

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL****CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

E/CN.4/Sub.1/SR 63

14 June 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

## SUB-COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND OF THE PRESS

## Third Session

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Friday, 10 June 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS: The adequacy of the news available to the peoples of the world and the obstacles to the free flow of information to them (E/CN.4/Sub.1/91, E/CN.4/Sub.1/92) (discussion continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. LOPEZ	Philippines
	later	
	Mr. AZKOUL	Lebanon
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. FONTAINA	Uruguay
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. AZMI	Egypt
	Mr. BINDER	United States of America
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. DEDIJER	Yugoslavia
	Mr. GANDHI	India
	Mr. GERAUD	France
	Mr. SILVA CARVALLO	Chile
	Mr. WILLIAMS	United Kingdom
	Mr. ZONOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

RECEIVED

JUN 16 1949

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

Representative of a specialized agency:

Mr. FARR

United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural  
Organization (UNESCO)

Secretariat:

Mr. HOGAN

Secretary of the Sub-Commission

THE ADEQUACY OF THE NEWS AVAILABLE TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD AND THE OBSTACLES TO THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION TO THEM (E/CN.4/Sub.1/91, E/CN.4/Sub.1/92) (discussion continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution submitted by Mr. Azkoul (E/CN.4/Sub.1/92) would be discussed after the general debate on item 6 had been completed.

Mr. CHANG stressed the basic principle that media of information should not be used as instruments for political indoctrination. It was the responsibility of the press to provide every variety of information and readers should be free to form their own opinions.

He referred to a recent article from a responsible newspaper in which it was stated that newspapers were being required to register in order to safeguard the freedom of the press for the people and to prevent revolutionaries from benefiting by the same privileges. He wondered who would decide which members of the population were to be considered as revolutionaries. He deplored the attitude underlying that regulation and thought the Sub-Commission should state emphatically that the press was a medium of information and should not be used for political purposes.

Mr. BINDER said that he was entering his thirty-first year of service as a journalist. Unlike Mr. Azmi who had spoken at the previous meeting, he had never had any governmental responsibility and he had experienced censorship as a reporter and not as a censor.

The question of the adequacy of the news available to the peoples of the world was one of the basic problems with which the Sub-Commission had to deal. The fact that an informed public was essential to the democratic way of life was axiomatic, but there was not such general

/agreement

agreement as to what constituted an informed public. One view was that, granted access to diverse and competing sources of information, people would be able to form their own opinions. The supporters of that view thought that diversity of information was the only certain guarantee of freedom and were prepared to accept the full implications of that theory and to tolerate even the publication of the opinions held by misguided or malicious people. The opposing view was based on the denial of the worth and dignity of the individual. For the supporters of the latter view, a well-informed man meant one who had been thoroughly indoctrinated. They believed that the truth had been revealed only to the rulers of the country and that it was their duty to see that the rest of the population shared their views. The means used were the insistent repetition of the official doctrine and the systematic repression of any conflicting opinions. Distortion and the official lie were even resorted to, if other means failed to suppress conflicting doctrines, and any individuals who did not become thoroughly indoctrinated were eliminated.

Mr. Binder said that he was speaking from experience as he had worked as a newspaperman under every variety of political system. He had no wish to start a controversy on the rival merits of the two views he had described, but he thought that they should be borne in mind in the course of the discussion. Any attempt at a compromise between the two could only lead to the abolition of all freedom.

He supported the paper submitted by Mr. Williams (E/CN.4/Sub.1/91) and moved its adoption, subject to the addition of any further categories of obstacles which members might suggest. He also supported the suggestion made by the representative of UNESCO that the United Nations Secretariat should concentrate on the first two categories mentioned in Mr. Williams' paper and the Secretariat of UNESCO on the last two. It would also be useful if the Secretariat could begin to gather information on the adequacy of news, starting with the aspect of quantity and leaving the more delicate question of quality until later.

Mr. FONTAINA said that he did not wish to follow Mr. Azmi's example and deal with very delicate questions. It was obvious that no man and no Government was perfect, and the fact that the Sub-Commission had been set up to try to remedy the defects showed that such defects existed.

/He, like

He, like Mr. Binder, had experienced censorship not as a censor but as a practising journalist.

With regard to conditions in his country, he said that there were no restrictions of any kind on the free flow of information and anyone was allowed to criticize the Government of Uruguay or of any other country without fear of redress. Certain organizations in Uruguay did, however, tend to hamper the free flow of information. There was an association of newspaper proprietors, which was intended to promote the interests of the profession, but which might conceivably be used to prevent the establishment of new newspapers by some such method as buying up all the available equipment.

As he had mentioned at a previous meeting, the question of customs barriers also had a direct bearing on the question. It was important, for instance, that the inhabitants of countries which did not possess the equipment necessary to manufacture wireless sets should be able to import them without paying excessive customs tariffs. He mentioned the case of Nazi Germany, where there had been a single governmental broadcasting organization and only those who had possessed short wave receiving sets had been able to hear anything other than official information.

In Uruguay, broadcasting came within the sphere of the Ministry of Defence so that rapid action could be taken in the case of a national emergency. There were, however, disadvantages to that system because the means of information servicing the civilian population came potentially under the control of a purely military organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS had spent nearly thirty years in journalism and associated professions. In the course of that period he had worked as a reporter for every variety of newspaper and periodical, he had edited a daily newspaper and, during the war, he had had the unpleasant task of supervising a censorship system. Recently, he had been the advisor on public relations to the Prime Minister of his country at a time when the Government had been trying to decide on the best method of keeping the people informed about its policy and activities.

The obstacles to the free flow of information, in the political field, fell into two main categories: firstly, the restrictions of

/censorship

censorship and, secondly, possible attempts by governments to persuade those in charge of the media of information to publish certain things or to emphasize a particular aspect of events.

As far as the United Kingdom was concerned there was no censorship in peacetime. Even during the war the system used had been described as a voluntary censorship system. Newspapers had been subject to exactly the same restrictions as the ordinary citizens of the country. Nevertheless, since newspapers by their very nature were more in danger of committing a breach of the regulations than the ordinary citizens, a special book had been prepared for them stating what type of material would be likely to constitute a breach of the Official Secrets Act or of the Defence of the Realm Act. It had also been possible for editors to submit their material to censors before publication, if they wished advice as to whether it was likely to be considered as a breach of the regulations. If the censor approved the material, that was considered an adequate defence, should a charge later be made against the newspaper for publishing the material. There had been no obligation whatever for editors to submit their material to censorship prior to publication; they had simply been able to ask the advice of the censors if they so desired.

That system had operated successfully until, towards the end of the war, a further clause had been added to the legislation to prohibit the publication of material which might create disharmony among the Allies. That clause had been added at the request of other allied Governments and had given rise to far greater problems for those in charge of censorship than all the rest of the legislation. Mr. Williams was therefore convinced that, when censorship was necessary for national security, it could only be operated safely and with due regard for the basic principles of freedom of information if it dealt with explicit factual material. As soon as a clause such as the one mentioned was included in the legislation, great difficulties arose because such material could not be clearly defined. The clause in question had only been applied for a very short period in the United Kingdom and he was glad to state that all censorship had ended with the war.

/With regard

With regard to the other type of political obstacle to the free flow of information, namely the use of persuasion, he said that before the Second World War there had been some attempt by Government circles to influence news published about foreign countries. He had himself been a newspaper editor at that time and, although such an attempt had been made, it had not had much success. In his opinion, that had been due to the fact that the United Kingdom press was economically strong and well established.

After the war the question had arisen as to what system should be followed for the dissemination of news about the Government and its activities. It was obviously desirable that as much information as possible should be made available on the subject, but there was also the danger that, if a governmental organization became an agency for distributing news, it might influence the type of news that was published. Mr. Azmi had pointed out the dangers of a system whereby the only information that could be obtained about the Government came from the press officers attached to the various departments. Under such a system it was possible that only the information which was creditable to the Government would be made available. Mr. Williams stated that, from his investigations as advisor on public relations to the Prime Minister, he had come to the conclusion that a system such as that of attaching press officers to the various departments was advisable. In order to avoid the dangers of that system, it had been decided that the press officers should be regular members of the civil service. The civil service in the United Kingdom had its own well-established traditions and was made up of permanent officials who were not appointed on a political basis and owed allegiance to the administrative system as a whole, not to the political party which happened to be in power. The information services were included in that system and were not therefore in the power of any political party.

Another factor was that, in a country where the newspapers were commercial organizations, there was always the danger that pressure might be brought to bear by the advertisers, from whom the newspapers derived most of their revenue. Attempts

of that kind had sometimes been made in the United Kingdom, but they had not, to his knowledge, been effective because the newspapers were sufficiently strong financially to withstand such pressure.

Mr. Williams stated that, to the best of his belief, there were no important political obstacles to the free flow of information in the United Kingdom.

He then called attention to a factor about which he intended to submit a proposal at a later meeting, namely, the influence of the advertiser on a commercial press. Newspapers seeking mass circulation and huge revenue from advertisements thought of news in terms of interesting masses of people. News of great public and international importance but which would be read by smaller numbers of people was reduced so that news which appealed to millions might be increased. That was a definite obstacle to the free flow of information which was necessary for an understanding of the complicated modern world. The Sub-Commission should consider that obstacle and try to find a means to overcome it.

The enormous cost of establishing a newspaper was another barrier to the free flow of information. It hampered the expression of all points of view, and the reporting of news which appealed, not to great masses of people, but to fewer, more discriminating readers.

Mr. Williams believed that that obstacle might be overcome if governments would agree to set up a number of public service printing plants and distribution organizations, in the manner of public utilities without regard to profits. Those who wished to establish newspapers, but who had very limited financial backing, might receive governmental aid.

The problem of establishing new papers had become worse in the United Kingdom as a result of the existing economic situation and the shortage of newsprint. That shortage forced the papers to adopt a smaller format, which made it difficult to cover all national and international news. It prevented the establishment of new papers because it necessitated the rationing of newsprint to existing papers on the basis of the percentage of newsprint used in 1938. Consequently, only those periodicals in existence in 1938 were able to get newsprint. Fortunately such a system was completely impartial and free of political influence and had been agreed upon by the newspapers and the government news supply agency.

The inability to found new newspapers, in a period when new philosophies, new ideas and movements were developing, was an obstacle to the full and free flow of information. It was possible that current newspapers no longer fully represented public opinion. New periodicals with new and different points of view might better represent the people.

With regard to legal obstacles, Mr. Williams explained that there were no press laws in the United Kingdom. Newspapers and those who ran them had the same rights and obligations as any individual. They could be prosecuted for libel, obscenity, or other offences, and received the same penalties as any citizen. The libel laws sometimes operated adversely against the press. There were cases where the press knew information about individuals or groups which should be exposed but was prevented from publishing it because of the libel laws. Those laws were being examined, however, and might be amended.

Among the commercial barriers to the free flow of information was the development of monopolies. It had been alleged that monopolistic practices in the United Kingdom were developing, especially in the case of provincial newspapers, some of which were being operated by owners in London. That meant that some of the people had to depend on one newspaper, owned and operated outside the community. The subject was being investigated by a Royal Commission of the Press, which would shortly issue a report of its findings. That report should be studied by the Sub-Commission; it would contain evidence of all sorts of obstacles to the free flow of information.

Monopolies forced readers of newspapers to obtain their information from a restricted source. They were obstacles not only to the reader, but also to the journalist: they restricted his field of employment.

In the opinion of Mr. Williams, the charges of the National Union of Journalists that monopolies were increasing to the point of becoming dangerous were exaggerated.

The principal news agencies in the United Kingdom, namely, the Press Association for domestic news, and Reuters for international news, were owned co-operatively. There was no possibility of their being used for commercial purposes by any one group.

/Although there



Although there were some economic and commercial obstacles to freedom of information in the United Kingdom, there was such a variety of periodicals that the people could easily read any point of view: socialist, conservative, liberal or communist.

One of the principal objectives of the Sub-Commission should be to increase news facilities for every type of periodical in order to give the peoples of the world a diversity of information, and to allow them to distinguish the good from the bad.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that Mr. Binder had proposed that the Sub-Commission should adopt Mr. Williams' summary statement (E/CN.4/Sub.1/91) as the basic working paper for its discussion of the adequacy of news available to the peoples of the world and obstacles to the free flow of information. He requested the Sub-Commission to consider drawing up a list of subjects for the research and studies which the Secretariat and UNESCO were to undertake between sessions of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. Binder had suggested that UNESCO should concentrate its studies on items (3) and (4) of Mr. Williams' summary statement, and that the United Nations Secretariat should prepare studies on items (1) and (2). Thus they would avoid duplication.

The Chairman speaking as a member proposed several additions to Mr. Williams' paper. He wished to insert the following items:

Item (d), to be added to sub-paragraph (1), as follows:

"(d) restrictions to the entry of foreign periodicals and other news materials."

Item (c), to be added to sub-paragraph (2), as follows:

"(c) status of agreements on allocation of broadcasting wave-lengths."

Item (d), to be added to sub-paragraph (3), as follows:

"(d) economic and financial conditions which militate against the development of information facilities in the under-developed countries."

A fifth sub-paragraph to be called:

"(5) Cultural obstacles".

He pointed out that the degree to which the peoples of the world were prepared to receive information was an important aspect of the problem which

the Sub-Commission should consider. The problem of literacy should be included in the list of subjects on which the Sub-Commission requested data from UNESCO and the Secretariat.

He proposed the inclusion, in the list of topics for research, of objective studies on the adequacy of news, which would include data on the existing world situation, such as the percentage of the peoples of the world who received adequate information, and the geographical distribution of those peoples. UNESCO could furnish the necessary statistics for such studies.

Among the studies on the press, he wished to request data on the production and consumption of news, the numbers of daily, weekly and monthly periodicals in various countries, the total circulation of such periodicals, and the ratio of the circulation to the total adult population. Studies on broadcasting enterprises should include statistics on the number and power of transmitters and receivers. Studies on newsreels should include data on the number of companies engaged in production and their output. Information enterprises studied should cover all types -- governmental, semi-governmental, co-operative and private. Their ownership, management and policies should be described. The variety of sources of information and opinion in various countries should be considered as also the extent to which all types of political, social, economic, and religious opinions were made available to the peoples of the world.

The publications of UNESCO contained much of the data necessary for the studies. He was sure that the Secretariat would find a convenient form in which to present that data to the Sub-Commission.

Mr. FONTAINA thought that the proposed item (d) should be deleted from sub-paragraph (1) of Mr. Williams' summary statement and that the words "news and" should be inserted before the word "movement" in item (b) of that sub-paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS recalled that he had submitted the summary statement merely as a guide for the Sub-Commission's discussions, and that the wording of the paper did not call for such minor alterations. It was only a suggestion regarding the method of approach which the Sub-Commission might adopt in making its studies. In the course of its sessions, topics could be added to or dropped from the list which he had suggested.

/Mr. FARR

Mr. FARR (UNESCO) remarked that UNESCO had been interested in the economic and cultural conditions which hampered the free flow of information. In 1947 and 1948 it had studied cultural obstacles in sovereign States. In 1950 it would extend those studies to Non-Self-Governing Territories. It had submitted a document dated 30 January 1948 (E/CN.4/Sub.1/63) during the second session of the Sub-Commission on obstacles to the dissemination of information.

The Sub-Commission had increased the scope of its programme of work and, on behalf of those who would have to prepare the documentation for the fourth session, he requested that a smaller number of topics for specific studies should be given to them, together with definite instructions as to the kinds of documents they were to assemble.

Mr. BINDER suggested that the documentation should include two types: the data required for the fourth session, and long-term studies. The subjects should include:

- (1) Data on the four or five items mentioned in document E/CN.4/Sub.1/91
- (2) Data on adequacy of news, such as sources of foreign news and ownership of newspapers.
- (3) Classification and analysis of existing agreements.
- (4) Constitutional provisions, national legislation and administrative practices.

The replies to the request for information addressed to Governments might be published in connexion with the last item. In Mr. Binder's opinion, studies on those topics were all that could be expected before the fourth session of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. Azkoul took the Chair.

Mr. ZONOV thought that the Sub-Commission's most important task was to consider the problem of the obstacles to the free flow of information and to the dissemination of true and objective information to peoples throughout the world. There was, however, a primary problem which had to be solved before the Sub-Commission could approach its two main objectives, namely, what kind of information should be

supplied to the peoples of the world. There were many kinds of information; members of the Sub-Commission could find many examples of the distortion and falsification of news disseminated through the press and radio. In order to safeguard the peace and maintain security and friendly relations among nations the question of the type of information to be disseminated would have to be solved.

The second substantial problem which, in his opinion could not be ignored, had been touched upon by Mr. Williams, namely, that of the ownership of the sources of information. The reply to that question would also answer the question of who influenced and directed the flow of information throughout the world.

As Mr. Williams had pointed out, the press in the United Kingdom was controlled by a number of monopolies. The same situation also prevailed in the United States. It should be obvious that the owners of information agencies exercised a selective influence and in the light of their own opinions determined what information should be made public. Under such a system, the common people of the world were denied the right to express their views because they owned no organs in which to publish them. It was manifestly impossible for the average person to express his own opinion when the sources of information were owned and controlled by monopolies. Mr. Zonov wished to stress that his remarks were based upon fact; in that connexion he quoted figures indicating that the Hearst organization controlled approximately twenty papers with a circulation of 5,500,000 as well as one of the major news services in the United States. The Scripps-Howard organization controlled approximately the same number of papers with a circulation of 2,500,000 and also the United Press agency. The problem of the dissemination of news in the United States was greatly conditioned by the fact that 90 per cent of United States papers received their information from three sources: United Press, Associated Press, and International News Service. Consequently, they were supplied with prepared information; under such a system no independent news or personal views could appear in the papers. A similar situation existed with regard to the radio in the United States. It had been reliably reported that of the thousand radio stations in that country the majority were controlled by the newspapers. The same conditions prevailed in the United Kingdom: four large monopolies published 55 papers with a circulation of 25 million.

/Mr. Zonov

Mr. Zonov then mentioned four of the leading United Kingdom newspapers which, he had been informed, were controlled by members of the nobility. He stressed the fact that he had quoted those facts in support of his contention that large and oppressive monopolistic information agencies did exist. It was apparent that the press and other sources of news were in the hands of a few who applied their own form of censorship. It was vitally important for the Sub-Commission to request the Secretary-General to study that question in addition to the other items on the agenda. The Sub-Commission would not be fulfilling its obligations if it followed any other course.

An analysis of the situation would indicate that monopolies existed throughout the world although perhaps not on the same scale as in the United States and the United Kingdom. Government support and sanction militated against the existence of smaller progressive organs who were being stifled and persecuted in many parts of the world. The newspapers and information enterprises were run as "big business" and consequently the spread of objective information was secondary to the amassing of huge profits.

In those circumstances large enterprises were not influenced by the reactions of public opinion but only by the wishes of big business. The Sub-Commission should be aware of the fact that such pressure on the part of one section of the population exerted a very definite influence upon the flow of information and constituted a real obstacle to the dissemination of truthful and objective news. The lack of newsprint, the shortage of plants and even the facilities for distribution were affected by the existing system of monopolies. The result of all those factors was that the common people of the world were deprived of unbiased information. The monopolies could have recourse to the law to promote their own interests and often possessed effective means of influencing the attitude of high government officials to such an extent that their power was supreme. They could dictate the views of their employees and there were very few journalists who dared to run counter to the opinions of their superiors.

In that connexion, he referred to the case of a Turkish correspondent of The New York Times who had been summarily dismissed when he had protested against the distortion of his reports and the failure to print his articles. His letter of protest to The New York Times had not even been published although

/it had

it had appeared in another paper. That was an instance of a correspondent being obliged to relinquish his position because he refused to conform to the views of the paper's directors. A writer in The Daily Compass had recently stated that the aim of the press should be to protect the democratic rights of all and to work for a positive programme for the promotion of freedom and the general well-being. The writer had gone on to say, however, that the existing press organizations fell far short of fulfilling that objective. The article stated further that little criticism of United States foreign policy had been appearing in papers recently because the correspondents who were opposed to the existing factions in Washington had either been dismissed or had decided to conform to the views of the Government.

Turning to consideration of the situation of the press and information agencies in the USSR, Mr. Zonov stated that the average person was very often ill-informed on the situation prevailing in that country, the reason for that being that he received his information from biased sources. In the USSR all media of information belonged to the people and all were free to write and express their opinions in the press or over the radio or in whatever form they desired. There were no restrictions on the press in the USSR; all information organizations had free access to news. Article 125 of the USSR Constitution proclaimed that every citizen had the right to freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of assembly. Those were not merely formal assurances since the means of implementing those rights were available to the people.

In the period from 1913 to 1946, the people of the USSR had witnessed an amazing growth in the number of newspapers published and circulated. Papers were currently published in 70 languages so that even those peoples who before the revolution had not had an alphabet, possessed the necessary media with which to express themselves freely. Similarly, the number of books published between 1913 and 1946 had risen from 86 million to 463 million. In that period, a total number of 11 thousand million works in 119 different languages had come off the USSR presses. Those included not only works by USSR authors but numerous publications by foreign writers. Radio and cinema organizations also belonged to the people and were subject to no restrictions of any kind.

/Mr. BINDER

Mr. BINDER regretted that the comments on the situation of the press in the United States and the United Kingdom made by Mr. Zonov had not been brought up earlier so that he could have had an opportunity to reply to them in detail. He realized that it must be difficult for a newcomer to the United States to understand the workings of a number of that country's institutions and also to read accurately the presentations and criticisms of the press which might be brought to his attention.

He had wondered whether Mr. Zonov's comments on monopolies referred to the United States, the United Kingdom or the USSR, because in his opinion they were all more applicable to the USSR than to the two other countries.

Mr. Binder was acquainted with the situation in the three countries and felt that the brief presentation of activities in the USSR tended to conceal the fact that twelve men in the Politburo exercised a very real monopoly on news, information and methods of presentation. He did not feel that a similar situation existed in any democratic country. In that connexion he wondered whether Mr. Zonov had been in the USSR at the time when the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, in an effort to allay anxiety about the tension between his country and the USSR, had offered to extend the existing friendship pact between those two countries for twenty-five years. That information had been published in almost every country except the USSR. The Communist-controlled monopoly in that country had withheld that offer from the public because at that time it was conducting a campaign to convince the people that the Western Powers were planning aggressive action against the USSR. He did not believe that any monopoly in the West could have withheld that type of information from the public. From his point of view, furthermore, it appeared that the nature of control exercised over news in the USSR was definitely monopolistic.

In reference to the resignation of a correspondent of The New York Times, Mr. Binder wondered whether resignation from the USSR press were possible and practicable. He had personally been acquainted with a Tass correspondent who had returned to the USSR in 1936 and had been unable to learn anything about his whereabouts / since then, although the correspondent had been widely known.

/That was

That was not an isolated case. Mr. Binder did not believe, however, that the problems which concerned the Sub-Commission were more easily solved by the tactics employed in police States. Freedom to print was a precious right which should be safeguarded. An enormous plant was not indispensable, however, to the dissemination of important news, as witness the average type of news letter. Nevertheless such publications which utilized an inexpensive mimeograph machine, despite their usefulness, would not be permitted in a police State.

Mr. Binder would shortly present a picture of the situation in the United States in connexion with item 6.

The purpose of his intervention was to clear up certain misconceptions which might have arisen from Mr. Zonov's comments. He did not feel that a comprehensive picture of censorship in the USSR had been presented. The Chief Administration of Affairs of Literature and Publishers, known as Glavlit, had been created and was the main censorship agency of the USSR. The directive creating it had stipulated that the office was to exercise full political, ideological, military and economic control over the production of the press and other information media including the radio. That agency/<sup>was</sup>empowered to prohibit the publication and distribution of (a) works which contained propaganda against the USSR and the dictatorship of the proletariat; (b) works which disclosed state secrets; (c) works which aroused nationalistic and religious hatred; and (d) works containing pornographic material.

Mr. Binder wished to remind the Sub-Commission that it could not accomplish its work within the time available if it attempted to disparage one country while bestowing unstinted praise upon another.

Mr. Lopez resumed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS had hoped to hear a more detailed exposition of the USSR press than Mr. Zonov had presented. He wished to correct a statement made by Mr. Zonov that labour and the trade union organizations could not produce papers in the capitalistic countries, or that, if they did have a small organ, it was often prosecuted. He wished to point out that the British Trade Union Congress controlled the policy of the Daily Herald, a paper with the largest circulation in the world.

Mr. Zonov had also charged that the monopolies did not permit expression of any views other than their own. Mr. Williams informed the Sub-Commission that Lord Kemsley had invited him to write a column devoted to the socialist viewpoint for publication in one of his Sunday papers, in spite of the fact

/that Lord Kemsley



that Lord Kemsley was personally opposed to that philosophy. Mr. Williams explained that he had been given a legal agreement that no word of his articles would be altered and that they would be published every week for one year. Although his articles had given rise to much comment and although his views had been denounced in editorials, the paper had never failed to reproduce his article once a week. He would like to hear in what way the opinions of the opposition were published in the USSR.

Mr. ZONOV explained that he had hoped Mr. Williams would supply more information on the ownership of newspapers in his country and on the way in which information was disseminated to the public.

In connexion with the remarks made by Mr. Williams on the ownership of the Daily Herald, Mr. Zonov stated that he was informed that the paper was controlled by Lord Southwood, who owned a 51 per cent interest in the company.

Mr. WILLIAMS, in reply to Mr. Zonov, stated that the Odhams Press controlled 51 per cent of the stock of the Daily Herald and that furthermore it was expressly stipulated that the British Trade Union Congress would have a decisive voice in the trade union policy of that paper, and that the political policy would be in accordance with the views of the Labour Party.

Mr. AZKOUL thought that Mr. Zonov had raised an interesting point concerning monopolies; Mr. Williams had also listed that question under item 2 (a) of his paper (E/CN.4/Sub.1/91). He was happy to see that there was no disagreement among the members of the Sub-Commission on the importance of that particular item.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the method of self-criticism initiated by Mr. Azmi during the previous meeting was the most acceptable procedure to follow. He pointed out, however, that criticism of others was not ruled out by that system and he earnestly hoped that the members of the Sub-Commission would make every effort to be objective in their comments regarding the ways of removing obstacles to the free flow of information.

Mr. AZMI pointed out that the Chairman had given a classification of the various types of ownership of periodicals. He proposed that a definition of information might be inserted in the Chairman's proposal as follows:

/"Information

"Information consists of facts and ideas reflecting the truth, the diffusion of which helps to raise the cultural and moral standards of peoples and spread the concept of peace throughout the world..."

The Sub-Commission could state that that was the sense in which it understood "information".

Mr. HOGAN (Secretariat) drew members' attention to the first part of their report to the Economic and Social Council; the remainder of the report would be prepared for the Sub-Commission's consideration in the near future. He explained that in the form and structure of the report, the Secretariat had followed established procedure. The annex to the report was to contain draft resolutions for the Council based on the resolutions of the Sub-Commission.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.