

Report on 25 years of European cultural cooperation (13 December 1974)

Caption: On 13 December 1974, Franz Karasek, Austrian Chairman of the Committee on Culture and Education of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, submits a report in which he condemns the inadequacy of the results achieved after a quarter of a century of European cultural cooperation.

Source: Council of Europe - Parliamentary Assembly. Texts adopted by the Assembly. 13 December 1974. Doc. 3525. 1974. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. "Report on twenty-five years of European cultural co-operation (13 December 1974)", p. 1-19.

Copyright: (c) Council of Europe

URL: http://www.cvce.eu/obj/report_on_25_years_of_european_cultural_cooperation_13_december_1974-en-5b0e8dba-e7ba-4433-a65f-6bb80459276a.html

Publication date: 29/11/2013

Report on 25 years of European cultural co-operation - Rapporteur: Mr KARASEK (13 December 1974)

I. Draft Recommendation presented by the Committee on Culture and Education²

The Assembly,

1. Noting the report of its Committee on Culture and Education on twenty-five years of European cultural co-operation (Doc. 3525);
2. Recalling its efforts to stimulate European cultural co-operation and establish it on a more coherent and more dynamic basis (Recommendations 567 (1969) and 649 (1971));
3. Believing that the whole machinery of co-operation in the cultural field should be reviewed in the light of the political aims and statutory obligations of the Council of Europe, and that the attention of member governments should be drawn to the urgent need for a clear definition of the respective roles of the different European intergovernmental organisations in order to obviate any possible squandering of public funds by administrative or technical bodies not subject to proper public control;
4. Confirming the specific role of the Council of Europe in the formulation and the overall implementation of a European policy of permanent education and cultural development, two inseparable aspects of a policy directed, above and beyond material and economic circumstances, towards man, his right to education and his right to culture;
5. Convinced that the operation of intergovernmental co-operation as institutionalised in the Council of Europe in the cultural field is vitiated by the absence of political leadership and that there is a gap between the political level (namely the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, which does no more than agree the finances to be accorded the Cultural Fund) and the technical level (the Council for Cultural Cooperation (CCC), which in the working out of its programme enjoys almost total autonomy in relation to the Committee of Ministers and to the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education of the twenty-one states party to the European Cultural Convention);
6. Aware of the useful work that the CCC has done in comparing together the different experiences of member states in its studies and in its research and aware also that such groundwork is essential for the choice and direction of subsequent action, but noting that the CCC is poorly equipped to make a start in the coming decade on the process of bringing about the desired convergence of the educational systems of member states so as to achieve greater unity in the sense of Article 1 of the Statute of the Council of Europe;
7. Looking back with some disappointment on the results of a quarter of a century of European cultural co-operation, and wishing to draw the lessons of experience gained over this time;
8. Believing that it is important for the future to distinguish between:
 - *a framework for reflection*, study and investigation : the flexible system of technical co-operation of the states party to the European Cultural Convention which it would be desirable to extend as far as possible to all states wishing to accede to this convention;
 - *a framework for decision and action* : such as is possible within the system of the member states of the Council of Europe, bound together by specific statutory obligations;
9. Considering that effective governmental direction for the work of the Council of Europe can come only from the involvement of the competent Ministers themselves, whom it is important to associate with the pursuit of the statutory aims of the organisation and whose executive authority is a necessary part of the process of determining the political priorities of the CCC programme and the controlling of their subsequent implementation;

10. Noting that Article 14 of the Statute of the Council of Europe would allow a development of this nature without in any way affecting the budgetary responsibilities of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs;
11. Wishing, moreover, to establish a dialogue with the Committee of Ministers sitting at the level of Ministers competent for educational and cultural affairs on the model of the Joint Committees held on questions of general policy;
12. Recalling its report on the mission of the Council of Europe (Doc. 3281) and especially paragraphs V. a and b of its Recommendation 704 (1973);
13. Noting that its Committee on Culture and Education has established a list of political objectives and a priority programme for action (contained in Doc. 3525),
14. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:
 - a. institute, along the lines of Recommendation 704 (1973) on the mission of the Council of Europe, special meetings at the level of Ministers competent for educational and cultural affair of member states that these may effectively:
 - determine, in the field of culture and education, priorities for action in the intergovernmental programme for the CCC then to implement;
 - reorganise, and if need be cut down, the total programme in the light of these priorities;
 - b. set up in conjunction with the Assembly a joint committee, composed of representatives of these special meetings of the Committee of Ministers and representatives of the Assembly, with a view to ensuring that these priorities for action reflect also the political objectives of a common European strategy of culture and education ;
 - c. remind member governments of their commitment to European co-operation in the field of culture and education, and that, whatever structures are available, these should be taken as a whole into consideration in the planning, but also in the financing, of such co-operation.

II. Explanatory Memorandum by Mr KARASEK

Introduction

1. It is a tradition for the Chairman of the Committee on Culture and Education to present each year a report on cultural policy, summing up European co-operation in the fields of culture and education and at the same time showing what are the prospects for this co-operation.
2. The report presented this year follows upon the 25th anniversary of the Council of Europe. Anniversaries are often occasions for rejoicing and sometimes even give rise to all too facile demonstrations of self-satisfaction and mutual congratulations. A political Assembly such as ours owes it to itself to remain lucid, critical and open to change, that it to say open to the necessary adjustment to the shifting conditions of a society undergoing rapid change.
3. Since 1967 the idea which has guided the activities of our committee has been that of reinforcing and rationalising European cultural co-operation, it being understood that the word culture also implies education.
4. Various stages stand out in the work of our committee, which is characterised by continuity without ever becoming imprisoned in rigid formulas.

5. Under the stimulus imparted by Mr Kahn-Ackermann, our former Chairman but now Secretary General, the committee established a preliminary diagnosis of European co-operation in the field of culture and education on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Council of Europe, and in that context it put forward proposals which, though at the time they may have seemed revolutionary, must be recognised as sound. These proposals were subsequently taken up by Mr Borel and Mr Capelle but modified slightly to take account of the views of the Committee of Ministers.

6. It is up to me, as the new Chairman of the committee, to draw conclusions from these years of effort aimed at providing the Council of Europe with the tools which will allow it to expand its activities in the fields of culture and education. It is however also an occasion on which I should, as your Rapporteur, examine the situation and adopt a new approach.

7. In this report, it is accordingly my intention to concentrate on the political and institutional aspects of the problem of the revival of co-operation within our organisation in the field in question.

Recapitulation

a. Objectives

8. Aware of the profound changes which characterise European society, the Assembly considered, on the basis of studies made by its Committee on Culture and Education and by the Council for Cultural Co-operation, that two major objectives should be pursued along parallel lines in the next twenty years, since, from a general standpoint, they are merely two facets of the same problem :

- *permanent education* which we consider as the means of organising education so that everyone may take part in and adapt himself to changes during a life-long process;

- *cultural development* which means giving everyone the best opportunities for cultural advancement by providing a stimulating and enriching environment, as well as all other means favouring full expansion of personality.

9. Those are the objectives. They are ambitious and require appropriate means for their implementation. Above all, permanent education and cultural co-operation imply - if they are to be achieved - integrated and coherent systems of co-operation. After five years of unflinching effort in that direction we are still far from our goal.

b. Means

10. As long ago as 1969, on the basis of a survey of the first two decades of European cultural co-operation and appreciating the profound changes which are a feature of European society, the Assembly endeavoured to work out a model for co-operation suited to the way in which that society was developing. It accordingly put forward a series of proposals (Recommendation 567 (1969) and Recommendation 649 (1971)) for giving European co-operation fresh impetus on a new, better organised, more coherent and more dynamic basis.

11. After proposing, as a first stage, the creation of a European Office of Education (Recommendation 567 (1969)) the Assembly, wishing to work out a compromise with the Committee of Ministers in the light of the provisional reply to that recommendation and also bearing in mind the outcome of the Joint Committee meeting of 9 June 1971, adopted Recommendation 649 (1971) inviting the Committee of Ministers, inter alia, to entrust the Council for Cultural Co-operation (CCC) with the functions of a European Office of Education, as the Committee of Ministers itself proposed doing. The Assembly pointed out, however, that this could be done only if the CCC's membership was changed to cope with this new task and its administrative and financial resources increased accordingly. The Assembly was convinced that an effort was needed in both these directions in order to enable the CCC to assume certain political responsibilities,

passing beyond the stage of mere intergovernmental co-operation conducted along "cultural diplomacy" lines to that of joint rethinking of national cultural and education policies; in short to do for education and culture what was being done by the Nine in the economic and social field.

12. The reply to Recommendation 649 (1971) given in the last Communication from the Committee of Ministers to the Assembly (Doc. 3371) glosses over, not to say evades, this fundamental political issue of the cohesion and efficiency of machinery. This reply is particularly unsatisfactory as regards the need to provide the co-operation system with "political leadership" by placing the CCC under the technical control - without excluding political control by the Committee of Ministers - of competent Ministers.

13. Lastly, the action taken on the CCC's proposals in its Opinion No. 10 gives cause for concern. When asked by the Committee of Ministers to submit proposals for enabling it to perform effectively the function of a European Office of Education, the CCC drew up a number of "intensified co-operation projects". In its Recommendation 717 (1973), the Assembly pointed out the modesty of these proposals but acknowledged that they represented a basis on which it should be possible to give fresh impetus to European co-operation in the field in question. However, the Committee of Ministers' decisions regarding the funds made available to the CCC stand in contradiction to the Ministers' officially declared intention to "rely on the CCC to meet the clearly increasing requirements for education and cultural co-operation" (Committee of Ministers' reply to Recommendation 567 (1969)).

Analysis of the reply from the Committee of Ministers to Recommendation 649 (1971)

14. Following these brief background remarks, I shall now examine more closely the text of the reply to Recommendation 649 (1971).³

15. This first point to note is the statement in paragraph 2 that "the CCC ... confirmed that it was ideally placed, thanks to its structure and its membership, to act as a focus for co-operation in the educational field between its member countries". That the Committee of Ministers, which is the political body responsible, should endorse so optimistic a statement by the CCC is a matter for some surprise. While the Assembly, after discussing the question with the Committee of Ministers in the Joint Committee, came out (in Recommendation 649 (1971)) in support of the idea that the CCC should be given the function of a European Office of Education (Recommendation 567 (1969)), it was nevertheless aware that this could be done only on certain conditions, and certainly not by a simple declaration of intent!

16. It is therefore disappointing that structural weaknesses in our co-operation system are still being persistently ignored, five years after Recommendation 567 (1969).

17. I entirely agree with the CCC when it stresses the close interdependence of education and culture ; but it is no longer true that the CCC, as is argued in the reply from the Committee of Ministers, is the only organisation concerned with both educational and cultural problems. The end of the second paragraph marks a profound divergence between the Assembly and the CCC. In the Assembly's view the European Ministers of Education constitute the "political summit" from which the CCC's initiatives and guidelines emanate. In the opinion of the CCC, which is not a political organ, the conference is merely a "body" with which it is desirable to "collaborate closely". To politicians, this approach to the problem of the relationship which ought to exist between Ministers of Education and members of the CCC, who are responsible to the Foreign Ministers, is extremely curious, and in any event illustrates the incoherent nature of the system. In paragraph 3, the CCC rightly points out its primary objectives, but in my view does not place sufficient emphasis on the implementation of joint action. It is true that in order for joint action to be possible, there must be a political will served by structures which are sufficiently co-ordinated and attuned to each other to generate efforts at convergence.

18. On the other hand, I welcome the statement in paragraph 6 that encouragement should be given to projects of intensified co-operation which the CCC has developed with considerable care, and which in certain cases may take the form of "special projects", i.e. "projects" with which only some of the governments represented in the CCC wish to be associated.

19. This offers a degree of flexibility which is of great political importance to European unity in the broader sense, and which would enable the CCC to work in the interests of all the states signatories to the European Cultural Convention while at the same time stepping up its activities in particular fields which are of interest only to some of them.

20. I do not believe the statement, in paragraph 9 of the reply from the Committee of Ministers, that a progressive strengthening of the means available to the CCC would be sufficient, without modification of its present structures and the means of action available to it, for it to assume the essential tasks of a focus for European co-operation.

21. First, the autonomy of the CCC in drawing up its programme may in fact be to its disadvantage. This autonomy is in fact a lack of contact; the Ministers of Foreign Affairs exercise virtually no control over the activities of the CCC, except to determine the size of its budget, while Ministers of Education and other competent Ministers feel only incidentally involved for the simple reason that a Committee of Ministers (of Foreign Affairs) exercises supervisory authority over the CCC.

22. Secondly, the CCC, with its present permanent committees, is ill-equipped for the task of deciding upon priorities put forward by each of these committees. The Committee of Ministers, in paragraph 10, place emphasis on the need to select strict priorities yet do not recognise how impossible such a selection is within the present structure.

23. Establishment of priorities must take place from the top downwards, in other words it is the appropriate Ministers who ought to champion the intensified co-operation projects in culture and education vis-à-vis the Foreign Ministers. Only these Ministers would have the requisite authority to hold a dialogue with the Committee of Ministers on joint projects the achievement of which must not depend on financial contingencies but on the political imperatives of European unification.

24. I am therefore sceptical about paragraph 11.

25. With regard to the "final remarks" and "other questions arising", it is possible to detect a willingness to move a little way towards the Assembly's proposals, but at the same time a reluctance to overcome the major obstacle to a renewed stimulus to co-operation in this sector within the Council of Europe.

26. As long ago as 1971, a former Chairman of the committee, our distinguished colleague Mr Borel, pointed to just this problem. His remarks are no less valid today and I should like to quote some of them here.

27. "The situation is serious. We are not merely at the cross-roads : we have our backs to the wall. We urge the Foreign Ministers most emphatically to draw the consequences. Given the necessary machinery and resources, the Council of Europe should, in the coming decades, have a prime role to play in the field of education and culture. As guardian of the spiritual, moral and cultural values common to the countries of Europe, it should become the main agency of intensified co-operation in culture and education, serving both the progressive development of the European Communities and the establishment of ever closer cultural relations with the countries of Eastern Europe.

In conclusion, we should like to know whether the Committee of Ministers, sharing our concern, is prepared to take all necessary steps to ensure that the Council of Europe is able to play the part it should in the field of education and culture, or whether the Ministers are preparing, as their past attitude to our proposals would suggest, slowly but surely to allow the organisation's cultural co-operation to go under.

We cannot accept that European cultural co-operation, imprisoned within an institutional straitjacket, should degenerate into a residual activity, nor can we agree that the Committee of Ministers should shift its political responsibilities on to a body such as the CCC which describes itself as a technical organ.

We believe that the hour has come for Foreign Ministers and Ministers for Education to draw the line between their respective provinces, if necessary with their heads of government intervening to arbitrate. In our view, the Foreign Ministers should continue to be responsible for general policy and for the budget. The Ministers for Education should be responsible for establishing priorities of European educational policy for the CCC and its permanent committees. Only if this is done will the parliamentarians, responsible as they are to the public for supervising the management of public funds, be able to continue to endorse the policy pursued in the Council of Europe."

28. What progress has been achieved since this was said in 1971? Has cultural co-operation been "intensified" in the Council of Europe? An affirmative answer would be hypocritical. The reply we have been given by the Committee of Ministers is unquestionably skilfully worded, but it is devoid of political substance.

29. Meanwhile the European Communities have decided to set up a committee on education co-operation (a CCC for the Nine), a committee on youth questions, a youth advisory committee, and a programme of action for the Nine on the safeguarding of the architectural heritage. It may be hoped that such activity can be complementary to the work of the Council of Europe. At present, however, governments, and the Committee of Ministers in their recent reply, are being singularly unforthcoming as regards suggesting structures and guidelines for co-ordination and co-operation.

The need for a new approach

30. Whilst the reply to Recommendation 649 (1971) is void of political substance, the expressions of self-satisfaction and the evasions in it are irritating to some of us. This shows once again that the Assembly has no political counter-part for the discussion of problems of education and culture.

31. I consider that it is urgently necessary to rethink the co-operation system in accordance with the political aims of the Council of Europe and the pursuance of its statutory objectives.

32. It is also urgent that the governments of our member states be asked to take the measures needed for a clear definition of the respective roles of the various European intergovernmental organisations, so as to prevent squandering of public funds by administrative and technical authorities not subject to proper control. This is a vital task which devolves on us, parliamentarians, who are responsible to the public for the authorisation given in our parliaments for expenditure incurred by our governments.

33. More than ever vigorous reactivation of co-operation in the fields of culture and education is needed. But what should be its framework ?

34. In the light of developments during the past ten years, it is becoming increasingly evident that we must distinguish in future between :

a. a framework for reflection, study and investigation as provided by the states signatories to the European Cultural Convention, a flexible framework for technical co-operation which should be extended as far as possible to all states wishing to accede to this convention ;

b. a framework for decision and action, as provided by the member states of the Council of Europe bound by specific statutory obligations.

35. As regards the first, it should be remembered that the framework of the European Cultural Convention is that of the CCC, and that it is also that of the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education.

36. The CCC describes itself as a technical organ. It is no longer necessary to demonstrate that it needs "political leadership" to set the priorities for its programme. Originally we thought that the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education might take over that role. However, in the reply to Recommendation 649 (1971), reference is made to the intention of the conference to remain autonomous,

and to the participation in the conference of a number of international organisations with a European vocation (which was never questioned). In short, the conference does not appear to wish to have any responsibility towards the Council of Europe. For its part, and this is astonishing, to say the least, the CCC considers that "it should take inspiration in establishing its priorities" from the conference. The parliamentarians in this Assembly can hardly agree that a ministerial conference should be no more than a vague inspiration for the establishment of CCC priorities and that CCC officials should have the right to question resolutions adopted by the competent Ministers. Here I put my finger on a point which is particularly symptomatic of the incoherence of our structures.

37. Today I am convinced that if the Council of Europe wishes co-operation in education and culture to enter a new phase, the impetus which such co-operation will need can come only from the statutory framework itself, that is to say from the framework of member states which are bound by specific statutory obligations. I recognise the merit of the CCC in the work done to compare the different experiences of member states, in its studies and its research. I also accept that the continuation of such ground-work is essential for the choice and direction of subsequent action. It must however be admitted that the CCC is at present poorly equipped to make a significant start in the coming decade to bring about the desired convergence of the educational systems of member states so as to achieve greater unity within the meaning of Article 1 of the Council of Europe Statute. A political impetus is needed for this and that impetus can come only from the competent Ministers who must now be closely associated with the future of the organisation. This is perfectly concordant with the application of Article 14 of the Council of Europe Statute and does not challenge the responsibility for the budget which will continue to be assumed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. This association of competent Ministers would allow us to overcome the gap between the political level, namely the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs which does no more than agree the finances to be accorded to the Cultural Fund, and the technical level, namely the Council for Cultural Co-operation which enjoys almost complete autonomy in the preparation of its programme.

38. In the draft recommendation the Committee of Ministers is therefore asked to institute at appropriate intervals special meetings at the level of Ministers competent for educational and cultural affairs and such as are in a position to :

- determine, in the field of culture and education, the priorities for action in the intergovernmental programme for the CCC then to implement;
- reorganise, and if need be cut down, the programme in the light of these priorities.

39. I also believe that parliamentarians have a clear part to play both in the establishment of political objectives (long-term) and in the choice of priority programmes for action (short-term) that might reflect such objectives.

40. This committee has for some time been preoccupied with the problem of objectives. I have already referred above, in paragraph 8, to permanent education and cultural development. A rather longer list can be derived in fact from the work of the committee :

- permanent education;
- equality of right of access to education and culture throughout Europe;
- integration of cultural activities and culture itself into the social and political life of society;
- Sport for All;
- search for common objectives for countries of Europe in culture and education;
- assuring young people a valid role in modern society;

- recognition and preservation of existing values, and of the individuality of people, institutions, regions or countries.

41. More recently the committee has considered a list of priority subjects for action aimed at furthering progress towards the realisation of such objectives :

- the reinforcement and rationalisation of structures of European co-operation in the field of culture and education;
- intensive development of the teaching of and exposure to the major European working languages at all levels from pre-school to that of adult education (as an approach to the problem of language barriers in Europe);
- measures to overcome individual handicaps (that of under-privileged socio-cultural background as well as physical, cultural and linguistic) that prevent equality of opportunity in access to education and culture;
- the integration of professional training in education at secondary and tertiary level;
- mobility of the European teaching community;
- schooling for the children of migrants;
- the harmonisation of copyright;
- participation by youth in social and cultural life;
- a European policy of recurrent education;
- an agreed policy of communications that recognises the educational and cultural role of the media;
- integrated conservation of the architectural and natural heritage, so that it occupies a positive place in all aspects of modern society.

42. This list is preliminary; it could be greatly elaborated, and it dearly must be continually revised and brought up to date. I note it here in brief as a basis for the further proposal contained in the recommendation, which is that parliamentarians of this Assembly should be involved alongside competent intergovernmental representatives in the establishment of a programme for action. This is how we believe the Work Programme of the Council of Europe in this field can be a continued reflection of the political will of Europe. Such political will has been too often lacking in the past, but is a precondition for the implementation of a positive programme for action.

APPENDICES

Recommendation 567 (1969) on "Twenty years of European cultural co-operation"

The Assembly,

1. Having noted the report of its Committee on Culture and Education on "Twenty years of European cultural co-operation" (Doc. 2645);
2. Recording its interest in the work of the 6th Conference of European Ministers of Education, held at Versailles from 20 to 22 May 1969, and its particular satisfaction at the very concrete proposals and suggestions made by the Chairman in his opening speech;
3. Believing that these proposals and suggestions are of a nature to reactivate on a new basis European

cultural co-operation - the real spearhead of all economic, social and scientific progress in the member countries - and recalling in this connection its Recommendation 497 (1967) on the strengthening and rationalisation of international cultural co-operation;

4. Considering, moreover, the 1968 annual report of the Council for Cultural Co-operation (Doc. 2590) which marks a new step forward in defining the priorities in its programme;

5. Emphasising that on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Council of Europe it is urgently necessary to rethink European cultural co-operation along constantly forward-looking lines and in terms of major targets whose attainment would signify a real cultural renaissance of Europe as an entity;

6. Desirous, looking back over the past, of recalling the fundamental role played by the European Cultural Convention and paying tribute to the activities of the Committee of Cultural Experts which contributed largely in the first stage of European co-operation to awareness of the fact that Europe has a common civilisation, thus creating the preconditions for the advance of the European idea;

7. Recalling that in a second phase, by setting up a Cultural Fund and by creating the Council for Cultural Co-operation, the Council of Europe made very substantial progress towards co-operation at once more multilateral and more technical, which also covered education;

8. Paying tribute to the CCC, which in spite of certain inherent structural weaknesses, plays a useful part as catalyst and laboratory through its confrontations of national experiences, its studies, its research and its recommendations aimed at helping the member countries to increase their educational and cultural potential;

9. Considering, however, that in the next twenty years the Council of Europe, in a society characterised by rapid and profound changes which require a constant effort of readaptation and restructuring, will have to pursue a forward-looking educational and cultural programme based on :

- *permanent education*, which means organising education so that man can participate in and adapt himself to changes during a lifelong process, and which should also co-ordinate all the factors which go to make up training;

- *cultural development*, which means giving everyone the best opportunities for cultural advancement by providing a stimulating and enriching environment, as well as all other means favouring the full expansion of the personality;

10. Aware of the fact that both permanent education and cultural development presuppose complete, integrated and coherent systems of co-operation which are at present lacking in Europe,

11. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers review the structures of European cultural co-operation along the following lines, by :

A. *Conference of European Ministers of Education*

Giving the Conference of European Ministers of Education a permanent character so that it can define and determine the priorities of a European policy in the field of education ;

B. *European Office of Education*

Setting up, in accordance with a procedure worked out by the Council of Europe, a European Office of Education under the technical control of the Ministers of Education of member countries. The Office would be financed at the beginning by government contributions for education paid into the Council of Europe budget, to which private funds could be added for specific tasks. This Office would consist of:

- a small number of committees covering all stages and types of education, from pre-school to out-of-school

activities, and including secondary and post-secondary education;

- Centres attached to it, for example a Documentation and Information Centre, a Research and Innovation Centre and a Centre for University Technology.

One of the first tasks of the European Office of Education would be to work out a European "teacher and student" statute;

C. Council for Cultural Co-operation

Inviting the CCC to give priority to preparing and implementing a long-term programme of cultural development and to creating the requisite structures.

Recommendation 649 (1971) on European co-operation in the field of culture and education

The Assembly,

1. Recalling its proposals for restructuring and reinforcing European cultural co-operation, and in particular its Recommendation 567 (1969) on "Twenty years of European cultural co-operation";
2. Confirming that its proposals are designed to re-establish European educational and cultural co-operation on fresh foundations on the eve of the enlargement of the European Communities;
3. Conscious that with this in mind governments will find it necessary to review the terms of reference and functions of European intergovernmental organisations, and that it is therefore more important than ever to insist on the Council of Europe's special task in the field of culture and education, and in particular with regard to the definition and application of a European policy for permanent education and cultural development;
4. Increasingly concerned by the fact that in the educational field Europe is lagging behind what has been accomplished in the economic sphere because it has been unable to avail itself of a complete, integrated and coherent system of co-operation, and convinced that the desire for the widest possible cultural unity in Europe should lead to the search for such systems, not in a community restricted to a small number of countries, but in the wider framework of the states parties to the European Cultural Convention;
5. Observing that by their very nature problems concerned with education and culture cannot suitably be dealt with by a community as such, and emphasising on the other hand the admirable flexibility of the system instituted in the Council of Europe whereby a certain number of governments are able to co-operate in the framework of so-called "partial" or "limited" agreements with a view to carrying out priority projects over a number of years, by means of which the governments concerned are enabled to intensify their co-operation in a given field in a way which enables all the member states to benefit from the results obtained;
6. Believing that, in a European society which is undergoing a swift and profound transformation, educational and cultural co-operation, which is the true spear-head of all economic, social and scientific progress, is an urgent and important problem which justifies a thorough examination at the highest governmental level;
7. Expressing its regret that the Committee of Ministers has been so slow to recognise the seriousness of this problem, but nevertheless noting with satisfaction that at the meeting of the Joint Committee on 9 June 1971 there appears to have been a general awareness in that body of the pressing need to provide for the requirements of European co-operation in the field of education and for closer co-ordination between all the authorities concerned;
8. Realising that, though the establishment of a European Office of Education as advocated in

Recommendation 567 (1969) must be regarded as a long-term objective, there is an immediate need to find a practical solution by conferring at once on the CCC the task of performing the functions of such an Office on an experimental basis;

9. Aware that in this case it would be essential to review if not the terms of reference at least the composition of the delegations to the CCC as well as the vital problem concerning the relations between that body and the Conference of European Ministers of Education;

10. Once again deploring that the resources of the Cultural Fund are entirely inadequate for Europe's present needs in this field, and emphasising that it is illusory in such circumstances to rely, as does the Committee of Ministers in its provisional reply to Recommendation 567 (1969), "on the CCC to meet the clearly increasing requirements for cultural and educational co-operation in Europe";

11. Considering in this context that the CCC should not limit itself to mere study and research, but assume certain political responsibilities which alone would enable it to pass beyond the stage of mere international co-operation and reach that of common redefinition of national policies;

12. Believing that, in order to facilitate such a development, it is necessary to provide the system of co-operation with "political leadership" and put the CCC under the technical control of the Conference of European Ministers of Education and a similar Conference of European Ministers of Culture, the establishment of which is becoming increasingly indispensable if we are to encourage a long-term policy of cultural development,

13. Recommends the Committee of Ministers :

a. to call upon the Conference of European Ministers of Education :

i. to ensure to the fullest possible extent the co-ordination from the planning stage onwards of the activities of the various international organisations concerned with the field of education;

ii. to exercise, in accordance with Recommendation 567 (1969), a technical control over the CCC with regard to the development of education;

b. to establish a Conference of European Ministers of Culture whose principal task would be to lay down, for the guidance of the CCC, in association with representatives of any other ministries which might be concerned, the priorities for a European programme of cultural development;

c. to instruct the CCC to perform, for an experimental period of five years, the functions allocated to a European Office of Education in accordance with the letter and spirit of Recommendation 567 (1969), and for this purpose :

i. to revise the composition of the delegations to the CCC by ensuring the predominance of the educational and cultural elements through the presence at the head of these delegations of officials from the immediate entourage of the European Ministers of Education and of the Ministers responsible for Culture;

ii. to establish a plan with a view to at least tripling over a period of five years the governmental contributions to the Cultural Fund, so as to permit that body to provide adequate finance for the harmonious expansion of a European programme for permanent education and long-term cultural development in consonance with the aims of the Council of Europe.

1. See Recommendation 567 (1969) and Doc. 2645; Resolutions 461 (1970) and 462 (1970).

2. a. Adopted unanimously by the committee on 9 December 1974.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE : MM. Karasek (Chairman) ; Aano, Roper (Vice-Chairmen); Abens, Adali, Bächtold, Büchner , Carachi, G. Collins, Damgaard, Gislason, Gölder (Alternate: Müller), Kökbudak , Legaret (Alternate : de Montesquiou), Leu, Lidgard, Luptowits , Mrs Miotti Carli, MM. Moneti, van Ooijen (Alternate : Letschert), Pica, Piket , Plasman, Sir John Rodgers (

Alternate : Lord *Duncan-Sandys*), MM. *Schugens*, *Schwencke* , Tomney, *Vitter*, *Wååg* , P. Weber.
N. B. THE NAMES OF THOSE WHO TOOK PART IN THE VOTE ARE PRINTED IN ITALICS.
b. See 18th Sitting, 23 January 1975 (adoption of the draft recommendation), and Recommendation 746.
3. See Doc. 3371, p. 9 (25th Session, Vol. VII).