

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Thursday, 27 November 1958,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 33: Recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-de- termination ( <u>concluded</u> ) . . . . .	293
Agenda item 35: Freedom of information: report of the Secretary- General on consultations concerning the draft Convention on Freedom of Information . . . . .	296

Chairman: Mrs. Lina P. TSALDARIS (Greece).

## AGENDA ITEM 33

**Recommendations concerning international respect  
for the right of peoples and nations to self-deter-  
mination (A/3829, A/3775) (concluded)**

1. Mr. COX (Peru) wished his delegation to be considered, not as having abstained, but as having voted in favour of draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights (Economic and Social Council resolution 586 D (XX), para. 1) at the previous meeting. That draft resolution was fully in accord with the Peruvian Constitution, which proclaimed that the wealth of the country belonged to the State. The question of self-determination was of the greatest importance at the current time and the attention of all the peoples of the world was focused on it. The adoption of draft resolution I would undoubtedly make for a better understanding of the concept. It was true that the wording of the texts transmitted by the Council was not free from imperfections; in particular, his delegation did not agree with some of the points in the draft resolution submitted by the Council (Council resolution 586 D (XX), para. 2) and had accordingly voted against it.

2. Mr. HARREMOES (Denmark) said that his country had always recognized and respected the right of peoples to self-determination. If it was desired to ensure that that right should be exercised, it was not sufficient merely to study the concept of the permanent sovereignty of peoples over their natural wealth and resources; a much more far-reaching survey would be necessary, in order to establish in what cases and in what manner the principle of self-determination could be put into effect. His delegation had therefore voted against draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights and had supported the text proposed by the Council. Furthermore, it held the view that it would be unrealistic to establish a commission to examine violations of the right to self-determination before the meaning of that right had been clearly defined.

3. Miss IMRU (Ethiopia) recalled that the General Assembly had embarked on the study of the question of self-determination because the majority of its members felt that that principle should be applied in the

colonial territories which were demanding their independence. It was also with that purpose in view that many measures had already been adopted by the United Nations and that the Commission on Human Rights had recommended the two draft resolutions which were before the Committee. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, which reaffirmed the inalienable sovereignty of the colonial peoples over the economic resources of their territories and provided the necessary machinery for giving effect to that right while at the same time safeguarding the free flow of capital. Considering as it did that a more adequate discussion of draft resolution II submitted by the Commission on Human Rights (Council resolution 586 D (XX), para. 1) would probably make it possible to allay the misgivings of some Member States, her delegation had supported the Yugoslav representative's proposal that any decision on that text should be postponed until the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. Her delegation had voted against the Council's draft resolution, not because it was opposed to the elucidation of the right to self-determination, but because it was unable to agree that a matter which was solely of interest to colonial territories should be associated with entirely different questions, or that the concept involved should be re-examined and defined.

4. Mr. Tulio ALVARADO (Venezuela) recalled that his country's Minister of Foreign Affairs had stated during the general debate in the Assembly (762nd plenary meeting) that the principle of self-determination would always be supported by the people of Venezuela. His delegation therefore could not do otherwise than give its full support to every step and every decision taken with a view to putting that principle into effect. That, in its opinion, was the purpose of draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights, for which it had voted. The permanent sovereignty of the State in economic affairs was enunciated in the Venezuelan Constitution and it was a right to which the people of his country had always attached the greatest importance. If the Council's draft resolution had been adopted, the result would have been to postpone a decision on the first of the texts submitted by the Commission on Human Rights. Accordingly he had voted against the Council's draft. He had abstained from voting on the Yugoslav proposal.

5. Miss FUJITA (Japan) said that she had voted for draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights as a whole and was glad that it had been approved by a very large majority. Nevertheless, she would have preferred the deletion of the expression "permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources" from the first paragraph of the preamble and its replacement by the wording approved by the Committee for article 1, paragraph 2, of the draft Covenants (A/3077, para. 77). As the suggestion which she had put forward to that effect in her previous statement (890th meeting) had not been supported by other dele-

gations, she had not proposed an amendment but had requested that the preamble should be put to the vote separately and had abstained from voting on it. Like a very few others, her delegation had decided that it could vote for the Council's draft resolution; in its view, that text and draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights complemented each other and together might help to ensure international respect for the right to self-determination.

6. Mr. JENSEN (Norway) did not think that the votes cast by his delegation at the preceding meeting could lead to any misunderstanding concerning the attitude of his Government on the issue of self-determination. Norway had particular reason to be in favour of giving effect to the principle of self-determination, for it had twice been obliged to assert its claim to that right during the past hundred and fifty years. At the same time his delegation noted with some concern that attempts were being made to give the United Nations greater authority in the matter than the Charter did. It could not subscribe to the argument that self-determination was a right because the Third Committee had decided to include it in the draft Covenants. It had voted against draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights for that reason and also because it considered that the proposed commission would serve no purpose as the question it would be called upon to study was within the purview of the Governments and parliaments of Member States. The Committee's discussions had shown once again that it might be useful to undertake a study of the concept of self-determination before taking any further steps towards the implementation of the principle itself. The question of the forms which the desire for independence might take was one of the important problems which required careful examination. His delegation had always held that new United Nations bodies should not be established as long as there was no wide agreement concerning the terms of reference and composition of the proposed bodies. Agreement had been possible on the proposal set forth in the Council's draft resolution; it had seemed difficult, on the other hand, to reconcile the divergent points of view expressed with regard to the commission proposed in draft resolution I. Contrary to what some representatives had implied, the position of delegations which, like his own, had supported the Council's draft resolution and voted against draft resolution I had been dictated not by certain treaty obligations but by the intrinsic merits of each text.

7. Mr. SAVINA (Italy) said that he would not reiterate the reasons why his delegation had voted in favour of the Council's draft resolution and against that of the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation understood the viewpoint of those who thought it pointless to continue discussing the principle and the right of self-determination, but it could not accept the interpretation given by some delegations to the Council's draft resolution and to the intentions of those who had favoured it. The latter had not wished to defer the examination of the question indefinitely. On the contrary, their attitude showed how anxious they were to ensure that the principle of and the right to self-determination should be applied ever more broadly and in a way which would be more in conformity with the interests of the peoples themselves. A careful examination of the Council's proposal would show that its fundamental purpose was to make possible a very

thorough study, not of the principle and the right of self-determination themselves, but of the ways in which they might be applied and the possible consequences of their implementation. The premature adoption of certain ill-conceived measures would have unfortunate repercussions on international relations politically, economically and socially.

8. Mr. CALAMARI (Panama) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights, which was in accordance with his country's Constitution and laws. Panama had always protected its rights to sovereignty and could not but support the efforts of those who were striving to constitute themselves sovereign States. Recognition of the right to self-determination would promote the establishment of friendly relations among nations. There could be no political sovereignty without economic sovereignty. The peoples of Latin America knew that, and intended to retain control of their natural resources while respecting the obligations they had assumed towards the foreign lenders whose capital they needed. The Panamanian Constitution protected private property acquired legally by physical or juridical persons; the ownership of such property could not be set aside or impaired by subsequent legislation (article 45), and expropriation was permitted only for reasons of public utility or social interest defined in the law, by means of a court order and subject to prior indemnification (article 46). Thus it gave undertakings and foreign capital very firm guarantees, which had always been scrupulously respected. Draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights likewise offered foreign lenders adequate guarantees, and there was little basis for the fears of some delegations regarding that proposal. The under-developed countries were too anxious to ensure their economic expansion not to comply with international law and honour the obligations they had assumed.

9. As the adoption of draft resolution II would have widened the gulf between Member States on the question of self-determination, the Panamanian delegation would have been unable to support that proposal. Nor, in view of the ideas on which the proposal was based, would the Panamanian delegation have been able to vote against it, for it had always been a matter of principle with that delegation to promote the adoption of measures designed to ensure to all peoples the full exercise of their right to self-determination. However, because of its doubts as to the benefits to be derived from the establishment of a system such as that proposed in draft resolution II, his delegation would have abstained if the draft had been put to the vote. It hoped that at the fourteenth session the Committee would have before it amendments which would make that text acceptable to a large majority. Fearing that the thorough study proposed in the Council's draft resolution might give rise to differences of opinion which would hamper the application of the principle of self-determination of peoples, he had voted against that text, the adoption of which would also have entailed the postponement of any decision on draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights.

10. Mr. MASSOUD-ANSARI (Iran) said that he had supported the Yugoslav representative's proposal that the vote on draft resolution II of the Commission on Human Rights should be deferred because his delegation had had some doubts regarding the procedure laid down in that text for realization of the right to self-

determination. It seemed to him highly desirable to establish a body with the task of ensuring respect for the right of peoples to self-determination. That question, however, deserved thorough study, and it was preferable to postpone consideration of it to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, at which the Third Committee might have before it a revised version of draft resolution II.

11. Miss MacENTEE (Ireland) said that she had voted in favour of the Council's draft resolution, which her delegation did not consider to conflict in any way with the other two texts before the Third Committee. That view, which she and the Japanese delegation were almost alone in holding, was perhaps prompted on the one hand by the fact that she had more confidence than other representatives had expressed in the academic integrity of the proposed experts and, on the other, by her firm conviction that even a very thorough study could only confirm the essential value of the concept of self-determination.

12. The Irish delegation would also have been glad to vote for draft resolution II of the Commission on Human Rights, which in its opinion should have been put into effect at the same time as the Economic and Social Council's resolution, specifically in order to offset the theoretical character to which some had objected in the latter. There were urgent situations in existence which a good offices committee could improve; it was therefore surprising to her that the Committee should so blithely have postponed consideration of draft resolution II to the fourteenth session. As she saw it, the Committee's first duty in considering the item was to safeguard the rights of the individual, and of the three draft resolutions before it draft resolution II seemed the most apt to the purpose. That was why the Irish delegation had voted against the proposal that consideration of that text should be postponed to the fourteenth session. In historical perspective a year was doubtless of slight account, but it could be a very long time in the life of an individual, especially if he was a victim of injustice or if his life was in danger. It was to be hoped, therefore, that that interval would be put to good use, and that the delegations which had said they had no objection in principle to that draft resolution would vote in its favour at the next session as resolutely as they had voted for draft resolution I at the preceding meeting.

13. The Irish delegation had abstained on draft resolution I, not because it doubted in the slightest the right of nations to exercise sovereignty over their natural resources, a right which was recognized in article 10 of the Irish Constitution, but because in her country the position in that respect required no further study and consequently Ireland could not invite the services of the proposed commission; moreover, it had no intention of imposing them on any other State. However, recognizing that other countries were not necessarily in the same position, her delegation had not wished to vote against the draft resolution.

14. Mrs. KHADDURI (Iraq) said that she had not intervened in the general debate as she shared the view eloquently expressed by many speakers that self-determination was a right and not a principle. Nor had she wished to refer to certain specific problems, well-known to all, unlike certain representatives who had created a regrettable atmosphere of tension by speaking in a very subjective way.

15. Her delegation had not supported the draft resolution proposed by the Economic and Social Council, since it called merely for an academic study and would accordingly be a backward step in an age when men were shedding their blood in order to gain their freedom. The Charter, the draft Covenants and various decisions of the General Assembly had already adequately defined the concept of self-determination.

16. She had voted in favour of draft resolution I submitted by the Commission on Human Rights, as she thought that the economic aspects of self-determination must not be overlooked. The only really independent nations were those which had full control over their natural wealth and resources. The survey proposed in draft resolution I would promote the economic development of the less-favoured countries.

17. Lastly, her delegation had voted in favour of the motion presented by Yugoslavia, as it considered that draft resolution II of the Commission on Human Rights had not received sufficient study at the current session and that consideration of it should be postponed until the next session.

18. Mr. THIERRY (France) had voted against draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights, which had seemed to him too vague both in form and in substance. He expressed once again his regret at the ambiguity created by the use of the word "sovereignty" with reference to the rights of nations which were not yet sovereign, even if it was hoped that they would shortly become so. Moreover, it was possible that the proposed commission might have some difficulty in determining precisely the nature and scope of its task.

19. In connexion with draft resolution II of the Commission on Human Rights, he had abstained from voting on the Yugoslav motion. He had noted incidentally that the delegations which had supported that draft resolution most strongly had also been the ones which had voted to have the consideration of it postponed.

20. His delegation had voted for the draft resolution prepared by the Economic and Social Council, in the belief that the proposed study was much needed and would constitute a useful point of departure for any subsequent action.

21. Mr. HEIBLE (Austria) said that his delegation had voted along the lines that it had indicated at the 891st meeting.

22. It had abstained from voting on the text prepared by the Economic and Social Council, considering that that text served no practical purpose and would only have the effect of prolonging the debate.

23. With regard to draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights, his delegation had abstained on the preamble, as the wording had not seemed entirely satisfactory, but had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. Moreover, as it thought that draft resolution II, to which it attached particular importance, was ripe for decision, it had been unable to support the Yugoslav proposal that action on that draft resolution should be postponed.

24. Mr. Chalapathi RAU (India) had voted for draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights and against that of the Council, for reasons which he had already stated.

25. His delegation had been prepared to take a decision on draft resolution II of the Commission on Human Rights, but in the light of statements made by various representatives who had wanted both formal and substantive amendments made to that draft, it had voted in favour of the Yugoslav motion. He hoped that the representatives to whose attitude he had just referred would make it their concern to prepare specific texts to be considered when the subject again came before the General Assembly and that the Third Committee would no longer be seized of the draft currently before it.

26. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) pointed out that his delegation's position on draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights and on that submitted by the Economic and Social Council was familiar to representatives and said that he had voted against the Yugoslav motion in the firm belief that the implementation of self-determination was of such importance that a decision concerning it ought not to be deferred. He would like to think that the adjournment could be interpreted as meaning that the question was to be included on the agenda of the next session for consideration as a matter of priority.

27. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), referring to the statement made by the representative of Ireland, wished to explain that he had voted in favour of the Yugoslav motion to postpone action on draft resolution II in order to take into account the doubts expressed by several delegations and also because he thought that the results of the survey to which draft resolution I referred would be extremely valuable to the good offices commission proposed in draft resolution II.

28. Mr. ELMANDJRA (Morocco) thought that the Committee might justly be proud of the decision taken at the preceding meeting, which would provide strong moral support to all who were fighting for their freedom. As a decision of the United Nations it would have the force of law; it could accordingly be hoped that the Powers responsible for administering Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories would respect it and co-operate with the proposed commission with a good grace. Lastly, it was to be hoped that the other organs of the United Nations, for their part, would not disappoint the Third Committee by making decisions inconsistent with the one it had taken.

29. Although it considered the two draft resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights to be closely interconnected, his delegation had voted for the Yugoslav motion for postponement of the discussion on draft resolution II because, among other reasons, it had thought that it would be useful to see how far draft resolution I would be respected in practice before entrusting a good offices commission with the task of studying violations of the right to self-determination.

### AGENDA ITEM 35

**Freedom of information: report of the Secretary-General on consultations concerning the draft Convention on Freedom of Information (A/3868 and Add.1-6)**

30. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the various documents relating to agenda item 35.

31. Mr. SHALIZI (Afghanistan) pointed out that the meeting had been devoted in large part to explanations of vote on agenda item 33, and he therefore hoped that it would not be counted as one of the eight meetings allocated to the consideration of item 35.

32. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), recalling the terms of General Assembly resolution 1189 A (XII), said that during the current session the Committee should concentrate primarily on the draft Convention on Freedom of Information, which had been prepared in 1951 by an *ad hoc* committee of the General Assembly (A/AC.42/7, annex).

33. The Committee should accordingly be mindful of the fact that it had only eight meetings for consideration of that topic at the current session. If therefore it considered the draft Convention article by article at the same pace as it had considered the draft International Covenants on Human Rights, it would be unlikely to make much progress, particularly as Governments which had not submitted written comments would no doubt wish to state their position in the course of the discussion. It might therefore be advisable to set a time limit for the submission of draft resolutions on item 35 and for the submission of amendments to the articles of the draft Convention. A decision to that effect would undoubtedly expedite matters and would be compatible with the wishes of the General Assembly, which had rightly considered freedom of information the touchstone of all other freedoms.

34. Mr. WISE (United States of America) said that there was general agreement that full and objective information facilitated the enjoyment of human rights as well as peaceful and friendly relations among nations.

35. Discussions in the United Nations concerning freedom of information had revealed that barriers to that freedom were of two kinds, the one being inadequacy of information media, and the other being shortcomings in the information made available to nations. Factors which limited information media included illiteracy, the restrictions due to inadequate supplies of newsprint, the high cost of radio receiving sets and the unrepresentative character of information services. Trade barriers to some extent also tended to inhibit the free flow of information. There was also the fact that skills in journalism, in the film industry, in radio and in television were often inadequate. Efforts by Governments and the community of nations could remedy the situation, and, in addition, the work of UNESCO, the International Labour Organisation, the other specialized agencies and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance should be continued and intensified.

36. Equally important were the obstacles and restrictions due to man-made interference. That interference took a number of forms. It was sometimes contended that when information media were in the hands of private concerns, the latter frequently distorted or misrepresented the information to suit their own interests; that commercial sponsorship encouraged sensationalism and bad taste; and that information media were controlled by a restricted group and did not properly reflect the attitudes and aspirations of large regions of the world. On the other hand, those who were against State control asserted that it compounded and augmented the defects of a free information system. Political considerations became a positive

rather than an accidental factor. If State control was exclusive, a system of mass "brain-washing" could be, and in fact all too often was, practised. Even if it was only partial, it was of a kind to inhibit the expression of unwelcome views.

37. To remedy that state of affairs an attempt had been made to draft an international instrument that would be acceptable to the greatest number and at the same time constructive in that it would facilitate the flow of information and actually reduce tensions. The United States delegation considered that the main reason why greater progress had not been made in that direction was that Member States had fundamentally different views concerning freedom of information. The contrast was particularly marked between the United States and the USSR, although the Constitutions of both countries enunciated the principle of freedom of information. Whereas the United States believed that that freedom was indispensable, that it constituted the very keystone of democracy and that all restrictions of it led to totalitarianism, the Soviet Union seemed to interpret it very differently. Reference might be made to the 6 July 1956 issue of *Pravda*, to the Soviet Encyclopedia—and specifically to one of its volumes that had appeared in 1952—and to the views stated by the Director of TASS, Mr. Palgunov, all to the effect that news was agitation via facts. In citing those sources, the United States delegation did not intend to enter into the merits of a particular system; it merely wished to point out that there were fundamental differences of concept, which at present made the two positions irreconcilable. That view, moreover, was shared by many representatives.

38. The replies received by the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1189 A (XII) showed how far positions differed concerning the draft Convention on Freedom of Information. It should also be noted that the Commission on Human Rights and its Committee on Freedom of Information had, according to their reports, been partially inhibited in their work by the fact that the General Assembly still had the matter under discussion. It therefore seemed momentarily impossible to reach sufficiently wide or constructive agreement and that consideration of the draft Convention could not serve a useful purpose. The debate would undoubtedly make that clear and would help some members to understand better the attitude of the United States delegation.

39. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, to be strictly accurate, the agenda item should be entitled "Abuse of freedom of information", for without such abuse, the question would not arise. It was in order to put an end to such abuse and to institute a sort of moral code in that very important field that an international convention was necessary.

40. Seeking to define the concepts of "freedom" and "information", he said that freedom of information, like any other freedom, imposed certain obligations, which derived from life in society. Information, in turn, consisted of two elements. The one was the mere reporting of facts; the other was their interpretation. Interpretation was necessarily subjective and included propaganda or, in other words, the tendentious interpretation of facts for the purpose of promoting a particular policy or defending certain interests.

41. He felt that, since the end of the Second World War particularly, the reporting of facts and their

honest interpretation had given way to propaganda. As for freedom, it was well-known how many crimes had been committed in its name during the course of history and, on the other hand, how often and how easily it degenerated into license.

42. Some persons maintained that if the under-developed countries, for example, had more information media, it would be possible to begin to talk about freedom of information. He felt that the question was not the amount of news disseminated, but rather its quality and by that he did not mean its literary or artistic quality but its moral quality.

43. It was true that moral codes varied considerably from one country to another, according to the convictions on which they were based, but it was still possible, with good will, to find a common denominator and to agree on certain standards of morality which were acceptable and applicable to the whole world. It was also true that the objective statement of authentic facts could be displeasing, but the reporting of facts was not therefore to be suppressed. Lastly, it was true that a sharp dividing line could not easily be drawn between honest interpretation and a tendentious interpretation which could be called propaganda, but there again, through an instrument such as the draft Convention, it ought to be possible to define fairly specifically what was legitimate and what was not.

44. The United States representative had made a comparison between those systems in which mass information media were governed by private enterprise and those in which they were in the hands of the State. In the second case, the State could undoubtedly ignore certain facts which contradicted its policy, but even in the first case information was not entirely free. The policy of a newspaper was influenced by that of its financial supporters, for the money received from sales was nowadays only a small part of newspaper revenue. Moreover, in all the advanced countries there were today gigantic information agencies which used all the mass media—Press, radio, television, cinema—to secure the success of their policy and to wage the "cold war"—that cold war which was the principal reason why there had been no improvement in the moral quality of news during the past ten years. Private news undertakings could not avoid the influence of those agencies no matter how much they wanted to preserve their integrity.

45. There was, moreover, a danger that the young countries without much experience in the field of information might let themselves be contaminated by the easy side of the methods used in the advanced countries. That trend towards propaganda had already made itself felt in the Asian countries and might well be similarly apparent in Africa when more highly developed information media had become available to the African countries. That was a grave danger which must be guarded against.

46. The question for the Committee to consider was not who owned the information media in the various countries, but how to avoid abuses. Those who felt that such abuses were more serious in cases where the information media were in the service of the State ought to be particularly pleased by a convention, for although a convention quite clearly could not of itself put an end to all abuses, it could, by exacting respect from the signatory States, at least eliminate some of them.

47. The fact that thirty-six countries had not replied to the Secretary-General's communication did not mean that those countries were not interested in adopting a convention. It meant simply that many of them had already made their position so clear over a period of years that there was no longer any need for further communications from them, particularly as the experts present in the Committee could reaffirm that position.

48. He agreed with the Philippine representative that the time had come for the Committee to do something constructive in the matter, and, by way of conclusion, he quoted the first paragraph of article 2 of the draft Convention (A/AC.42/7, annex) in which stress was laid on the duties and responsibilities involved in the exercise of freedom of information.

49. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think that the attitude of the United States representative was either very rational or very constructive. It was the second time in a few days that he had stressed the existence of deep differences of opinion on a question under consideration; he had done so first in connexion with the right of peoples to self-determination and he was doing so now in regard to freedom of information. At the same time, he was rejecting any possibility of narrowing those differences, and it would not be surprising if, at the next meeting, he submitted a proposal for postponing the consideration of the draft Convention to a later date. The United Nations would then simply register the differences of opinion without going any further. The United States representative had said that the Committee's task was to reduce international tension, but by his methods he was simply intensifying it. The experience of the discussion on self-determination had obviously not succeeded in convincing him that political attacks and general statements were not enough to prevent the

Committee from examining its texts. International tension could be lessened only if rules were laid down in respect of freedom of information, and the USSR delegation was fully prepared to give serious consideration to the articles of the draft Convention in order to accomplish that purpose.

50. While he would leave the task of interpreting the United States Constitution to the conscience of the United States representative, the members of the Committee read the newspapers and could, for example, learn from that source that in the United States anti-discrimination measures and freedom of information existed only on paper. He therefore objected strongly to any analogy between the United States Constitution and that of the USSR. The Soviet Constitution guaranteed freedom of information to all workers, and provided them with the requisite safeguards in that respect.

51. Another example would illustrate how much demagoguery there was in the United States representative's statement on freedom of information in his country and how the United States Press reported the work of the United Nations. In the New York newspapers for 27 November 1958 there was not a single line on the adoption by the Third Committee, at its 893rd meeting, of draft resolution I of the Commission on Human Rights, concerning self-determination. The United States should not confuse the United Nations with its innumerable "brain-washing" agencies, to use the term employed by the United States representative. The Organization was endeavouring to work seriously and constructively. The USSR delegation was convinced that the Third Committee would not adopt the course which the United States representative wanted it to take but would, at its next meeting, examine the substance of the draft Convention on Freedom of Information.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.