



Thursday, 2 December 1954,
at 3.10 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Agenda item 69: Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war (concluded) | 193 |

Chairman: Mr. Thor THORS (Iceland).

AGENDA ITEM 69

**Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war
(A/2744, A/AC.76/L.16) (concluded)**

1. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that in countries not Members of the United Nations, where people were unfamiliar with the Organization's work, it might well have been thought that in bringing before the General Assembly the item "Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war", Czechoslovakia was showing honest concern for the preservation of peace and that its draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.16) was a move to reduce international tension. Peoples with greater experience of the Organization's work might have hoped, though perhaps not very confidently, that at a time when relations between East and West appeared to be improving, consideration of the item would put an end to the familiar pattern of invective and slander. The hopes of both groups must have been disappointed once the discussion started.
2. The Committee had heard all the familiar accusations and attacks made against the United States. Those attacks and accusations were directly opposed to the aim which the Czechoslovak delegation had claimed to be pursuing. He failed to see how the Czechoslovak representative could reconcile her accusations against the United States with the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter which stated that one of the purposes of the Organization was to develop friendly relations among nations.
3. The Soviet and a number of other representatives had asserted that legislation in their countries prohibited all propaganda in favour of a new war. That did not prove that they did not undertake propaganda likely to compromise good relations between States. In any case, the attitude of those representatives was not conducive to better international relations and the result of the discussion had been exactly the opposite of what the authors of the draft resolution had claimed to achieve.
4. The representatives of Czechoslovakia and of certain other countries which claimed to be innocent victims of United States propaganda had passed over in silence the propaganda campaign launched by Communist China against Thailand. As the representative of the Union of South Africa had recalled at the previous meeting, Thailand had brought that matter before the Security Council (S/3220) in May 1954, but the Soviet Union had vetoed (674th meeting) any

Council action. Since then, the cold war waged by the Chinese Communists against Thailand had increased in violence. The false accusations heaped on Thailand during that campaign were similar to those mentioned by the Iraqi representative at the 40th meeting. The Chinese Communists were inciting the population of Thailand, and even aliens living in the country, to rebel against the lawful Government. Their agents infiltrated into Thai territory and carried out subversive activities.

5. For those reasons, his delegation would oppose the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

6. He did not see the necessity of the ten-Power amendments (A/AC.76/L.17) but as the ideas contained therein were also those of his delegation, he would vote for them if they were put to the vote.

7. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the United States representative's attacks at the 39th meeting against Czechoslovakia, the other peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union would not facilitate the settlement of the question under discussion. Her delegation had already explained that its only purpose in proposing the inclusion of the item in the General Assembly's agenda had been to put an end to the hostile war propaganda among nations which was interfering with peaceful co-operation and aggravating international tension.

8. It was appropriate to sum up the debate. In the first place, it was apparent that no delegation had denied that propaganda in favour of a new war existed in a number of countries, and in the second place, all delegations had held the view that the General Assembly should take measures against such propaganda. That showed that Czechoslovakia had been perfectly justified in proposing that the General Assembly should consider the question.

9. Her delegation emphatically rejected the allegation that its draft resolution served the purposes of the cold war. Its unequivocal objective was to put an end to propaganda in favour of a new war which prevented the peaceful coexistence of nations and stood in the way of any improvement in international relations. Those delegations, that of the United States for example, which attributed other intentions to the Czechoslovak delegation had thereby shown that they themselves were concerned only with the cold war.

10. In his statement the United States representative had utterly misrepresented the Czechoslovak attitude. When speaking of propaganda in favour of a new war in the United States her delegation had pointed to the fact that such propaganda was the work of small but influential groups which had spokesmen even in the United States Congress. That propaganda had gone so far that President Eisenhower had been obliged to condemn it. Her delegation had not claimed that every instance of hostile propaganda was an expression of hostile policy. It was for that reason that the Czechoslovak draft resolution invited all Governments to take

the necessary measures to ensure that means of information as important as the Press, radio and television would not be used as instruments of such propaganda.

11. In his statement, the United States representative had practically admitted that certain groups conducted such propaganda in the United States. Such propaganda was not only harmful to peace but to the countries which were parties to it. Only its political maturity and the peace policy of its Government enabled the Czechoslovak people to draw a very clear distinction between the peoples of those countries and the spokesmen for war. Nevertheless, the statements of such spokesmen had done great harm to the United States prestige in the world, particularly in the Western countries. She quoted the views of Americans returning from Europe and an interview given by Mr. Lodge, Chairman of the United States delegation, to show that those travellers felt that Europeans regarded Americans as warmongers.

12. The United States representative and several others had maintained that it was not war propaganda but the so-called iron curtain which was the greatest obstacle to the relaxation of international tension. It was well known, however, that the United States had done everything possible to restrict commercial relations with Czechoslovakia, the other peoples' democracies and the USSR and to prevent any contact with democratic countries.

13. The allegations of the French (39th meeting) and Iraqi (40th meeting) representatives relating to broadcasts from Radio Budapest had been refuted many times by the Government of Hungary. The South African representative's remarks about Czechoslovakia only showed that certain circles could not reconcile themselves to the fact that Czechoslovakia had chosen the road to freedom, on which it meant to stay.

14. Replying to the observations of the United Kingdom representative, she said that her country took a very grave view of any propaganda in favour of a new war because it remembered Hitlerite propaganda and its tragic consequences for humanity. It was regrettable that the United Kingdom representative should have thought fit to indulge in attacks against Czechoslovakia and other peoples' democracies. As to his reference to the Marshall Plan, she pointed out that Czechoslovakia had rejected that plan because it was directed against the political and economic independence of countries. Czechoslovakia was endeavouring to develop economic relations with all nations, based on respect for mutual interests. Her country had not hesitated to accept President Eisenhower's offer of flood relief because no unacceptable conditions had been attached to that offer. The United Kingdom representative had thought it necessary to defend the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe because he probably did not know the nature of the broadcasts of those two stations. They consisted of slander and incited the populations of the peoples' democracies to commit criminal acts, sabotage and subversion. It was such conduct which constituted barriers to international co-operation, and clearly all propaganda of that kind had to be brought to an end.

15. She then discussed the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.16). With regard to the preamble, she stated that her own and other delegations had produced ample evidence to show that propaganda in favour of a new war was being carried on in some

countries. The evidence had not been challenged during the general discussion.

16. Operative paragraph 1, which called upon all Governments strictly to observe the provisions of General Assembly resolution 110 (II) and which left every State free to decide what measures should be taken, should be acceptable to all delegations.

17. With respect to the amendments that had been proposed (A/AC.76/L.17), she observed that their sponsors had expressed surprise that the Czechoslovak delegation in its draft resolution had not mentioned General Assembly resolutions 290 (IV) and 381 (V), which were also relevant. The explanation was that resolution 110 (II) had been adopted unanimously, whereas the other two resolutions had been adopted by simple majorities after a campaign of invective and slander directed against Czechoslovakia, the other peoples' democracies and the USSR.

18. In paragraph 3 of their amendments, the ten Powers had proposed the insertion in the Czechoslovak draft resolution of a new paragraph emphasizing particularly the principles set forth in resolution 290 (IV). She could not accept that proposal, since paragraph 10 of that resolution, for example, questioned the principle of unanimity of the great Powers in the Security Council. Resolution 290 (IV) also dealt with the question of disarmament and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction on which the General Assembly had expressed itself unanimously at the current session. The proposed amendments would turn the clock back and compromise the results achieved. For those reasons her delegation could not support the amendments.

19. The General Assembly should not pass over in silence the problem of propaganda in favour of a new war. The Czechoslovak draft resolution recommended what steps should be taken to settle the problem.

20. Mr. JACKSON (United States of America) said that the several hours of the Soviet bloc speeches were cancelled out by just a few minutes of the speech given by the Iraqi representative. The Iraqi representative had been stating facts about activity directed from the Soviet bloc—inciting rebellion and overthrow of the Government and constitution.

21. He said that after the account of the activities of the United States Press and radio presented by the Czechoslovak representative, it would be interesting to consider how information media were used in Prague. A despatch published by Reuters News Agency that very day would give an idea of the situation. According to Reuters the Italian newspaper *Il Messaggero* had reported that the Italian Government was considering the severance of diplomatic relations with the Prague Government if Radio Prague did not stop broadcasting anti-Italian propaganda.

22. He noted that the statement of Mr. Streibert, head of the United States Information Agency and head of the Voice of America, which had appeared in the periodical *U.S. News & World Report*, and had been quoted by the USSR representative, had been taken out of context. The Voice of America did not engage in activities conflicting with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It did not, like Radio Prague, Radio Bucharest and Radio Budapest, engage in propaganda aimed at fostering discord and hostility among nations. He invited all delegations to visit the studios of the Voice of America in Washington and

judge for themselves. He would be pleased to have the representatives hear the news and views which the Soviet bloc Governments did not want their people to hear and which they took strong measures to keep them from hearing. The Soviet bloc was using some 1,500 jammers which were being used in their own country and adjacent countries as well. When Mr. Streibert had assumed his duties, he had received specific instructions from the President of the United States; the United States representative read out the text of the instructions by which the Voice of America was directed to inform accurately all people about United States policy, the aim of which was to promote their legitimate aspirations for liberty, social progress, and peace.

23. He said that if the Soviet bloc could maintain the iron curtain with its hundreds of radio-jamming stations and forbid access to the news of the world by the Press, periodicals, books, etc., if it could subject the people behind the iron curtain to a constant barrage of carefully controlled propaganda and prevent any other voice or interpretation from being heard but the Kremlin voice, and if it could at the same time get the United Nations to go on record condemning all public statements, official or unofficial, in any country which described life under communism and which spoke for the people who were prevented from speaking, which pointed to the danger of Communist expansion or called for defences against it—then, indeed, the Soviets would have scored a triumph of incalculable proportion, giving them a clear propaganda path to proceed with their international expansion.

24. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the manifest object of the amendments proposed by the United States and other countries (A/AC.76/L.17) was to stultify the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.16). The United States representative had urged (38th meeting) the Committee to adopt them in the interests of the cause of peace. But the amendments were based primarily on the provisions of General Assembly resolution 290 (IV), entitled "Essentials of peace", against which the USSR delegation had voted because in its opinion the implementation of those principles would not have served the cause of peace. That resolution moreover constituted an infringement of the sovereignty of States, and the repeated references to the provisions of the Charter which it contained were designed merely to conceal other provisions which were not in accordance either with the Charter or with international law. The Czechoslovak draft resolution, on the other hand, was based on resolution 110 (II) which had been adopted unanimously by the General Assembly (108th plenary meeting).

25. It was therefore quite obvious that the proposed amendments were not designed to reconcile the differences of view between their sponsors and those of the delegations which supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution. Unlike the Czechoslovak draft resolution, they did not invite Governments to take effective measures against all forms of propaganda tending to create hostility and hatred among nations, and consequently could not contribute to a relaxation of international tension. The USSR delegation would therefore vote against the amendments.

26. In reply to the United States representative, he read out a passage from the interview given by Mr. Streibert, to which he had referred at the 40th meeting.

27. Mr. PERRY (New Zealand) said that although the apparent intent of the Czechoslovak draft resolution was to reaffirm the principles set forth in General Assembly resolution 110 (II), it had become clear that that was not its real purpose. The true object of the Czechoslovak delegation and the delegations which supported it was to condemn the United States. The New Zealand delegation would not support such a manoeuvre. It would however associate itself with the tribute paid by the United Kingdom representative to the United States for its sacrifices in the cause of peace and the advancement of the less fortunate countries.

28. Two features of the Czechoslovak proposal should be emphasized. In the first place, it was surprising that the Czechoslovak delegation had not seen fit to amend its draft resolution in the interval between the time when it requested the inclusion of the item on the agenda (A/2744) and the time when the text had been submitted to the Committee (A/AC.76/L.16). The events which had taken place in the General Assembly meanwhile should, however, have led the Czechoslovak delegation to revise its position, or at least to amend the references to the increasing prevalence of war propaganda and to the association of public officials with appeals for the use of atomic weapons.

29. Secondly, operative paragraph 2 of the Czechoslovak draft resolution seemed to be in accordance not with the General Assembly resolution 110 (II) but rather with paragraph 3 of a draft (A/BUR/86) proposed by the USSR delegation at the second session of the General Assembly, which had been rejected by the First Committee (86th meeting). That USSR draft, like the latest Czechoslovak draft, was negative in character, and the General Assembly had instead adopted a positive text requesting Governments to take appropriate steps to promote friendly relations among nations.

30. The introduction of this item at present was unfortunate. However, if the General Assembly was to adopt any resolution, it should reaffirm the three resolutions which it had previously adopted on the subject, and should emphasize practical and positive measures. The aim should be to strengthen international peace through the removal of barriers to the free exchange of information and ideas. That seemed to be the purpose of the amendments, and accordingly the New Zealand delegation would vote for them.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.16) and the amendments thereto (A/AC.76/L.17).

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The amendment to the second paragraph of the preamble (A/AC.76/L.17, para. 1) was adopted by 34 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

32. Mr. RIZK (Lebanon) requested a vote by division on the amendment to the third paragraph of the preamble (A/AC.76/L.17, para. 2), the Committee to vote first on the passage up to and including the words "genuine international co-operation" and then on the rest of the amendment.

The first part of the amendment to the third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 35 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

The second part of the amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

The amendment proposing the insertion of a new paragraph in the draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.17, para. 3) was adopted by 35 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

The amendment to operative paragraph 1 (A/AC.76/L.17, para. 4) was adopted by 35 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

The amendment proposing the deletion of operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 30 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ethiopia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

Against: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 35 votes to 5 with 10 abstentions.

34. Mr. PERRY (New Zealand) observed that the purpose of the amendments adopted by the Committee had been to modify the character of the resolution so that instead of being negative, it would emphasize the positive action that should be taken to strengthen peace. The title of the item "Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war" therefore no longer corresponded to the text adopted by the Committee. Accordingly, he proposed that the draft resolution should be entitled: "Strengthening of peace through removal of barriers to free exchange of information and ideas". If the Committee could not now insert a title he would request that its report to the General Assembly should recommend the adoption of the title he had proposed.

35. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) pointed out that the title of the draft resolution corresponded to the wording of the agenda item, and it was on that item that the Rapporteur had to report. The second proposal of the New Zealand representative, that the Committee should recommend to the Assembly that the title of the draft resolution be brought into line with its provisions, was therefore preferable.

36. The CHAIRMAN shared the view of the Argentine representative. He put to the vote the second proposal of the New Zealand representative.

The proposal was adopted by 29 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

37. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) explained that he had abstained in the vote on the New Zealand proposal because he felt that if the Committee thought the draft resolution should have another title, it should decide to alter it, but it had not been asked to decide the question.

38. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) said he had abstained because he did not think it wise to give titles to resolutions. In future, it would be wiser not to do so. The title, which was often odd, was not in itself instructive.

39. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said he had abstained for reasons similar to those just given by the French representative.

40. Mr. CALDERON (Guatemala) explained that he had voted in favour of the amendments to the draft resolution for two reasons. First, they provided the necessary clarification of a somewhat ambiguous text: the reference to free exchange of information and ideas as an essential condition for international understanding and peace, for example, was one of the chief concerns of the free nations fighting Communist subversion. Secondly, the amendments clearly condemned infiltration through propaganda as a form of interference in the domestic affairs of nations. Guatemala was aware of the extent of such propaganda; in its capital city, a flood of propaganda leaflets had been found, originating in Communist countries and inciting the people of Guatemala to the class struggle. That kind of propaganda constituted a threat to peaceful relations among States.

41. Mr. BOROOAH (India) explained why his delegation had not taken part in the general debate and had abstained in the vote. The Government of India had faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter. It was keenly aware of the disastrous effects of war propaganda and of barriers to the free exchange of information and ideas, and would like to see them removed as soon as possible. It felt, however, that the draft resolution could yield no useful result in the prevailing atmosphere of distrust. Far from being conducive to progress towards the desired goal, proposals or amendments of that nature could only give rise to mutual recriminations and would adversely affect the international atmosphere, which had recently improved to some degree.

42. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that all war propaganda and activities designed to create tension among nations and peoples should be stopped. Respect for the principles of the Charter and for the resolutions of the Assembly was the only way to achieve the desired goal. It was true that the means of disseminating information and ideas had not been used to help create understanding among peoples. That situation, however, was due to differences among the great Powers and to the fact that certain international problems were still unsettled; it was the consequence, not the cause of international tension. If every effort was made to dispel that tension, its consequences would disappear automatically. The resolutions concerning disarmament and the peaceful uses of atomic energy had lessened the tension somewhat and represented a step in the right direction. It was desirable that the more propitious climate should become permanent and that nothing should be done to disturb it. Those were the considerations which had decisively influenced Iran's vote.

43. He had voted for the first paragraph of the preamble because it took note of a fact which was cause for satisfaction. He had voted for the amendments to the second and third paragraphs of the preamble because the original text had contained allegations against a single country, as had been pointed out during the general debate. He had also voted for the amendments in paragraphs 3 and 4 of document A/AC.76/L.17 be-

cause they reaffirmed Assembly resolutions and stated objectives which the Iranian delegation had consistently endorsed. Finally, he had abstained on the amendment proposing the deletion of the last operative paragraph because, if States observed the provisions of the preceding paragraphs, they would be bound to take the measures advocated.

44. Mr. DE KADT (Netherlands) explained that his delegation, considering the preamble of the draft resolution utterly unnecessary and as part of the propaganda campaign of the totalitarian countries against the free world, had abstained from voting on the passages in question. On the other hand, as the amendments contained constructive points, his delegation had voted for them just as it had voted for the new draft resolution resulting from their adoption. He also thought that the draft resolution should have another title, as it was now an entirely different text.

45. Mr. GAMARRA (Uruguay) said that the original draft resolution had made implicit but unsubstantiated charges against one country. Nor had the charges been corroborated by the supplementary explanations given during the debate. Those explanations had been fully answered by the United States representative. Other

countries could have made similar charges against the countries of the Soviet bloc and submitted a similar draft resolution. The authors of the amendments had preferred to present amendments, drafted in general terms, to the draft resolution, and for that reason, the Uruguayan delegation had voted for them.

46. Mr. VILOVIC (Yugoslavia) regretted that the item had been placed on the agenda, because the debate on it was likely to have an adverse effect on the signs of a *détente* which had been observed during the current session and which were likely to create better conditions for international co-operation. Modern political life was characterized by certain activities which constituted an incitement to a new war and which could only worsen relations among States. The Government of Yugoslavia was deeply disturbed by those activities. For its part, it had always endeavoured to respect the principles of the Charter and to promote peaceful relations among States. Accordingly, it was against any propaganda in favour of war. The Yugoslav delegation had abstained in the vote because consideration of the item was not conducive to better international relations.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.