

and bursaries to bring to this country selected scholars, research workers, and administrators from war-devastated countries. The offer was most enthusiastically received.

We were conscious not only in the opening session, but also in subsequent discussions, that the various member States are placing their main emphasis on very different parts of the programme. As one American commentator has said, "It is possible to distinguish four expectations, to which UNESCO must adjust its growing activities. There is, first, the expectation of the war-devastated countries that UNESCO will help them in the urgent task of educational and cultural reconstruction, without which they will not be able to carry their share of responsibility in co-operative activities. Secondly, the so-called "undeveloped" countries look to UNESCO to assist in bringing them abreast of other areas in educational advance and the application of science. Third, there are those who expect UNESCO to forward the developments of the arts and sciences for the enrichment of all and the general welfare of mankind. Fourth, and finally, we in the United States particularly view UNESCO as the agency to promote the search for a common ground of understanding, and to fortify the cause of peace and security by the aid of the world resources of educational, scientific, and cultural co-operation."

None of these four aspects of UNESCO's work can be entirely neglected, but it is inevitable, in an Organization that is both so young and so far-reaching, that different countries and different individuals should see them blended in very different proportions. A further difficulty is that, whilst the majority of delegates think that UNESCO should concentrate on "stimulating," "encouraging," and "promoting" (to use words that occur regularly throughout the programme) work by other agencies, there is a strong minority who believe that it can only remain live and vigorous if it carries out certain projects on its own account.

These diversities of opinion are reflected in the programme for 1948, which is, we think, still too big and diffuse. With intellectual leaders of forty countries each pressing for his own favourite projects, it was not possible by any normal democratic means to produce a programme as compact and unified as any one would wish. It would be wrong to be unduly discouraged by this. With realistic leadership from the Director-General and a judicious admixture of imagination and critical common-sense in the Secretariat, the differences will be resolved more easily in practice than in theory. By the end of 1948 it should be seen quite clearly which projects are impracticable and which are likely to produce solid results within a reasonable period. It is necessary constantly to remind ourselves that UNESCO is a