

Wednesday, 9 October 1957,  
 at 10.45 a. m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 12:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) ( <u>continued</u> )	
Draft resolution on participation of women in community development . . . . .	71
Draft resolution on the development of international co-operation in the field of science, culture and education ( <u>continued</u> ) . . . . .	73

**Chairman: Mrs. Aase LIONAES (Norway).**

**AGENDA ITEM 12**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters VI and VII) (A/3613, A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.611 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.612, A/C.3/L.613) (continued)**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (A/C.3/L.611 and Add.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited attention to the draft resolution on the participation of women in community development submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Ethiopia and Guatemala (A/C.3/L.611).
2. Mr. COX (Peru) warmly supported the draft resolution. Women's activities should by no means be confined to community development, but their participation would be of inestimable value. The general debate had shown the importance of community development in raising the levels of living of rural populations; he congratulated the sponsors of the draft resolution on their initiative.
3. His country, aware of the importance of ascertaining the scope of a social problem before attempting to solve it, had just carried out a highly successful experimental census and would undertake a final census of the population, housing and live-stock in 1958. Furthermore, the Peruvian legislature had just approved an Economic Development Act, which should ensure the country's harmonious economic and social development. Like many other countries, Peru was facing some of the difficulties of urbanization, and in its view the best way of arresting an unhealthy growth of cities was to provide better living for the rural population, by such methods as land reform, which would prevent a rush of farmers to the urban centres, where by their offers of cheap labour they frequently depressed the wages of industrial workers.
4. With reference to the various reports submitted by the Secretariat, he remarked that thoroughness and accuracy were more important than timing.
5. Mr. KANLER (Austria) agreed with the representatives who had stressed the great importance of community development methods. His own country, which had an extensive social programme applying

to all sectors of the population, had acquired considerable experience in the use of those methods and stood ready to offer to the United Nations the services of community development experts, in the hope of making a contribution to the solution of some pressing social problems.

6. He supported the draft resolution on community development (A/C.3/L.611), and also the other draft resolutions before the Committee.

7. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) remarked that, while Indian women had not, in the past, enjoyed full political and civil rights, they had held a dominant position in the home and in the country's social organization, so that community development programmes could hardly be carried out without their co-operation. India had an extensive community development scheme, embracing thousands of villages, and on the whole it had been very successful. Nevertheless, the participation of women had not been as full as might have been desired, because it was not in the Indian people's tradition for educated young women to leave their homes and go out to work in the villages. While every effort had been made to provide suitable working and living conditions for community development workers, the difficulty had not been entirely overcome and in that respect India hoped to be able to profit by the experience of other countries. He took great pleasure therefore in supporting the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.611).

8. Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey) paid a tribute to the sponsors of the draft resolution, for which he would be glad to vote. The participation of women had been found to be essential in all countries to the real success of community development programmes; in his country, women had been active for some time in such programmes.

9. Mr. EFFENDI NUR (Indonesia) had pleasure in supporting the draft resolution and wished to know if the reference, in the first paragraph of the preamble, to community development programmes planned on a long-term basis was factually correct.

10. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) also supported the draft resolution. Her Government had engaged in extensive and successful community development programmes, carried out with the assistance of the United Nations Secretariat and the specialized agencies and also of the United States of America.

11. With reference to the second paragraph of the preamble, she took issue with the statement that community development depended basically on the human element - in her experience, the economic element had often been decisive - and she also failed to see that women were necessarily a more human element than men. She advocated an integrated approach to community development and felt that men and women should be equally active.

12. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) wholeheartedly supported the draft resolution, but considered that its adoption would be expedited by the deletion of the word "especially" in the second paragraph of the preamble. She therefore made a formal proposal for the deletion of the word.
13. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) also supported the draft resolution. There was absolute equality between men and women in Greece, yet women played a more important part than men in social work, and would accordingly take the lead in promoting community development, in accordance with the draft resolution.
14. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) said that her delegation fully supported the draft resolution. There seemed to be some misunderstanding concerning the purpose of the draft. The main point was not that more women should become social workers, but that women who had been relegated to a secondary position by various circumstances should be encouraged to participate in community development.
15. Begum JEHAN MURSHID (Pakistan) said that in her country great importance was attached to the participation of women in social work, and particularly in community development. Her delegation therefore wished to become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution.
16. Miss MAÑAS (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft, said that the three delegations would be honoured to count Pakistan among their number.<sup>1/</sup>
17. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) stated, in reply to the Indonesian representative, that the Council's report (A/3613) contained one reference to a long-term community development project. The sponsors believed that that justified the wording of the first paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution. With regard to references to international co-operation, she considered that it was clear from operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution that not only international assistance but also national effort was required. The paragraph reflected the real situation in many countries where women were not yet fully participating in community development programmes, but should be encouraged to do so. The secondary position to which they had been relegated by circumstances, which the Israel representative had mentioned, should be balanced by special emphasis on the role they might play. If the use of the word "especially", however, in the second paragraph of the preamble was thought by any delegation to mean that only women should concern themselves with community development, it would be better to delete it. She proposed that a separate vote should be taken on that word.
18. Miss ADDAE (Ghana) fully supported the draft resolution, but considered that the participation of women in community development was closely linked with the status of women. In Ghana, women had not been obliged to struggle for equal rights and had thus been able to form the backbone of community development projects.
19. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) observed that the experience of women in her country had been the reverse of that of women in Ghana. Since other avenues were closed to them, Iraqi women had concentrated their efforts on social work, including community development.
20. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) pointed out that, since in many countries women were slow to take part in community development programmes, the representative of Ghana was right in saying that their participation would be fuller if their status were higher; the phrase "by every means in their power" in operative paragraph 1 included the raising of that status. The primary concern of the sponsors, however, was not to raise the status of women, but to promote community development through the participation of women.
21. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) agreed with the representative of Ghana that the degree of participation would depend on the status of women. Nevertheless, the question of raising the status of women was dealt with in another draft resolution (A/C.3/L.612) before the Committee.
22. Miss ADDAE (Ghana) agreed with the two previous speakers, but felt that the status of women was an important factor in their participation in community development.
23. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said he shared the Indonesian representative's misgivings concerning the wording of the first paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution. It was not accurate to state that the General Assembly had noted with satisfaction the community development programmes which were being carried out in various countries. He suggested a drafting change whereby the Assembly would note with satisfaction that such programmes were being carried out.
24. He agreed with the remarks of the representative of Ghana. He felt that the extent to which women participated in community development depended on the status they had achieved, and he had some doubt whether, where that status was low, community development afforded a means of raising it. That doubt would not, however, prevent his delegation from voting in favour of the draft resolution.
25. With regard to operative paragraph 3, he asked the Secretariat whether the request would involve additional work which it could readily undertake. He had been under the impression that the Secretary-General's activities with regard to community development consisted in drafting general principles and giving advice to Governments, rather than in preparing reports on specific programmes.
26. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) agreed with the United Kingdom representative's suggestion concerning the first paragraph of the preamble and shared his doubts concerning operative paragraph 3. With regard to the latter, however, if the Secretariat could make an additional effort, it would be interesting to have detailed information on methods used to achieve the purposes of the draft resolution.
27. Mr. HILL (Deputy Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the United Kingdom representative was right in thinking that the Secretary-General was not planning to prepare reports

<sup>1/</sup> The addition of Pakistan to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution was indicated in document A/C.3/L.611/Add.1.

on specific community development programmes. He would, however, report to the Social Commission at its next session and to the Council in 1959 on significant measures taken with regard to community development. A chapter on progress achieved in that field would also be included in the Report on the World Social Situation to be published in 1961. Accordingly, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would entail no additional staff or resources. The wording of the paragraph was somewhat misleading; stress should be laid on the progress of community development, rather than on individual programmes.

28. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) suggested that the words "these programmes" in paragraph 3 might be replaced by "the progress of community development".

29. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) and Mr. ROY (Haiti) endorsed the United Kingdom representative's suggestions.

30. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) accepted those suggestions, on the understanding that the Rapporteur would incorporate them in the draft resolution.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the word "especially" in the second paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.611 and Add.1).

The word "especially" was rejected by 27 votes to 14, with 31 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF SCIENCE, CULTURE AND EDUCATION (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) (continued)

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised text of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2).

33. Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia) noted with satisfaction that most of the speakers who had commented on the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.1) had appreciated its motive and supported its main idea. In view, in particular, of the brilliant advances of science in the modern world, great new opportunities were offered for international co-operation. The time had come for the United Nations and the specialized agencies to take active steps to promote exchanges among nations of all the fruits of their intellectual activity. Desirous of attaining that end, and anxious to take into account the views of other delegations, the Czechoslovak delegation had accepted most of the amendments to its draft resolution and now submitted a second revised text (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) to the Committee. It had accepted the Chilean amendment (A/C.3/L.616) to operative paragraph 2, with the exception of the words "members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies". Science, education and culture knew no political or geographical boundaries, and co-operation in those matters should not be confined to any group of States. Her delegation had maintained operative paragraphs 3 and 4, and she requested the Chilean representative not to press for their deletion, since they provided for initial steps towards international co-operation. In consequence of the replacement of operative paragraph 2 by the Chilean text, the five-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.614, point 2) and the Philippine amendment (A/C.3/L.615) to the old text of the para-

graph no longer applied. Since the joint amendment to operative paragraph 4 (A/C.3/L.614, point 3) would ensure the aim of her delegation - which was that the Economic and Social Council should discuss the substance of the matter at its twenty-sixth session - she had accepted it also.

34. In conclusion, she thanked all the delegations which had helped to improve the text of the draft resolution by submitting useful amendments, and expressed the hope that the Committee would approve the revised text and would thus take a long step towards the strengthening of friendly relations among States.

35. Mr. ALDUNATE (Chile) said that he had followed the suggestion made by the Saudi Arabian representative at the preceding meeting and had consulted all the delegations which had supported his amendment (A/C.3/L.616) before approaching the Czechoslovak representative in an attempt to achieve a text on which they could agree. He was most grateful to that representative for the spirit of co-operation which she had shown in incorporating the major part of the Chilean amendment in her draft, and he hoped that that spirit would prevail throughout the remainder of the Committee's debates.

36. Nevertheless, he felt obliged to maintain the part of his amendment which referred to States members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies and would ask for a vote on that phrase.

37. Mr. MAHEU (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that he had found the scope of the debate on international co-operation in the field of science, culture and education most gratifying, as UNESCO had been established precisely for that purpose. The Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.610/Rev.2) had the merit of emphasizing the importance of such co-operation.

38. The draft resolution fell into three parts. First, the purposes of the draft resolution, as expressed in the penultimate paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 1, had the warm support of UNESCO. The same objectives were enshrined in the UNESCO Constitution, had been the aims of the programmes of action of UNESCO over the past ten years and had been reaffirmed in resolution 7.7, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its ninth session, in November 1956.

39. Secondly, operative paragraph 2 contained an invitation to all States to develop further all measures for the encouragement of exchange and co-operation between peoples in the field of science, culture and education. The revised text of that paragraph was preferable to the previous one, as it did not spell out the different methods by which such co-operation was to be achieved. There was danger in including a list of that kind, which could not be exhaustive and might later be considered restrictive.

40. Thirdly, the procedure of international action outlined in operative paragraphs 3 and 4, similar to that already included in General Assembly resolution 1043 (XI), was entirely satisfactory, as it respected the constitution, competence and established practice which governed co-operation of the specialized agencies and the United Nations.

41. Under paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, UNESCO was invited to do two things: to state its

views and activities and also to give any information it might have on the views and activities of Governments. There would be no difficulty in carrying out the first of those two tasks and the second would be facilitated by the implementation of resolution 7.22, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its ninth session, under which a second meeting of directors of national services of cultural relations would be organized in 1958. The first meeting in 1955 had already been fruitful and much could be hoped from the second.

42. Operative paragraph 4, in the new version, was quite acceptable, as the deletion of the reference to methods appeared to imply that the consideration of the methods was left to the specialized agencies, as distinct from the questions of general policy, on which the Economic and Social Council could more appropriately concentrate its attention.

43. Mr. TSAO (China) said that he had certain misgivings with regard to both the original and the revised text of the Czechoslovak draft resolution. First, international co-operation in the field of science, culture and education was not dealt with in chapters VI and VII of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/3613), which were now under discussion but in chapter VIII, which was to be discussed elsewhere. Secondly, the purposes of the draft resolution, as expressed in the third paragraph of the preamble, were not new. As had been pointed out by other speakers, they were to be found both in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Constitution of UNESCO. In fact, UNESCO and the other specialized agencies had been working to further such purposes for the past ten years. It might seem somewhat naive for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution embodying the principles on which the Organization was based, after the United Nations had been functioning for ten years, and its prestige might even suffer if it did so. The crux of the matter was that co-operation was not a matter of words and resolutions but of deeds. If the delegations which so warmly supported the draft resolution put its principles into practice, instead of urging others to do so, such co-operation would already be an accomplished fact.

44. In the circumstances, the draft resolution could be considered only as a piece of political propaganda and he could not support it.

45. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the spirit of compromise shown by the Czechoslovak delegation in accepting amendments to its draft resolution and the wide support the draft had received in the Committee. It was unfortunate that some other delegations had shown anything but a conciliatory spirit.

46. The United Kingdom representative had said at the preceding meeting that to embark on a discussion of the development of contacts would be to force an open door. The situation in that respect, however, was not as encouraging as the United Kingdom representative had made it out to be. There were numerous facts indicating that at the current time many Governments were creating totally unjustified and artificial obstacles to the development of contacts. He had deplored the fact that so few persons from the USSR visited the United Kingdom but the reason was that, as in the case of the Farnborough

Air Show, they were not invited or were not granted visas. Furthermore, when persons from the USSR were invited by private individuals, they were often refused visas.

47. The United States representative had said, at that same meeting, that cultural exchanges should be on a reciprocal basis, but visitors to the United States from the USSR met with difficulties from the immigration authorities, and United States students who wished to visit the People's Republic of China, for instance, were threatened with severe persecution because they dared to find out about the life of the Chinese people on the spot.

48. Not a single Soviet tourist could visit the United States and there were no meetings of ex-servicemen, for instance, or chess-players because of the artificial obstacles raised by the United States authorities.

49. Certain representatives had attempted to maintain that the USSR was placing obstacles in the way of cultural relations but that was quite untrue. On the contrary, the USSR was most anxious to promote wider contacts, so as to give the people of other countries a chance of seeing for themselves that the slanders circulating about the Soviet Union were unfounded. The misinformation disseminated by such radio programmes as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe would find no credence with people who had seen the Soviet Union with their own eyes.

50. At the previous meeting, the United States representative had advanced the very strange "theory" that there was no need to maintain cultural, scientific and other contacts with countries whose internal régimes he did not like. He had even considered as shameful exchanges of trade-union delegations with certain countries and had attempted to draw a distinction between the Governments and the peoples. That was but one more proof of the gulf which separated the ruling circles and the trade-union leaders of the United States from the people of the country. They were so afraid of contact with the socialist countries because they did not like their internal régimes. It was the United States which had dropped the "iron curtain", as had been recognized by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in a recent article in The New York Times.

51. She agreed with the United States representative that there were Governments which did not express the will of their peoples; that was certainly true in countries where monopoly capital ran the Government. In those countries which most loudly boasted of their supposed "freedom", there were régimes which denied freedom to their peoples. The information media were used to beguile the masses and slander peace-loving nations. Millions of people were prevented from finding gainful employment, and obtaining an education solely because of the colour of their skin; police action was arbitrary and there was no freedom of expression or of the Press for those who did not think as the monopolies wished them to. Nevertheless, however deplorable, such circumstances should not be allowed to prevent the expansion of cultural relations between peoples, who should be encouraged to co-operate, regardless of the political régimes under which they lived, in order to achieve the high purposes for which the United Nations had been established.

52. Turning to the draft resolutions before the Committee, she said that she would vote for the draft resolution concerning seminars (A/C.3/L.612). She felt that the wording of the draft resolution concerning balanced and integrated economic and social progress (A/C.3/L.613) was so loosely worded that it might make the achievement of the purpose it aimed at more difficult rather than easier. She would consult with other delegations before stating her views on it.

53. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) thanked the Czechoslovak delegation for having accepted two out of the three five-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.614).

54. Replying to the USSR representative, he said that, although he regretted that no visitors from the USSR had been invited to the Farnborough Air Show, he had not been thinking of that kind of meeting but of visits by ordinary citizens as individuals or in groups. So far, such visitors from the USSR had been con-

spicuous by their absence. Some persons from the USSR who had been invited by private individuals might possibly have been refused visas because they were coming for meetings of a political character for which not only Russians but other foreigners were refused admission, but there was no systematic policy of preventing ordinary tourists from visiting the United Kingdom. On the contrary, such visitors were encouraged.

55. He entirely agreed with the USSR representative that exchanges of visits were desirable. If visitors could see for themselves what the situation was in the USSR, it was equally desirable for citizens of the USSR to be able to see conditions in other countries. It was the USSR, not the United Kingdom, which prevented them from doing so.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.