning and projections, the ILO was working on a world employment programme which would include projections of the labour force throughout the world and study of possible employment targets. Lastly, the ILO was studying other current problems, such as the question of wages and social security, which planning might help to solve.

Mr. BLAU (United States of America) expressed approval of the work of United Nations bodies in the field of planning and projections, while stressing the need to strengthen the advisory services provided at the request of Governments.

He could not agree with the USSR representative's view that the public sector should be strengthened in development plans. Like the French representative, he felt that it was particularly important for developing countries to have the necessary statistical information at their disposal.

He endorsed paragraph 6 of the report of the Committee for Development Planning, which stated that planning should be viewed not solely as a technique but as the vigorous pursuit of harmonized policy of measures for economic and social development. He also recognized the need for a policy of co-operation, which was particularly vital for Africa, a continent which had great aspirations but few resources and skills to translate its intentions into action. The Committee had decided to concentrate on multi-national planning, thereby responding to the wishes of the African peoples, who had realized that their goals were a matter not only for their respective countries but for the continent as a whole. For the time being, however, planning must follow a sub-regional approach. The United States was contributing to the development of Africa by supporting the African Development Bank.

However, he could not support the proposal in the report to the effect that the preferential arrangements between some African countries and the European Economic Community (EEC) should be extended to other African groups. He recalled that at the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at New Delhi the United States representative had advocated a system of general preferences established with the agreement of the world community.

Although he could agree to the proposal that the Committee for Development Planning should hold its fourth session at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) in Bangkok, he considered that the Committee ought to cease being an itinerant body and settle down at United Nations Headquarters. Asia and the Far East afforded great scope for sub-regional co-operation, since they included vast areas which were at very different stages of development. He hoped that at Headquarters the Committee might later try to construct a synthesis from its experiences and travels.

Mr. IKEDA (Japan) expressed his delegation's thanks for the useful contribution of the Committee for Development Planning. Bearing in mind that a large number of developing countries had been unsuccessful in implementing development plans, the Committee was to be congratulated on having made a realistic attempt to determine the implementation difficulties confronting those countries. Given their lack of resources, it was essential, if they were to achieve a high rate of development, that the developing countries should knowingly determine priorities and identify crucial strategic choices.

While welcoming the increased attention the Governments of developing countries were paying to planning problems, his delegation, like the Committee for Development Planning, was concerned by the fact that those countries made no significant progress in planning during the past year. That lack of progress was the most regrettable on the eve of the second Development Decade, during which each country's national development plans would be closely linked with the global development strategy, since setbacks in national development plans would directly affect the Decade. In that context, United Nations responsibility in planning - improved data, study of projection methods and techniques, preparation of regional and sectoral projections - assumed its full importance.

In his delegation's opinion, it was essential, for the effective application of development plans, to recognize that planning was an instrument for the formulation and implementation of a coherent development policy but could not be a substitute for such a policy. The Committee for Development Planning had emphasized that fact in its report.

The Committee for Development Planning had drawn attention to the difficulties impeding the implementation of development plans in African countries. Some of those difficulties were common to several regions and others were peculiar to Africa. One of those difficulties was the shortage of competent planning personnel at both the formulation and implementation levels. In view of the highly specialized nature of planning activities, it was difficult to supply that shortage rapidly and the United Nations must pay the greatest attention to that problem in its training activities.

He pointed out that, in that connexion, the Asian Institute for Economic Development and Planning at Bangkok had, since its establishment four years previously, trained some 600 planning officials for developing countries in Asia. ECAFE had unanimously approved a regional project to establish an Asian statistical institute for the training of senior statisticians.

His delegation approved the calendar of meetings for 1969 of the Committee for Development Planning. Following examination of planning and implementation problems in Latin America and Africa, the proposed session at Bangkok would permit a similar examination for the Asian countries. His delegation hoped that the Committee would submit practical recommendations with a view to more effective implementation of national development plans in the developing countries of Asia.

Mr. MABILANGAN (Philippines) said that the conclusions submitted by the Committee for Development Planning in its report were similar to those of the second session, namely, that only a few developing countries had been successful in their development plans, despite the increasing awareness of those countries as a whole of the importance of planning in economic and social development. The setbacks noted were due not so much to the plans themselves as to the manner in which development measures were applied and crucial strategic choices identified. The reasons for those setbacks were emphasized in chapter I of the report relating to Africa.

He described briefly his country's experience in development. The Philippines Four-Year Plan provided for an increase of 2.5 per cent a year in per capita income or an increase of 6.1 per cent in gross national product. Savings should represent 20 per cent of the income and were expected to be \$600 million less than investments over the plan period. Investment needs were large because of the increasingly high level of growth targets and because of the need, at that stage of development, to devote a large part of investments to strengthening the infrastructure and to industrialization.

Since the Philippines had to import half the capital goods and raw materials it needed, imports were expected to rise considerably with the growth rate for exports remaining, at best, at the same level. There would thus be a deficit in the balance of payments of \$350 million in the four years of the plan. In quoting those figures, he wished to show that in the Philippines, as in many developing countries, the foreign exchange problem was more serious in the long run than that of savings for the implementation of development plans. Unless the flow of financial resources to the developing countries was significantly increased by means of a favourable assistance policy and unless the export earnings of those countries increased as a result of favourable trade arrangements with the developed countries, the developing countries would experience great difficulty in effectively implementing their development plans.

In the light of the foregoing comments, his delegation fully endorsed paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report of the Committee for Development Planning and shared the Committee's conviction that immediate steps should be taken by the richer members of the world community to ensure that well-formulated and viable plans of developing countries were not thwarted by the lack of a favourable external climate.

He hoped that the invitation extended to the Committee by the Executive Secretary of ECAFE to hold its next session at Bangkok would be accepted, and welcomed the support given to that project by the representatives of the United States and Japan. His delegation attached great importance to the Committee's fourth session in the course of which Asian planning problems were to be examined - as Latin American and African problems had been in the previous sessions - and a more thorough study made of the preparations for the second Development Decade.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION YEAR (item 27 of the Council agenda) (E/4518)

Mrs. THORSON (Director, Social Development Division) said that in its resolution 2306 (XXII) of 13 December 1967 the General Assembly, recognizing the urgent need for a more effective mobilization of efforts in education and training as an essential element of a successful strategy of international development and recognizing further the fundamental importance of education as a means of widening man's horizons, improving mutual understanding and strengthening international peace, had decided to observe an International Education Year and provisionally designated the year 1970 for that purpose. It had also requested the Secretary-General to consult with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other interested specialized agencies in preparing a programme of activities and requested him to submit a report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session, through the Economic and Social Council, so that the Assembly might decide on the proclamation of an International Education Year.

The Secretary-General's report (E/4518) outlined developments up to the end of April 1968. It had not been possible to submit a more detailed report to the Council at its current session because preparations for the programme of activities would depend on the adoption by the Assembly at its twenty-third session, following decisions taken by the UNESCO General Conference at its fifteenth session, of guiding principles concerning those activities, a large part of which UNESCO had agreed to prepare. Nevertheless, it was obvious and consistent with the enlarged interpretation of the idea of education which emerged from General Assembly resolution 2306 (XXII) that close inter-agency co-operation was desirable and necessary for the preparation and implementation of those activities.



UNESCO's proposals emphasized the fact that the International Education Year should go beyond the scope of a celebration and aim at the adoption by Governments and the international community at large of measures to promote educational progress, the three main objectives being to take stock of and rethink educational concepts and policies, mobilize increasing support for education, and increase international co-operation. To further those objectives, UNESCO had said that it was ready to advise the Secretary-General on the preparation of a programme of activities, and to ensure co-ordination between United Nations bodies and advise Member States, national commissions for UNESCO and international non-governmental organizations on the activities to be undertaken.

Education, as it should be interpreted in the context of the International Year, implied, in the words of Bertrand Russell, the training and developing of the human mind, the liberation of creativeness. That was why all bodies of the United Nations system, including the United Nations, concerned with the human factor of development were involved in the educational activities essential to the improvement of conditions in all sectors of human life, be it nutrition, health, participation in productive economic activities or adjustment to social evolution.

Within the framework of the International Education Year, those activities would have, therefore, to be oriented towards the general objectives which would be outlined by the General Assembly at its twenty-third session.

The Administration and Co-ordination Committee (ACC) had hoped that indications regarding the contribution other parts of the United Nations system might be able to make to the world-wide activities of the International Education Year could be prepared in time for inclusion in the current progress report. That had not been possible, pending further discussions at the governmental and Secretariat levels; the contributions of those organizations would inevitably have to be closely linked to the decisions which would be taken by the UNESCO General Conference at its fifteenth session, which would not take place until October or November. The Secretary-General would submit to the General Assembly, at its twenty-third session, a report on the programme of activities of the United Nations family on which the success of the International Education Year would largely depend.

Mr. Varela (Panama) took the Chair.

Mr. de SILVA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that he proposed to explain the nature of the decisions which the Committee should take to serve as a basis for the Council's own decisions on the International Education Year.

Both at Bucharest and in the 1535th plenary meeting of the Council, the Director-General of UNESCO had clearly propounded the three basic principles of the International Education Year and the reason why those principles, taken together, warranted the proclamation of the year 1970 as an International Education Year.

The first principle was that education should be considered in its widest sense, namely, as embracing all aspects of the formation of man. The International Education Year should therefore be oriented towards the entire range of activities organized by society to enable the individual to educate himself and continue his education irrespective of his age and the subject of his studies. At the national level, that meant that education should be regarded as a continuous and permanent process.

The second principle, the corollary of the first, was that, if education was construed in its widest sense, the International Education Year should be conceived as a form of joint action by all the United Nations bodies, whose common task it was to maintain peace and ensure the economic and social development of the Member States, which was contingent on the education and training of individuals. It was because the International Education Year implied the participation of the United Nations as a whole that UNESCO should define with the utmost clarity the contribution which it intended to make to the preparation and celebration of the International Year.

Finally, in the third place, the International Year should provide a focus around which Governments and the international community could marshal not only their activities but also their ideas.

In selecting 1970 as the International Education Year, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had endorsed the conclusions of the General Assembly to the effect that the International Year would coincide with the end of the first Development Decade and come before the second Decade; in 1969, the ILO would have completed the preparation of its world employment programme, the logical consequence of which should be to concentrate the attention of the States on education and training; despite - or perhaps because of - the genuine quantitative progress achieved in education during the first Decade, numerous signs of dissatisfaction were evident and the time seemed ripe to attempt to define some common educational standards and seek more effective means of orientating education. International co-operation was an absolute prerequisite for such efforts.

To sum up, the goal of the International Education Year could be said to be: to broaden the formal ideas of teaching and training by means of an entirely new concept, which regarded education as a means of freeing energies for the purpose of genuine innovation.

It was clear that the basis of such an effort was at the national level; however, the United Nations as a whole and the regional and non-governmental bodies were involved in that collective undertaking.

Having outlined the principles of the International Education Year, he said that he would define its objectives. They should be in keeping with the major problems of education and training, and the Governments should do their utmost to make the International Education Year a success rather than confining their support to mere lip service.

In the opinion of UNESCO, those objectives could be classified in three categories: quantitative (adult literacy, complete access to education for young people and women, training of intermediate and senior staff for development activities); qualitative (reform of general and technical education with emphasis on primary and technical education in rural areas, move from selective to mass education at both secondary and higher levels, stimulate the growth of a new teaching system aimed at promoting international understanding): concepts and general methods (new methods using audio-visual media and programmed teaching techniques, organization of continuing education and change from traditional methods to a spirit of free inquiry). Finally, in education as a whole it was necessary to change over from traditional, passive teaching methods, involving the mere transmission of information, to active methods of participation and argumentation.

It could be said that the goals of the International Education Year, stated briefly, were to widen the possibilities for education and training, encourage reform and innovation in the vital sectors and promote new ideas on the applications of modern education.

UNESCO was willing to assume the responsibility for the preparation, co-ordination and, it hoped, organization of those collective efforts. Without claiming any monopoly of education, UNESCO was prepared to be the co-ordinating centre for the United Nations as a whole.

Mr. de SILVA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that he proposed to explain the nature of the decisions which the Committee should take to serve as a basis for the Council's own decisions on the International Education Year.

Both at Bucharest and in the 1535th plenary meeting of the Council, the Director-General of UNESCO had clearly propounded the three basic principles of the International Education Year and the reason why those principles, taken together, warranted the proclamation of the year 1970 as an International Education Year.

The first principle was that education should be considered in its widest sense, namely, as embracing all aspects of the formation of man. The International Education Year should therefore be oriented towards the entire range of activities organized by society to enable the individual to educate himself and continue his education irrespective of his age and the subject of his studies. At the national level, that meant that education should be regarded as a continuous and permanent process.

The second principle, the corollary of the first, was that, if education was construed in its widest sense, the International Education Year should be conceived as a form of joint action by all the United Nations bodies, whose common task it was to maintain peace and ensure the economic and social development of the Member States, which was contingent on the education and training of individuals. It was because the International Education Year implied the participation of the United Nations as a whole that UNESCO should define with the utmost clarity the contribution which it intended to make to the preparation and celebration of the International Year.

Finally, in the third place, the International Year should provide a focus around which Governments and the international community could marshal not only their activities but also their ideas.

In selecting 1970 as the International Education Year, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had endorsed the conclusions of the General Assembly to the effect that the International Year would coincide with the end of the first Development Decade and come before the second Decade; in 1969, the ILO would have completed the preparation of its world employment programme, the logical consequence of which should be to concentrate the attention of the States on education and training; despite - or perhaps because of - the genuine quantitative progress achieved in education during the first Decade, numerous signs of dissatisfaction were evident and the time seemed ripe to attempt to define some common educational standards and seek more effective means of orientating education. International co-operation was an absolute prerequisite for such efforts.

The ILO could also help to bring about a better adaptation of education to rural communities within the framework of the International Education Year.

Mr. NAYERI (Iran) said he would welcome the proclamation of 1970 as the International Education Year. It was the duty of the United Nations to give the necessary priority to one of the most justifiable activities of the international community. Education was one of the greatest goods in life; it enabled man to evolve and advance throughout the ages.

As the Director-General of UNESCO had said, that year should be devoted to a dual effort of thought and action at both international and national level.

Thought was necessary, first of all, because if the development problem was considered as a whole, it could be seen that the question of cultural and scientific development arose alongside that of purely economic expansion, and there was between the developing and the advanced countries a widening gulf which should be closed without delay.

The problem of education, taken in its entirety, involved various features which should be studied during the International Education Year. In the first place, the pace of cultural and scientific progress was much slower than that of economic advance, and that difference in the rate of progress would necessarily lead to a gap between the cultural and the industrial levels and create the dangerous social imbalance already observed in certain developing countries.

Literacy represented another facet of education, and it was the cornerstone of any development project. Iran had gained some experience in that area, having embarked with considerable success on a thoroughgoing educational reform. It was therefore in a position to testify that, as the literacy campaign progressed, the attempt should be made to make education, in all its forms, accessible to the entire population and to give every talent the opportunity of fulfilment.

The International Education Year would enable the States to act on Iran's suggestion to earmark the equivalent of one day of their military budget to the literacy campaign. In his delegation's view that suggestion was worth repeating and should now be universally applied.

It was the duty of all States to apply all available means of propaganda and publicity and to bring the campaign not only to the social elite but also to the man in the street, at least to make him aware of the existence of the problem and the scale of the challenge. It would be a signal success for the International Education Year if the world were made conscious of what the United Nations was actually doing.

His delegation was glad that UNESCO understood the importance of technical training for rural development; it was indeed of paramount significance since it involved two-thirds of the world's population. A reform of primary and technical education for rural development would remedy what the head of the Iranian delegation had described as "the vicious circle of cultural deprivation", so that as long as the rural environment in the developing countries stayed as it was, the child would continue to be shaped by his surroundings and remain at the same primitive level. That circle could be broken only by making new techniques universally available at all levels.

Hence the question of the transfer of science and technical knowledge should be a central concern of the International Education Year. As the head of the Iranian delegation had stressed, the developed countries had a particularly heavy responsibility in that respect since, although the developing countries were able to assume the primary responsibility for their expansion, the same did not apply to modern science and technology, which were almost exclusively in the hands of the advanced countries. The absence of a common strategy was sadly felt in that field, and the course of action to be followed during the International Education Year was clearly traced out.

His delegation approved the suggestions made by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report and by the Director-General of UNESCO in his statement during the general discussion. It was to be hoped that the United Nations General Assembly would take a final decision on the International Education Year at its twenty-third session. His delegation was a sponsor of a draft resolution to be submitted on that subject for the Committee's approval, and it hoped that it could count upon the support of its members.

Mme. HIRLEMAN (France) said that the problem of education was a major concern of France, and that it was in favour of an International Education Year, provided that it did not involve any additional expenditure for the United Nations.

France would have occasion to make comments and suggestions on the subject at the next General Conference of UNESCO.

Mr. CRANE (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization) (FAO) said that he welcomed UNESCO's decision to assume responsibility for the organization of the International Education Year. FAO's agricultural education and training programmes could make an important contribution to the International Education Year. Moreover, FAO had decided to postpone until 1970 its world conference on agricultural education and training, originally scheduled for 1969, so that it would coincide with the International Year.

The ILO could also help to bring about a better adaptation of education to rural communities within the framework of the International Education Year.

Mr. NAYERI (Iran) said he would welcome the proclamation of 1970 as the International Education Year. It was the duty of the United Nations to give the necessary priority to one of the most justifiable activities of the international community. Education was one of the greatest goods in life; it enabled man to evolve and advance throughout the ages.

As the Director-General of UNESCO had said, that year should be devoted to a dual effort of thought and action at both international and national level.

Thought was necessary, first of all, because if the development problem was considered as a whole, it could be seen that the question of cultural and scientific development arose alongside that of purely economic expansion, and there was between the developing and the advanced countries a widening gulf which should be closed without delay.

The problem of education, taken in its entirety, involved various features which should be studied during the International Education Year. In the first place, the pace of cultural and scientific progress was much slower than that of economic advance, and that difference in the rate of progress would necessarily lead to a gap between the cultural and the industrial levels and create the dangerous social imbalance already observed in certain developing countries.

Literacy represented another facet of education, and it was the cornerstone of any development project. Iran had gained some experience in that area, having embarked with considerable success on a thoroughgoing educational reform. It was therefore in a position to testify that, as the literacy campaign progressed, the attempt should be made to make education, in all its forms, accessible to the entire population and to give every talent the opportunity of fulfilment.

The International Education Year would enable the States to act on Iran's suggestion to earmark the equivalent of one day of their military budget to the literacy campaign. In his delegation's view that suggestion was worth repeating and should now be universally applied.

It was the duty of all States to apply all available means of propaganda and publicity and to bring the campaign not only to the social elite but also to the man in the street, at least to make him aware of the existence of the problem and the scale of the challenge. It would be a signal success for the International Education Year if the world were made conscious of what the United Nations was actually doing.

His delegation was glad that UNESCO understood the importance of technical training for rural development; it was indeed of paramount significance since it involved two-thirds of the world's population. A reform of primary and technical education for rural development would remedy what the head of the Iranian delegation had described as "the vicious circle of cultural deprivation", so that as long as the rural environment in the developing countries stayed as it was, the child would continue to be shaped by his surroundings and remain at the same primitive level. That circle could be broken only by making new techniques universally available at all levels.

Hence the question of the transfer of science and technical knowledge should be a central concern of the International Education Year. As the head of the Iranian delegation had stressed, the developed countries had a particularly heavy responsibility in that respect since, although the developing countries were able to assume the primary responsibility for their expansion, the same did not apply to modern science and technology, which were almost exclusively in the hands of the advanced countries. The absence of a common strategy was sadly felt in that field, and the course of action to be followed during the International Education Year was clearly traced out.

His delegation approved the suggestions made by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report and by the Director-General of UNESCO in his statement during the general discussion. It was to be hoped that the United Nations General Assembly would take a final decision on the International Education Year at its twenty-third session. His delegation was a sponsor of a draft resolution to be submitted on that subject for the Committee's approval, and it hoped that it could count upon the support of its members.

Mme. HIPLEMAN (France) said that the problem of education was a major concern of France, and that it was in favour of an International Education Year, provided that it did not involve any additional expenditure for the United Nations.

France would have occasion to make comments and suggestions on the subject at the next General Conference of UNESCO.

Mr. CRANE (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization) (FAO) said that he welcomed UNESCO's decision to assume responsibility for the organization of the International Education Year. FAO's agricultural education and training programmes could make an important contribution to the International Education Year. Moreover, FAO had decided to postpone until 1970 its world conference on agricultural education and training, originally scheduled for 1969, so that it would coincide with the International Year.



Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that because of the organization of the Committee's work his delegation was not prepared at the present meeting to take part in the discussion of the item on the International Education Year. However, the United States delegation attached a great deal of importance to the item and he wanted to note that his delegation would have a statement to make when the item was next discussed in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN assured the United States representative that his comments would be taken into account.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.