



## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 7:	
Expansion of United Nations activities in the field of industrial development ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	173
Agenda item 5:	
Economic and social consequences of disarmament ( <i>resumed from the 1221st meeting</i> ) . . . . .	175
Agenda item 18:	
Report of the Commission on Human Rights	
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	176
Agenda item 20:	
Advisory services in the field of human rights	
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	177
Agenda item 21:	
Implementation of the Supplementary Convention of 1956 on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices resembling Slavery	
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	177
Agenda item 15:	
Measures designed to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples . . . . .	177

*President* : Mr. J. MICHALOWSKI (Poland).

*Present* :

Representatives of the following States: Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Poland, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Tunisia, Venezuela.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization.

## AGENDA ITEM 7

**Expansion of United Nations activities in the field of industrial development (E/3656 and Add.1; E/L.967/Rev.1) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said that for many years the traditional theory of comparative cost advantage had stood in the way of the recognition of the importance of

industrialization. That theory was in fact a defence of the *status quo* since it maintained that there could only be prosperity if countries specialized in those lines of production for which they were uniquely suited. Fortunately, new ideas were emerging, and industrialization was being regarded as an essential part of the process of economic development.

2. It had also come to be realized that the performance of industry in the under-developed countries could not be evaluated in traditional terms of domestic and international competitiveness and profitability but had to be assessed according to the general impact of the particular industry on the economy and especially its ability to provide employment and a training ground for management and technical experts for other industries. Industrialization was a self-generating process and could not be assessed statistically on a short-term basis. Current efforts to organize the work on industrialization more efficiently testified to that entirely new approach. He wished to commend the United Nations and the specialized agencies on the vigorous initiative they had taken during the preceding few years and to welcome the memoranda by the Secretary-General (E/3656) and by the Commissioner for Industrial Development (E/3656/Add.1) which outlined the direction which further and more intensive action should take. The latter in particular rightly emphasized the decisive role to be played by the regional economic commissions and indicated the functions to be discharged by the Headquarters Offices of the Centre of Industrial Development (E/3656/Add.1). He agreed with the Commissioner that the recommended teams of advisers on industrial development should serve in the regional economic commissions where they could be in close touch with field operations. However, though such teams could assist governments in drawing up comprehensive plans of industrialization, they might not include persons with the right qualifications to help in drawing up detailed plans for specific industries. For that reason the industrial activities of the specialized agencies and those under EPTA as well as the Special Fund should be extended so as to provide upon request specialized assistance of that nature.

3. With those considerations in mind, his delegation had joined in sponsoring draft resolution E/L.967/Rev.1.

4. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America), paying tribute to the prompt and constructive action taken by the Secretary-General following the second session of the Committee for Industrial Development, expressed appreciation for the Secretary-General's memorandum and welcomed the appointment of so highly qualified a person as Mr. Mayobre to the post of Commissioner for Industrial Development.

5. In view of the difficulty the Committee had had in arriving at a satisfactory evaluation of the work of the United Nations family in the field of industrial development and of the actual volume of resources devoted to the purpose, as described in its report (E/3600, para. 91), he particularly welcomed the Commissioner's memorandum and the statement he had made at the 1230th meeting concerning future plans for intensifying United Nations activities. It was to be hoped that the programme to be carried out in co-operation with the regional economic commissions would help to accelerate the rate of industrialization through more vigorous and concerted action, the need for which had been stressed by the Committee. Ultimately, industrial development depended on action taken by the countries themselves with the help of others.

6. The programme as outlined by the Commissioner was indicative of a sound approach, foresight and realism. The Commissioner's memorandum also gave a balanced picture of what should be the respective roles of Headquarters and the regional economic commissions. It recognized that advisory services by themselves could not do the job but were prerequisites for effective action. No country could afford to misuse resources and every factor should be analysed before plans were set in motion.

7. His government would co-operate fully in the common task which should lay the foundations for industrial development for decades to come. He would support the four-Power draft resolution.

8. Mr. PORTELLA de AGUIAR (Brazil) said that in order to meet some of the objections raised at the 1230th meeting the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided to amend it.<sup>1</sup> First, in operative paragraph 4 the words "whenever such placement would give the most effective results as" should be substituted for the words "the need for whom was"; secondly, operative paragraph 6 should read: "Expresses the hope that adequate financial resources will be appropriated . . . Industrial Advisory Service, to meet the needs of the developing countries in all regions."

9. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as the Council was discussing practical ways of furthering the process of industrialization, he would draw attention to the view expressed by the Committee for Industrial Development in its report with regard to the valuable assistance which experts from the centrally planned economies with their wide experience in planning could give to developing countries. Such experts had been warmly welcomed under bilateral agreements and had done excellent work, but within the United Nations Secretariat, the specialized agencies, EPTA and the Special Fund the position was entirely different and artificial obstacles were created to prevent such experts from being used. That most abnormal situation must be remedied and he had every hope that the Commissioner and the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions would approach the matter with wisdom and good sense, bearing in mind the interests of developing countries.

<sup>1</sup> The revised text was subsequently circulated as document E/L.967/Rev.2

10. He would add that assistance could be given only in response to government requests and express the hope that bodies which so loudly proclaimed their desire to provide assistance would not hedge it about with conditions that failed to respect the sovereign rights of the recipients.

11. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) wished the Commissioner for Industrial Development every success in his new post.

12. His delegation unreservedly supported the draft resolution. Industrial development was of the utmost concern to the developing countries, including his own, and any move to expand United Nations activities in that field was to be welcomed. Moreover, the draft resolution tended to strengthen the work of the regional economic commissions; his own country thought very highly of the activities of ECLA, especially in Central America, where it had been the principal instrument of the economic integration, the beneficial effects of which were already being felt.

13. The PRESIDENT, inviting debate more particularly on the draft resolution, said that financial implications of its proposals would be set out in the general statement on the financial implications of action by the Council which would be submitted towards the end of the session.

14. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that it was evident from the comments made at the 1230th meeting, notably by the representative of Colombia, that his delegation's doubts about the wording of paragraph 6 had not been fully understood. Some of those doubts had been dispelled by the sponsors' first amendment, but his delegation was still uncertain whether it was appropriate in that context to speak of expanding United Nations activities in general in the industrial field. It would have been preferable to refer only to the industrial advisory service.

15. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as the draft resolution covered some new points which had not yet been discussed and had financial implications, it called for further and more detailed study, preferably in the Economic Committee.

16. The PRESIDENT said that the Council, in adopting its arrangement of business at the 1209th meeting, had decided to deal with the current item in plenary without reference to the Economic Committee; the Council was, however, free to reverse its decision.

17. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia), referring to the remarks of the United Kingdom representative concerning operative paragraph 6, said that as a sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation would deprecate an amendment whereby reference would only be made to the industrial advisory service, since other United Nations activities had to be expanded in view of the capital importance of industrialization to economic development. As he had said earlier in the meeting, the industrial advisory service might not be able to provide all forms of assistance needed by governments.

18. Mr. PORTELLA de AGUIAR (Brazil) said that his delegation attached great importance to the wording

of paragraph 6 and considered that the industrial advisory service was only part of a wider network of activities.

19. No useful purpose would be served by referring the draft resolution to the Economic Committee.

20. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that he would not like any member of the Council to infer that the United Kingdom was opposed to an expansion of United Nations activities in the field of industrialization. Nevertheless, without prejudice to the merits of the case, he would propose, under rule 34, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, that the Council should postpone its decision until it had been informed of the financial implications of operative paragraph 6.

21. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the United Kingdom representative to the information contained in annex III of the report by the Secretary-General on the financial implications of actions of the Council (E/3663), under the heading "Industrial Development Advisory Services".

22. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) suggested, as a compromise, that the vote might be deferred until the following meeting.

23. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) supported that suggestion since he had not had time to consult his government nor to study the financial implications of the expansion of United Nations activities other than the industrial advisory service, which was apparently going to cost \$250,000.

24. The PRESIDENT proposed that, in deference to the wishes of certain delegations, further consideration of the revised draft resolution be deferred to the meeting on the afternoon of 26 July.

*It was so agreed.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 5

##### **Economic and social consequences of disarmament (E/3593 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4; E/L.969) (resumed from the 1221st meeting)**

25. Mr. TRIVEDI (India), introducing the draft resolution (E/L.969) sponsored by Ethiopia, India, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America and Yugoslavia, said it was the outcome of a combined effort to work out a generally acceptable text.

26. The draft resolution expressed appreciation of the study by the Consultative Group of Experts transmitted in the Secretary-General's report (E/3593 and Corr.1 and Add.1-4) and urged that the work be continued. It endorsed the experts' view that general and complete disarmament would be an unqualified blessing. The sponsors would have liked to lay particular stress on the needs of developing countries because the Development Decade was one of the main themes of the Council's current session but had refrained from doing so for fear that such emphasis might not meet with general approval. The final operative paragraph requested the Secretary-General to place the item on the agenda of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly.

27. As one of the sponsors he would propose the substitution of the word "related" for the word "specialized" in operative paragraph 7 (a) as that change would render the review more comprehensive.

28. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that the negotiations culminating in the draft resolution had been conducted in a spirit of co-operation. The draft accurately reflected the ideas expressed during the general debate at the 1220th and 1221st meetings on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. Its sponsors included the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, the two great Powers on which the outcome of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament essentially depended. By its adoption, the conclusions of the report by the group of experts would acquire the authority of principles acknowledged by the United Nations, and in that way the United Nations would be able to encourage and hasten the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

29. Mr. PONTI (Italy) said that he would support the draft resolution provided that the "report" referred to in the text meant document E/3593 and Corr.2 together with its four addenda.

30. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution spoke for itself. It was the result of a combined and determined effort to work out an agreed text that would demonstrate to public opinion the Council's contribution towards a solution to the problem of disarmament.

31. Mr. KLUTZNIK (United States of America) expressed gratification at the unanimity achieved among the sponsors of the draft resolution, the adoption of which would mark a significant advance in the consideration of a vital topic. The spirit of the group of experts' study should be kept alive and the problems involved should be kept under continuous review pending agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

32. With reference to the Italian representative's remark, he hoped that his co-sponsors would agree that the "report" referred to was the Secretary-General's report transmitting the experts' study together with the addenda thereto.

33. He accepted the change to paragraph 7 (a) suggested by the Indian representative.

34. Mr. TRIVEDI (India) endorsed the United States representative's reply to the Italian representative.

35. Mr. REVOL (France) said that, as his delegation had already commented at the 1217th meeting on the current item when agenda item 4 had been discussed, he would merely add that the experts' conclusions treated as they deserved to be treated allegations to the effect that certain countries regarded disarmament as harmful to their economy. The sponsors of the draft resolution (E/L.969) included the two countries with the largest military budgets. The French delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, subject to two reservations: first, France, which was not taking part in the Conference of the Eighteen-nation Committee on Disarmament,

could not associate itself with operative paragraph 5 (b); and secondly, with regard to paragraph 7, it should be understood that the Secretary-General was alone competent to decide what studies should be undertaken and that it would be his duty to call in any assistance he might deem necessary.

36. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would have to inquire whether the wide distribution of the report, called for in operative paragraph 5 (c), could be effected by the Office of Public Information without additional cost.

37. Miss SALT (United Kingdom), agreeing with the President, said that her delegation supported the draft resolution and hoped that it would be unanimously adopted.

38. Mr. JEFTIC (Yugoslavia) said that the dominant theme in the general debate had been the great danger to civilization arising out of the armaments race and the waste of human and material resources, which could be put to better use in raising standards of living throughout the world. It was of the greatest importance that an agreement should be reached as early as possible on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It followed that the Council should continue to review the economic and social consequences of disarmament.

39. It was heartening to see that the draft resolution was sponsored by delegations belonging to different social systems, and he hoped that it would be approved unanimously. His delegation would, however, have preferred the proposal to have incorporated operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.962, since withdrawn, under which Member States, especially the great Powers, would have been asked to consider the possibility of allocating a percentage of their savings from disarmament to the economic development of the less developed countries. In the absence of support for his delegation's views, it had not seen fit to press them.

40. Mr. TOKUHISA (Japan) welcomed the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution included both the United States and the Soviet Union. The draft resolution referred to the measures to be taken after general and complete disarmament had been achieved; unfortunately there was no sign as yet of an agreement on the subject. In the absence of such an agreement, the provisions of the draft resolution would be merely of academic interest.

41. Since the draft resolution had only just been submitted, his delegation would request that rule 56 of the rules of procedure be applied and the vote taken at the Council's meeting on 26 July.

42. Mr. PONTI (Italy) supported the Japanese representative's request, all the more so as the postponement might make it possible to obtain a reply from Headquarters about the expenditure involved.

43. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the expenditure entailed would in fact be insignificant. Similar documents were published in dozens by the United Nations and the cost was charged to the ordinary budget. It was surely unfortunate that

such a trifling matter should create obstacles to the adoption of a draft resolution of such vital importance.

44. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) entirely agreed with the USSR representative; the cost of the action proposed would be purely nominal. Moreover, financial implications were usually reported in due course.

45. The PRESIDENT said that, since there was no contrary decision by the Council, the Japanese representative's request to defer the vote to 26 July would be complied with.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 18

#### Report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/3616/Rev.1)

##### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3676 and Corr.1)

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee and the draft resolutions incorporated therein (E/3676 and Corr.1).

47. Mr. MOLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolutions in question, except draft resolutions I, II and VI.

48. Draft resolutions I and VI called for the preparation of voluminous reports and documents; it was doubtful whether the practical importance of those documents would justify the expense. With regard to draft resolution II on the study of discrimination in the matter of political rights, the best way of fighting discrimination was by legislation. His delegation had proposed an amendment to that effect in the Social Committee which had not been adopted, and it would therefore have to abstain in the vote.

49. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolutions I to VII contained in the report of the Social Committee (E/3676 and Corr.1).

##### I. PERIODIC REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

##### II. STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF POLITICAL RIGHTS

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

##### III. STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PERSONS BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

##### IV. INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFORMATION MEDIA IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

*Draft resolution IV was adopted unanimously.*

##### V. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Draft resolution V was adopted unanimously.*

**VI. GUIDE TO NATIONAL LEGAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OR PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

*Draft resolution VI was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

**VII. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

*Draft resolution VII was adopted unanimously.*

50. Mr. FORSYTHE (Australia), explaining his vote on draft resolution IV, said that his delegation fully supported the intentions of that draft resolution, which indeed incorporated some amendments drawing attention to new techniques of communication for educational purposes, which his delegation had submitted in the Social Committee. Nevertheless, its affirmative vote was subject to the understanding that it was for the General Conference of UNESCO to pronounce upon any budgetary implications involved in the light of other calls on that organization's resources.

**AGENDA ITEM 20**

**Advisory services in the field of human rights (E/3634 and Add.1)**

**REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3677)**

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution in the field of human rights set out in paragraph 4 of the report of the Social Committee on advisory services (E/3677).

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

**AGENDA ITEM 21**

**Implementation of the Supplementary Convention of 1956 on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices resembling Slavery (E/3626 and Add.1-3)**

**REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3678)**

52. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution in paragraph 4 of document E/3678.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

**AGENDA ITEM 15**

**Measures designed to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples (E/3638 and Add.1; E/L.970)**

53. The PRESIDENT invited debate on the report of UNESCO (E/3638 and Add.1) and also drew attention to the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (E/L.970).

54. MR. FRANÇOIS (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), introducing the report, said that General Assembly resolution 1572 (XV) had a close parallel in resolution 1.1531 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO as its eleventh session (E/3638, annexes I and II). The report before the Council, which had been considered by the Executive Board of UNESCO, had involved a good deal of work on the part of his organization's secretariat, as stated in the intro-

duction to the report. All the 73 replies received by the secretariat in response to its inquiries had been analysed; the results were summarized in part II of the report, whilst part I set forth the conclusions which the Director-General had drawn from that analysis.

55. The measures which could be taken to guide the young in the desired direction could be classified under four heads (para. 10): first, promotion of exchanges and personal contacts; secondly, education at all stages from the primary school to the university; thirdly, teaching about the United Nations; fourthly, action outside the school. From the experience of the specialized agencies, particularly UNESCO, and above all from the replies received from governments and international non-governmental organizations, it was clear that that constituted a complete catalogue of activities and that it was unnecessary to add fresh measures. The classification was not arranged in order of priority: all the measures were important and all of them were complementary. There was no lack of support or enthusiasm among the young. The one complaint was of insufficiency of means: inadequate financial support, shortage of experienced educators and leaders of youth movements, too little time given in school programmes to international comprehension and, finally, lack of effective teaching aids.

56. Some thought had been given to the possibility of preparing an international declaration of basic principles (part II, E). The arguments put forward for and against such a declaration were summarized in the report (paras. 39 to 48). Faced with an almost equal division of negative and affirmative opinions, all supported by cogent reasons, the Director-General of UNESCO had felt unable to make a recommendation. Similarly, the Executive Board of UNESCO had not been able to arrive at a decision on the question. The Director-General's report would be submitted to the General Conference at its following session in November 1962, which would certainly not fail to take into very full account the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council.

57. The measures designed to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding between peoples had at all times been one of the main concerns of UNESCO. The curricula planned by UNESCO for school and out-of-school education, parts of which had been used as models by governments and non-governmental organizations, invariably made provision for courses fostering international comprehension. The UNESCO was, however, no less conscious of the need not merely to continue in that direction but to intensify the efforts undertaken and above all to mobilize larger resources for that cause.

58. Mr. MOLIAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing his delegation's draft resolution (E/L.970), said that the reasons which had led the General Assembly to adopt its resolution 1572 (XV) — which had been due to a happy initiative of the Romanian delegation — were that, despite the struggle of the peoples of the world for peace, the threat of war was still present; in some countries, the spirit of militarism and revenge was still alive, racial persecution and colonial oppression still prevailed and fundamental human rights were ignored.



59. The ideals and principles which were taught to the young were of concern to everybody; after all, youth bore the brunt of war, and ultimately the question of peace or war would largely depend on the upbringing and mentality of the younger generation. The topic under discussion therefore deserved the closest attention of the United Nations. In operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 1572 (XV), there was a reference to the possibility of formulating an international declaration of basic principles. The suggestions originally submitted by the Romanian delegation at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, and subsequently as a working paper at the sixteenth session (E/3638, annex IV), provided an excellent basis for such a declaration.

60. The UNESCO, too, had an important part to play; its conference had adopted a resolution, supported by the USSR delegation, concerning exchanges between youth in various countries—but resolutions were not enough; a declaration of the kind referred to in General Assembly resolution 1572 (XV) was required. Its adoption would not conflict with the resolutions of the General Assembly and UNESCO, nor with the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; on the contrary, such a document would be a logical supplement to the Charter. Moreover, it would draw the attention of governments and of public opinion to problems of education, and would be a guide to international youth organizations and a major contribution to the cause of peace. Unfortunately, such a declaration had not yet been embodied in a specific document. By General Assembly resolution 1572 (XV) the Council was called upon to make recommendations; he hoped that it would be possible to adopt recommendations that would be generally acceptable. In his delegation's view, the UNESCO report should be transmitted to the General Assembly together with the records of the discussions at the current session of the Council so that the General Assembly could take a final decision. The intention of his delegation's draft resolution was to stress once again the need to continue efforts to educate youth in the spirit of peace and also to enable the General Assembly to resume its consideration of the matter and reach a decision.

61. Modern youth was a conscious and active force; it increasingly understood its responsibilities towards society and was trying to contribute to peace, to the emancipation of all colonial and dependent peoples, and to the promotion of justice, democracy and progress. Youth should be helped to understand that friendly and peaceful international relations were the basis for the development of modern society and that it was necessary to fight against war propaganda and to strive for general and complete disarmament.

62. In the Soviet Union, very great importance was attached to educating youth in the spirit of peace and international understanding. That followed from the foreign policy of his country, which was based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. In no school or university, in no cinema, in the Soviet Union would it be possible to find any glorification of war or incitement to hatred of other nations; nothing remotely resembling racial discrimination existed in his country. At the twenty-second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union, Mr. Khrushchev had stressed the desire of the Soviet Union to live in peace with all countries, irrespective of their social systems. At the same congress, the objectives of Soviet foreign policy had been outlined: it was based on an undeviating adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence, on the encouragement of all those who fought for peace, and on the development of economic co-operation with all countries wishing to maintain such relations with the Soviet Union.

63. Peaceful coexistence also implied cultural contacts. Cultural exchanges were taking place between the Soviet Union and over one hundred other countries. The educational system in the Soviet Union encouraged Soviet youth to co-operate with young people in other countries and to develop links with foreign youth organizations. In 1961, 231 delegations representing youth and student organizations, together with 300 groups of young tourists from 114 countries, had visited the Soviet Union. Young people from the USSR had taken part in thirty-two international conferences and seminars; in 1961 the World Forum of Youth, attended by over 800 representatives of various organizations, had been held at Moscow, and Soviet youth organizations were at the moment actively preparing for the Eighth World Youth Festival to be held at Helsinki, at which 12,000 young people would be present. Seminars and camps in the USSR were attended by young people from many foreign countries. It was therefore natural that his delegation should support any proposal to educate youth in the ideals of peace and international understanding; it would support every effort made by the United Nations and UNESCO to relieve international tension and to strengthen peace in the world.

64. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that so complex a subject as that under discussion could hardly be dealt with thoroughly by the Council in the short time at its disposal. But the Council could attempt to examine its purely international aspect and so launch a venture of the highest significance for the co-existence of peoples.

65. In essence, the task was to create the right conditions for international collaboration by influencing youth throughout the world and giving the competent organs of the United Nations guidance for that purpose.

66. Naturally, the main responsibility rested with governments and national educational institutions, for it was their duty in the first place to inculcate the spirit of peace and friendship in the young. The Polish Government was working ceaselessly towards that goal, although its task was rendered more difficult by the painful memories of a very recent epoch. Poland was deeply attached to the principles of international understanding and peace which were solemnly proclaimed in its constitution; Polish school and university programmes gave prominence to the teaching of those principles. Educational institutions, youth organizations, international seminars, study courses in foreign universities as well as cultural and sporting events helped to translate the principles into practice.

67. It was understandable that the Polish people could not be indifferent to the attitude adopted by their neigh-

bours and particularly by the countries with which Poland's relations in the past had not always been based on peace and mutual respect. Poland was very happy to note that in the German Democratic Republic the government and the cultural institutions were making great efforts to extirpate all traces of chauvinism, racial hatred, militarism and the sentiment of superiority formerly inculcated by the Nazi state. Whatever might be one's views concerning the German Democratic Republic, one had to admit that in that country the education of youth had been radically overhauled, as was confirmed by the statement of the German Democratic Republic transmitted to the Council by the Polish delegation in connexion with agenda item 3 (E/L.961). One could only wish as much could be said of the Federal Republic of Germany. Although some of the young people were learning from the lessons of the past and wished to live in peace with the youth of other nations, the professional exponents of hate and revenge were not idle and it was no mere chance that history textbooks gave a false version of events.

68. Although governments could not be constrained to co-operate in the noble work of promoting the ideals of peace and mutual respect among youth, every constructive measure taken by the United Nations in that

direction could contribute to the peaceful coexistence of young people from different countries. The report submitted by the Director-General of UNESCO and the discussions in the Third Committee at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly showed that remarkable results had already been obtained in that field. However, a great deal still remained to be done, and the ideals of peace, mutual respect and understanding among peoples would not be translated into reality until an international declaration of basic principles had been drawn up and accepted, in keeping with the Romanian suggestions originally made at the fifteenth session of the Assembly. Such a declaration would have a great impact on education and in addition would specify the duties of the State in that respect.

69. The Polish delegation shared the sentiments expressed in the Romanian draft declaration which was based on the United Nations Charter and on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and which represented a logical sequel to the Declaration of the Rights of the Child (General Assembly resolution 1386 (XIV)) and to General Assembly resolution 1510 (XV) on manifestations of racial and national hatred.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.