

**United Nations**

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**Nations Unies** UNRESTRICTED  
E/P.V. 118  
15 August 1947  
English

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

**MASTER FILE**

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL  
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York  
Friday, 15 August 1947, at 3:30 p.m.

Acting President: Mr. Jan PAPANÉK (Czechoslovakia)

NOTE: This verbatim record is issued under rule 35 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

The rules of procedure do not provide for the submission of corrections to the verbatim record, but only to the summary record (rule 49).

Interpretations as delivered at meetings are recorded in the present verbatim record for the convenience of representatives and corrections to these interpretations need not be submitted.

Corrections to the text of original speeches should be sent to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council for the guidance of the writers of the summary records.

The PRESIDENT: I declare the one hundred and eighteenth meeting of the Economic and Social Council open.

Mr. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): I wish to raise a point of order. I have had an opportunity to read the minutes of our last meeting, and I must say that the English interpretation of the speech I made at that meeting completely misrepresented my remarks. It misstated my thoughts on many, many points; and, in some cases, it was directly contradictory to what I said. For instance, according to the interpretation, I said that if the press should be influenced, it could only be by the government. That is the exact opposite of what I actually said. In many other ways, too, my thought was entirely misrepresented.

I had thought it would be an easy matter to have the minutes corrected, but I have now been given to understand that that is impossible. I should therefore like to say that the English interpretation of my speech should be considered to be non-existent and certainly not representing what I meant to say. I should like to ask the President to take the necessary steps to have an authentic translation prepared of the speech I made.

The PRESIDENT: It will be taken care of.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): The French representative has raised a point in which the Soviet Union delegation also has a certain interest. I have noticed on many occasions that the English interpretation of remarks made by the Soviet Union delegation was not altogether precise; there were certain errors in the interpretation. I should like to ask the Secretariat to make the necessary corrections and to furnish a precise rendering into

English of my delegation's remarks before the document containing the English text is circulated.

The PRESIDENT: That will be brought to the attention of the Secretariat and the matter will be taken care of.

I must now leave the Council meeting in order to attend a meeting of the committee which is negotiating an agreement with the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. I hope that that meeting will be concluded soon and that I shall be able to return to the Council. If there is no objection, I should like to ask Mr. Finn Moe, the representative of Norway, to take the Chair during my absence as the Council continues its discussion of document E/547. The discussion is on draft resolution 6. We are at the end of Chapter I.

Mr. Moe assumed the Presidency.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND OF THE PRESS (document E/547)

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): We have had a very full discussion of this amendment, and there is little for me to add to what has already been said. I shall try to be brief. In agreement with a large part of what the representatives of Canada and the Netherlands said yesterday, we have had some misgivings about possible misinterpretation of the amendment. On the other hand, our views are perhaps a little less strong than some which have been expressed in opposition to the amendment.

I am sure that we were all impressed by the plea for moderation expressed yesterday by Mr. Moe as the representative of Norway. There is one statement, however, that I think has to be made in the light of some of the remarks that were unfortunately made

around this table several days ago, when a more or less related item was under discussion. In the light of that discussion, I must clearly reject any implication that the willingness to bring this amendment under close scrutiny constitutes in any way a direct or indirect tolerance of such offensive doctrines as Fascism or Nazism or such practices as war-mongering or the use of the press for waging a war of nerves.

This is one of these cases in which to discuss amendments, and to discuss these practices, by no means implies any condonation of such practices. . The United States delegation rejects any effort to put such an interpretation on any of its remarks. .

Again, perhaps I might comment in passing on the suggestion of the representative of Byelorussia yesterday afternoon that those who have undertaken critically to examine this amendment did not speak for the mass of their people. . . The curious spectacle of the representative of one government undertaking to understand the people of another country better than do the representatives of their own government could, I am sure we should all agree, lead to some very strange results in this Council. .

Now for the substance of the amendment. . From the very inception of this country, certain fundamental human rights have been enshrined in both its traditions and its practices. Perhaps the most important single one of these tradition-enshrined rights has been liberty. A people with such a tradition does not feel it necessary to protest its repugnance for fascism or for nazism, but we do feel, as the representative of Canada said yesterday, that some of those words such as fascism, collaborationism, and so forth have tended to lose some of their significant content and to become rather more epithets. We feel that the emphasis in the forthcoming Conference should be on freedom -- freedom to know and freedom to tell.

We are also concerned over the abuses of censorship and of police as much or even more than we are over the dangers of the abuses of freedom. We would also agree very heartily with the remarks of the representative of France as to the dangers and undesirability of the monopolization of news, whether that monopolization be by private or

by public means. Nevertheless, we do recognize, along with the sponsors of this amendment, the utter incompatibility of fascism with democracy and with freedom of information. We also recognize that there are probably differences in approach which arise out of different experiences on the part of the people of the United States as compared with the peoples of some other countries, but if this is so, it is by reason of the fact that fascism is so repugnant and so antithetical to the instincts of the American people that it has never gained any serious or significant foothold here.

At the same time we do not forget that we, too, have twice poured out American blood and resources to help destroy the enemies of democracy who have arisen outside our borders, and we regard that as more significant than any vote which we may take on any form of words in this Council.

If we were to adopt any amendment, I think we should find ourselves most in agreement, of all the forms that have been proposed, with the suggestion made by the representative of Lebanon yesterday. We all recognize that tyrannical doctrines have a way of changing their form and their clothes from time to time, and if we are to adopt any amendment we should adopt one which comprehends all the forms, present or future, of those ideologies which are opposed to peace, freedom, and freedom of information.

For that reason, as I say we should prefer the suggestion made by the representative of Lebanon, but if that one does not prevail we shall have no difficulty in accepting something like the amendment proposed by the representative of Norway referring to anti-democratic ideologies.

If that does not prevail, we shall have no difficulty in accepting something like the amendment offered by the representative of Norway which refers to anti-democratic ideologies.

However, I should like to make only one small remark of not too serious a nature about the second of these amendments. Once again it is a matter of precision. Certainly we are all against war mongering and incitement to violence, but there is a very difficult line to draw between seeking the sensational and war mongering, and I think that everyone of us around this Council table has had many occasions to regret the fact that after a very solid day's work with 99 per cent agreement, we find that our debates are reported as a very bellicose state of affairs and the only things that get reported, or at least that make the headlines, are the few differences that we have had. I will say, however, that I was more surprised than I would have ever expected to be to find that this is a habit within the United Nations as well as outside of it.

I refer to the press release of 13 August on the 30th plenary meeting of this Council in which the Members will recall I made a fairly lengthy statement about the problems of migrant labor, and I think the Council will recall that I spent most of my time -- nearly all of my time -- discussing the technical aspects of the problem. The official United Nations press release picks out only one sentence of that whole speech, namely, a denial of certain charges made by my friend from the Soviet Union Mr. Morosov. If in reporting within the United Nations it is so difficult to refrain from the sensational, we will have to be somewhat tolerant with the press of the world in its reporting.

Mr. AHMED (India): The delegation of India will not oppose the amendments proposed by the delegations of France, Chile, and Norway. In fact, we are in complete accord with the purport of those amendments.

To whatever extent the use of the word "fascism" might have been stretched or strained elsewhere, we have no doubt in our minds that when the delegations of France, Norway and Chile used the word "fascism" in their amendments, they used it in the same sense and connotation in which we understand it. We understand fascism to mean--as I have no doubt the delegations of France, Norway and Chile understand it--the monster whom we have all fought and conquered.



We are always as concerned as the three delegations I have mentioned to see that this monster does not raise its ugly head once more. Indeed, the entire purpose of the United Nations, in both the positive and negative aspects of its work, is just to see to that.

Having stated that, we doubt the advisability of using ideological or label words in stating fundamental principles. We feel that the use of ideological words illustrating fundamental principles tends to limit their universality, and also tends to restrict their application in time.

It is our hope that under the auspices of the United Nations, in a generation or two the words "fascism" and "collaborationism" will be consigned to the limbo of oblivion, and will be just words for the philosophers and historians to remember and deal with, just as with many of the "isms" within our own memory and our own lifetime.

We feel that if these ideological words are used in defining fundamental principles, they will, as I have said, detract from the universality of those principles.

We do not share the view expressed by the representative of Norway, and later on by the representative of Venezuela, that unless and until we use the word "fascism" in this statement of fundamental principles, and call upon the Conference by naming the word "fascism" to fight it or to remove its venom, we shall be exposing ourselves to the danger of this aspect of freedom of information being lost sight of. We have no such fear in our minds.

We feel that an identical purpose can be served by stating principles in the broadest possible terms, and by not using ideological words. Indeed, in clause (a) of that paragraph, had the suggestion been made that instead of the words "to tell the truth without prejudice", we should have used the words, "to tell democratic truth without prejudice", we should not have found

any agreement with it.

It is for that reason that we do not find ourselves in agreement with the word "anti-democratic" either, because we believe that by eschewing these ideological terms and removing those which have been used in that paragraph, we shall be preserving our purpose much better.

I do not know whether other delegations have considered the matter, but I find that in the Charter of the United Nations the word "fascism"--or even, for that matter, the word "democracy"--is not used once. Does that in any way detract from the wide appeal and application and from the universality of the Charter? Would anybody suggest that, because we have not said anywhere in the Charter that the remnants of fascism should be fought or that collaborationism should be destroyed, the Charter is therefore less applicable or has less force? I doubt whether anybody would be bold enough to make an assertion of that nature.

I hold that the use of the word "fascism" or the word "anti-democratic" is not necessary in stating broad general principles. I believe that the paragraphs as they now stand cover all aspects of that problem; and that within the framework of the words used in those paragraphs, which are identical in part with the words used in the Charter, we can expect that the Conference on Freedom of Information, in its discussion of the various items on the agenda, will keep this detailed aspect in view without our having to call it to the attention of the Conference by name.

It is for that reason, and that reason alone, that the delegation of India would abstain from voting on this proposal. As I have explained, our abstention would not mean disagreement. We are in complete agreement with the purport of the proposal. As a matter of drafting, however, we feel that ideological expressions should not be used in stating broad and fundamental principles.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia): In the course of one of our previous meetings, when we discussed the report of the Sub-commission on Freedom of Information and the Press, the Czechoslovak delegation has emphasized the importance of the responsibility of the press and the importance of positive aims for which a free press must fight. The proposal which is before the Council contains two of those aims, two of the most important, and my delegation will vote in favour of this amendment, because the text is clear to me, to my country, and I think to anyone who had anything to do with fascism and nazism.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): First of all I wish to comment upon the speeches made by the representatives of France and Norway, and more particularly on what they had stated concerning some of the proposals contained in the draft agenda submitted by the Soviet Union delegation to the Social Committee.

The representatives of France and Norway, when speaking of the Soviet Union draft, had spoken of the idea of a campaign being included in the Soviet Union draft. I should like to declare at once that the Soviet Union text contains no such word. There is obviously a misunderstanding due to an erroneous translation done by the Secretariat from the Russian text of the draft into English. The interpreter who helps me in my work on the Council says that the Russian word which was used should be translated into the English word "struggle" rather than "campaign", and this of course makes quite a difference. I think it is highly regrettable that the lack of precision, meaning the written translation, leads to misunderstanding on such an important point in the Soviet Union draft proposal.

Coming to the amendment submitted by the three delegations, France, Norway and Chile, I should like to mention that in the view of the Soviet Union delegation the contents of this amendment are highly significant. This is recalled by the fact that the draft agenda submitted by the Social Committee omits many important and main principles of the tasks to be fulfilled, tasks that are imposed by the very ideas which inspired the creation of the United Nations themselves and that are clearly stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations.

According to the Soviet Union delegation, the amendment submitted by the three countries I have mentioned is a step forward.

MB/ehs

E/P.V.118  
37-40

It is an improvement on the draft submitted by the Social Committee because this amendment does mention the struggle against fascism and war mongers who tried to suggest a new war. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union delegation considers that this amendment does not go far enough, that it does not fully bring into effect the main tasks that are imposed upon us by circumstances as well as by the Charter of the United Nations. Whereas the Soviet Union proposal of the draft agenda in our opinion fully corresponds to the main tasks to be considered.

In this respect, I should like to point out that during the discussion of the Soviet Union draft proposal in the Social Committee, there were no objections raised by any of the delegations with regard to this draft proposal. This is rather easy to explain because I do not think it would be possible to find any objection if one wanted to have as the basis of one's conceptions the Charter of the United Nations and the main tasks of the Organization of the United Nations.

For this reason, it was strange to hear some orators declare, in the discussion that took place in the Council with regard to this subject, that they did not fully understand what the term "fascism" meant. I should recommend to these people that they can receive an explanation of this term from the people of Stalingrad, from the people of all the cities and villages of the Soviet Union that have been destroyed, from the people of all the cities and villages that were destroyed in other countries which suffered under the fascist yoke. I am sure that these people would be ready to explain what the term "fascism" means.

Furthermore, it seems to us that it is too early to forget what the term "fascism" means. First of all, only a short time has elapsed since the end of the war and the victory over fascism; therefore, all of us can still remember the horrors of fascism. It would be a crime against the peace-loving people of the world to forget it so early.

Secondly, I think it is also too early to forget it because the conditions existing at the present time contain considerable evidence of the fact that there still are remnants of fascism. There are reactionary circles which still sympathize with fascism and are busily engaged disseminating propaganda for a new war, disseminating this propaganda among the Member States of the United Nations, and

using all means of information which, as we know, in many countries belong to a small group of monopolists.

It was said yesterday that it would be desirable to make the press and other means of information more responsible for what they say. The Soviet Union proposal contains concrete suggestions to that effect. We consider that there should be a very strict responsibility for lies and calumnies in information.

The Soviet Union proposal suggested that there should be freedom of the press to be enjoyed by all citizens, with the exception of those who indulge in fascist propaganda.

In his statement of yesterday, the representative of the United Kingdom said that he did not wish anybody to be silenced. As an example of this principle being applied in his country, he stated that the people in the United Kingdom were allowed to listen to the German radio during the war.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union delegation, this is not a valid argument. In the first place, we know that some of the people who spoke over the German radio against their own people and their own nations, thereby helping German propaganda, have been justly condemned in the United Kingdom. However, the main objection is that there can be nothing in common between freedom of information, as it ought to be understood, and propaganda for a new war and the use of means of information against the very aims and principles of the United Nations.

Is it possible to assume that any speaker could be in earnest when he pretends that freedom means that fascists may use the means of information to foster a new war? In the opinion of the Soviet Union delegation, such a conception would amount to using the term "freedom" as a cover for encouraging propaganda by the remnants of fascism against the very interests and objectives of the United Nations. To forbid such activity would be to defend the main interests of the United Nations.



If we must forbid the use of opium and sign a convention against the harm that the use of opium and other narcotic drugs can bring to mankind, if we have a convention against obscene publications, then it is also our sacred duty to forbid any fostering of war or any activities which are contrary to the main principles of the United Nations, against peace and security in the world. Is it more important to fight the harm done by opium and obscene publications than to fight propaganda against peace, against friendly relations among nations, against the main objectives of the United Nations?

The struggle for democracy and against fascism, against the press and other means of information used to foster new wars, and the attempt to develop friendly relations among independent people -- all these are the main tasks of information, as has been emphasized in the draft submitted by the Soviet Union delegation for the agenda of the Conference on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

The Soviet Union delegation requests that the Economic and Social Council should consider this draft in its proposal.

Some of the orators who spoke before me said that unwillingness to mention this struggle against the remnants of fascism does not imply that people are actually unwilling to join in such a struggle. If, however, we agree on the necessity for the struggle against the remnants of fascism as one of the main tasks of our activity, why should we be so shy in mentioning it as one of the main tasks in establishing the agenda of the Conference on Freedom of Information and of the Press?

The struggle against fascism and its activities is an everyday task, and therefore clearly it cannot be omitted from the agenda of the Conference on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words on the draft amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand. He suggests that we should forswear anti-democratic ideologies and forswear incitement to war. I should think that, saying nothing but "forswearing", this proposal would only encourage anti-democratic forces in their criminal fostering of war. Therefore, this amendment would not be acceptable to the Soviet Union delegation.

Mr. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): In the first place, I wish to apologize to the representative of the Soviet Union if an error in the translation led me to utter a reproach which was not really justified. I have taken note of the fact that the word in question should have been translated by "struggle," and not by "campaign." However, the representative of the Soviet Union has spoken about "organization of the struggle." To my mind, that still conveys the idea of a certain kind of leadership given to such a struggle, in the way in which a conductor might lead an orchestra. That shows that there is still a very basic difference between the views of the Soviet Union representative and the views appearing in the proposals of the French, Norwegian and Chilean delegations.

The French delegation has followed with a great deal of attention the lengthy debate which has taken place in the Council. I want to say at once that the debate has been conducted on a very high level, which is all to the honour of the Council, that body which is sometimes open to the reproach of busying itself with procedural questions rather than with fundamental problems. I also want to say how deeply I appreciate the spirit of comprehension which has been shown here by the representative of the United States.

It is quite evident that we have been busying ourselves here with fundamental principles. If it were only for the exchange of ideas which has taken place--an exchange which, I repeat, has taken place on a very high level--we would not regret having instituted this debate, even if the end of our labours has been somewhat delayed.

A certain number of criticisms have been levelled against the French proposals, and I should like to deal with them shortly. The critics have shown some hesitation, or have even refused to accept the amendment proposed by the French delegation. The proof of this can be seen in the fact that at least two other formulas have been put forward as substitutes for the French amendment, and it therefore appears very clearly that if we could give answers to some of the objections which have been made, we should be able to vote a formula which would find a ready echo in the hearts of all the peoples of the world.

There have been a certain number of contradictions between the criticisms that have been made. On one side we had the representative of the Netherlands, who feared that the French proposal was something in the nature of a repetition of what has already been stated. I do not think it is really a repetition, but if it is, I would ask what is wrong with repeating things? It might be well to quote the old saying to the effect that, if something goes without saying, it might go all the better if it were said.

On the other hand, the representative of Canada has voiced the opinion that the French formula adds too much to the text which was already before the Council. If I understood him correctly he said the only thing necessary was to tell the truth, and that if the truth were told to the peoples of the world they would easily find their way and would not run the risk of getting into the wrong channels. I am afraid that this is a misconception. One can perfectly well tell the truth, but not always all the truth.

GR

E/P.V.118  
57-60

Sometimes it is absolutely impossible to do so. The space in the newspapers is restricted -- I may say that in my own country newspapers are now published with only two pages -- and time on the radio is restricted, and therefore, while it is easy to say "speak the truth", it is not so easy to speak all the truth.

One is led to make a choice, and put on the front pages of the newspapers little or sometimes big scandals, while hiding away on the back page, in small type, things which are perhaps more important, dealing perhaps with the case against the fascist and similar regimes. There is a way of cutting the articles, of having banner lines across the front pages of the newspapers which, without really distorting the truth, without saying anything which could be called a lie, still amounts to failure to tell the whole truth.

It has been said that the press should be like a mirror which would reflect the truth. But may I say that a mirror can be reflected and that it can bring very different aspects of the same object. Therefore, in order to accomplish the purpose which we all have in mind, I do not think that it would be wrong to state that the press should reflect the truths which must be reflected according to the importance they have.

It has been said here that we are dealing with universal principles and that if we become too precise we might run the risk of being outmoded within a very short time. This surely could not apply to the second part of the French amendment. Certainly it would be a little too optimistic to predict that the struggle against war mongers will be outmoded within a very short time or that it will not appear as up to date. It may be true that at some future date fascism will appear as only a souvenir, a memory to be despised and hated. However I must add that certainly the time has not come yet that our generation is still afraid that it might suffer from a return of fascism. As our generation is also willing to protect the coming generation against the possible return of fascism, let us not forget that fascism has exerted its attraction on the younger generations of very old countries with very old civilizations and that youth has been seduced by that doctrine. I have been told also that the notion itself was a little confused, and the honourable representative of the United Kingdom has quoted an example by which a group of stalwart labour journalists, having gone to the Soviet Union, had been called fascist by the press of that country. I do not think that this argument is really pertinent. It reminds me of a man who would be opposed to the condemnation of a

lie just because he has been unjustly called a liar. I would not show too much bashfulness about it. I would not be too timid. I would not be afraid to be very clear on the point because I do not think that the situation is as simple as that, and we cannot be too careful to avoid a return of fascism.

I have also been told that we should not use words which are purely ideological words. However, the Charter itself, if it does not use the words mentioned by some of our colleagues around this table speaks of fundamental freedoms and of human rights. I do not think that those terms have been very clearly defined up to this time. We know what we mean by fundamental freedoms. We know what we mean by human rights. However, the Commission on Human Rights is still sitting as we speak here, and I do not think a very clear definition has been given of words which we continue to use because they convey to our minds the exact meaning which we want to give them. If we should need some clearer definition of fascism, however, I do not think it would be very difficult to find in the words of the propounders of that doctrine a very clear definition indeed. I doubt, however, whether we need to have recourse to such sources which are not very clean. I may say that the chiefs or the leaders of the great democracies have given a very clear definition of the term fascism, and I would tell the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, that among the formulas that have been used by their great leaders we can find some of the most clear definitions and very much on the point indeed. However, the people who have suffered from the fascist invasion, the people who have suffered under the fascist and nazi regimes, they have not forgotten. Their experience is still very much alive in their heart and in their mind, and certainly they would not approve anything which

would not deal very clearly with the origin of all the evils under which they so greatly suffered. 'I should like to reassure my colleague from the United Kingdom who was rather shocked by the words " to remove." Well, I am going to try to give him a very clear explanation of what we really mean. He told us that the English public has never been forbidden to listen to the German radio, and this is perfectly true. But as do all the people of the allied nations, and I myself for very personal reasons, I have learned to have the greatest respect indeed for the BBC. However, I should like to ask our United Kingdom colleague if the pupils of Lord Haw Haw desire to come back to speak on the microphone of the BBC, wouldn't they be very politely removed from the place, or would they be admitted to speak on the microphone of the BBC. The man in the street understands perfectly well what we mean. They know what fascism is. They would not understand that simply but for a question of terminology we did not indicate that one of the main tasks to be assigned to the press and to the means of expressing public opinion is the struggle with all their might against the fascists and collaborationists.



A negative vote would certainly afford an occasion for mis-interpretation in many parts of the world. The explanation for the vote may be given in this Council. However, the explanation will pass and be forgotten. What will remain will be the vote itself, and I have no doubt that the enemies of the principle of democracy will attach a very clear implication to the vote which will be cast in this Council.

Therefore, I insist that the French amendment should be admitted and should find the approval of the Council, with a single amendment as proposed by the representative of Norway, to the effect that the word "anti-democratic" should be substituted for the word "fascism" in one place, and only in one place.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Interpretation from Spanish): I have the good fortune to speak after the representative of France, which permits me to shorten my speech and not take too much of the time of the Council.

The representative of France clearly showed the danger that would occur if we eliminated the word "fascism." I fully agree with what he said in this respect. I wish to state that it had always been the intention of the Chilean delegation -- and I have no doubt that the same is true in the case of the French and Norwegian delegations -- to interpret the term "fascism" in the following manner: the ideology of the countries that were vanquished in the last war. This definition, of course, removes any possibility of a malignant interpretation with regard to this term.

I think that practically every argument that has been put forward against our amendment has been refuted. To my mind, there still remains one notion brought forth by the representative of the United

Kingdom which has not yet been dealt with. The representative of the United Kingdom said that we could not put into a resolution dealing with freedom of information and of the press any idea of restriction by suggesting that the resolution should combat ideologies. He said that it would be inconsistent for the United Kingdom to accept such a restriction in the face of the fact that a representative of the United Kingdom had submitted a draft for the Bill of Human Rights which mentioned the widest possible freedom with regard to opinion and expression.

I should like to remind the Members of the Council that the draft submitted by the United Kingdom, as well as any other draft with regard to the Bill of Human Rights, if it speaks of freedom of opinion and expression, still admits restrictions of such freedom of expression when taking into consideration the security of a country. If such freedom of expression and of opinion can and must be restricted for security reasons in any given country, how much more should such freedom be restricted because of considerations of security involving all humanity, which is certainly endangered by fascist ideologies?

I shall not insist on further explanation, and I wish to press the Council to come to a decision with regard to our amendment, which is now in the following form, after the amendment suggested by the representative of Norway and accepted by the representative of France: "To combat anti-democratic ideologies and to remove the remnants of fascism and collaborationism from the media of information." This would be the same for items (c) and (d).

Mr. MONGE (Peru) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make clear the opinion of my delegation as far as the amendment of France, Norway and Chile, to Chapter I, paragraph 2, of resolution 6, is concerned. The term "fascism" which is included in this amendment, refers obviously to methods of violence.

Can there be any doubt as to the meaning of this term so far as any country that has suffered from the terrible effects of the last war, is concerned? It is obvious and only logical that two years after the end of the war, not only the concepts but the people themselves still live. No one is capable of misunderstanding who is and who is not a fascist, who has or who has not a fascist ideology. There can be no doubt about that.

Yet we of this Council represent the whole of the world. Our branches are vaster still than the vast branches of those who have suffered from this war, and this is only two years after the war has come to an end. There is already, in countries that have not suffered directly from the war the possibility of misusing and misunderstanding this term.

During the very brief period since the end of the war, we have seen this term used in a different sense in a good many of the countries that did not feel the direct impact of the war.

The term is given a certain social meaning; quite often, political parties which are democratic not only in name, but perhaps in fact, use the term to stigmatize their political adversaries.

For this reason, although I have remained silent during three days of this important discussion, listening to the great concepts and generous ideas that were expressed, I feel that I must now express my view that to include this term in our draft resolution, in the light of the erroneous use of the term in some countries, might cause greater harm in the future since the term is not always honestly and clearly used in every country.

Therefore, although I have a deep sympathy for the generous country of France, which suffered so much during this last war and which has been a beacon to Latin American culture in many respects, having so many close relations with Latin America, I am going to vote against the amendment submitted by France, Norway and Chile. As has been said by the representative of the United Kingdom, I consider that the provisions of the Charter include all the ideas necessary for freedom of information and of the press.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (Interpretation from French): The delegation of Lebanon voted against the Soviet Union amendment, since we considered that its text was implicitly included in the draft presented by the sub-committee. We still hold the same view. In our opinion, if we say that we protect truth, that means that we

fight against lies; if we say that we protect peace, that means that we are taking measures against war. Yet, since many Members of the Council seem to wish that what was implicit should be stated explicitly, if the majority of the Members wish to have the negative counterpart of the positive statement included in the draft, the Lebanese delegation maintains its own amendment.

We consider that that amendment has two advantages: First, it goes further than the amendment submitted by France, Norway and Chile in the matter of protecting freedom and human rights, because it speaks not only against one given ideology, but against any possible ideology which might threaten that freedom and those rights. Second--and I must thank the representative of France for reminding me of that--we know precisely what we say, because very soon we shall have an official statement of the United Nations concerning human rights and human freedoms, a statement containing a full list of those rights and freedoms, which would not be the case if we were speaking of fighting fascism or anti-democratic forces or if we were using any such terms.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I wish to support, in the warmest terms, what the representative of the Lebanon has just said. In my remarks earlier in the debate I said that, if there was a general feeling among the Members of the Council that something was missing from this list of fundamental principles, I was open to conviction. It is clear from the course of the debate that there is a feeling that we must put in, somewhere among these principles, the idea of defending the basis of those principles.

It appears to me that the amendment proposed by the representative of Lebanon is, as he says, the widest possible amendment. It goes further than the other amendments; it embraces them, it is open to none of the objections about lack of universality to which I drew attention, and to which other Members have also drawn attention in their speeches.

I shall therefore warmly support the proposal of the Lebanese representative and vote against the other amendments, and my grounds for doing so will be that they are all included in the Lebanese amendment, which has the authentic ring of universality on the principles of human rights which is in keeping with the other principles laid down.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Interpretation from Spanish): The vote of the Venezuelan delegation will be in support of the amendment submitted by the delegations of France, Norway and Chile. This is quite logical, and is consistent with the attitude which has always been assumed within the United Nations by the Venezuelan delegation on the question of condemning fascism. Our view has always been that fascism should be condemned clearly, specifically, and openly.

We know that there are remnants of fascism, and we know that Franco Spain openly was, and still remains, the living representative of

fascism. That reason alone would be enough to make us take this opportunity of making an open and clear-cut condemnation of fascism. That reason alone would be enough to cause us to vote for the amendment of the delegations of France, Norway, and Chile.

I do not wish to give any more reasons, or to analyze the objections that have been made to this amendment, as what has been said by other speakers, for example the representative of France, is sufficient. I do not see that it is any use to repeat the same arguments one against the other.

The PRESIDENT: We have before us three amendments, one proposed by the delegations of France, Norway and Chile, of which the text has been slightly changed, one proposed by the delegation of New Zealand, and one proposed by the Lebanese delegation.

According to our Rules of Procedure, which lay down that when two or more amendments are moved a vote shall be taken first on the one which is furthest removed from the original proposal, the Council will vote first upon the amendment presented by the delegations of France, Norway and Chile. If that amendment is defeated the Council will vote on the New Zealand amendment, and if that is lost, on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Lebanon.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): In my previous intervention, I asked the Council to consider, in connection with what we are now discussing, the proposal that had been submitted by the Soviet Union delegation. The amendments submitted by the delegations of France, Norway and Chile are amendments to one specific chapter of the draft agenda, and on this chapter the Soviet Union delegation has also submitted an amendment. I should like to ask the views of the Council concerning Chapter 1 of the document submitted by the Soviet Union delegation under the heading of 7/30, Chapter 1, Points 1, 2, 3 and 4 which are supposed to replace sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of Chapter 1 of the Report of the Social Committee, document E/441, page 12.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that this is meant then to be an amendment to the text proposed by the Sub-Commission and that we should now vote upon it, is that correct?

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): I think that any Member of the Council has the right to submit any amendments on the Report of the Committee which is one of the organs of the Council.

I should like to add that according to the Rules of Procedure of the Council, the Soviet Union amendment, being the furthest text from the Report, should be voted upon first, and if it is rejected we can then vote upon the amendments submitted by the representatives of France, Norway and Chile.

The PRESIDENT: I must apologize to the representative of the Soviet Union. I simply asked my question to be sure that it was in the form of a proposal because in his first intervention the Soviet Union representative said he would like to submit for the consideration of the Council or something to that effect.



Mr. SMITH (Canada): I wanted to speak on a point of order connected with the order of voting on the three previous amendments. This new subject raised quite a new question, and I have nothing to say at the moment.

The PRESIDENT: I think the amendment proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union is the one that is furthest from the original proposal and should probably be voted upon first.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to direct the attention of the Council to the fact that in the English text of my amendment, the term I mentioned before as being incorrectly translated should be rectified. I should like to have the word "campaign" replaced by the word "struggle" or any such word that might be suggested as better corresponding to the Russian term. This can be done by those who are more familiar with the English language than I.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I think the representative of the Soviet Union is correct in desiring his amendment to be taken first because it is furthest away from the text. However, when we come on to these other amendments, I think the debate showed that the Lebanese amendment was produced after the French amendment and was in a sense an amendment to the French amendment. Quite apart from that consideration, the debate has shown that the Lebanese amendment is the wider amendment. None of these are really amendments; they are additions to the text. It is a wider addition to the text and it includes the French text. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that the proper course would be to take the Lebanese amendment next.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Interpretation from Spanish): I do not agree with the suggestion that the Lebanese amendment has a vast and more all-inclusive meaning than the amendment we have submitted. Our amendment has two main ideas: first, it has the idea to combat anti-democratic ideologies; and, second, it has the idea to remove the remnants of fascism and collaborationism from the media of information.

The amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand and the amendment submitted by the representative of Lebanon are more or less on the same plane with the first part of our amendment, namely, to combat anti-democratic ideologies. Nevertheless, we also include the second part: "To remove the remnants of fascism and collaborationism from the media of information."

Mr. SMITH (Canada): I wish to support the viewpoint expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom. In my view, the Lebanese amendment is clearly wider than the French-Norwegian-Chilean amendment. As a matter of fact, I had taken it to be -- as I think it was intended -- an amendment to the amendment, so that by either rule it should be voted on first. This procedure has, I think, one further advantage. The Lebanese amendment is something on which I believe we can all agree. Therefore, we will express the opinion of all the Members of the Council.

It seems to me that the Council is very much divided on the other amendments, as I gather from the discussions we have had during the last two days. For all these reasons, I respectfully suggest that we should vote first on the Soviet Union amendment, which is certainly the furthest removed from the original text, and after that on the Lebanese amendment.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Interpretation from Spanish): Speaking <sup>draft</sup> on this question of procedure, I think that if we examine carefully the/ amendments before us we will find it is a fact that the one that differs most from the original draft is the amendment submitted by the three delegations of France, Norway and Chile. Of course, I am not speaking now of the Soviet Union amendment, which comes first anyway. I am speaking of those remaining and particularly on the question of precedents between the amendment of France, Norway and Chile, and the Lebanese amendment.

I think there is no doubt of the fact that item (c), as it stands in the original draft, has the main bulk of the ideas to which the Lebanese delegation refers. The Lebanese delegation only says in a general way that one has to combat anything which threatens what this item (c) includes, whereas the amendment submitted by the three delegations of France, Norway and Chile, in a precise, and as I have mentioned before, a specific way, indicates the means and the necessity of fighting this dangerous ideology that has but recently started a world war and brought forth the calamities we all know.

The amendment says, any "remnants", and that one has to fight these. It indicates, moreover, how to fight them by removing the remnants of fascism and collaborationism. So that from its very character, I think there can be no doubt on the facts that after we have voted on the Soviet Union amendment, we have to pass to the amendment of France, Norway and Chile. Also, the text of the Lebanese amendment invites analogy with the original text.

I think that by so speaking, I interpret the true spirit of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): It seems that in the present case we are faced with an attempt on the part of certain Members of the Council to establish a special procedure of voting on this question, which is in violation with the established Rules of Procedure for similar cases, which are accepted in all the organs of the United Nations.

I believe it is clear to everyone that the proposal which is farthest from the text of the Report of the Social Committee is the Soviet Union proposal. If one were to translate this question of Rules of Procedure into the language of figures, one might say that the Soviet Union proposal is furthest from the original text inasmuch as the question which is raised by the Soviet Union delegation has nothing said on it in the Report of the Social Committee.

I believe it is evident that the Lebanese proposal is the one which is nearest to the text of the Social Committee, and it only treats one question. I believe that anyone who carefully peruses these proposals will see that the Soviet Union proposal is wider. It involves a wider consideration and deserves to be placed on the agenda of the Conference.

BF:cc

E/P.V.118  
101-105

After that, we come to the proposal of France, Norway and Chile which treats these questions in only a partial manner. We then come to the Lebanese proposal which is only concerned with one amendment and with one item.

I must say that, if any other procedure of voting than is not provided for in the rules of procedure is followed, it will be obvious to the Soviet Union delegation that a completely unprecedented system of voting is being followed in order to please certain delegations, since no other justification for such a procedure can be found.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian): I wish to express myself in favour of voting first on the proposal presented by the USSR and then on the proposal presented by France, Norway and Chile. I base my preference on the following considerations: Each of these documents is an independent resolution which tries, more or less substantially, to change the contents of a paragraph of the draft agenda. I think that we should consider each document not as a sub-amendment, but rather as an independent draft resolution.

I think that aside from all other considerations, it is necessary to take into account the order of receipt of these documents. It is known that the first in order was the Soviet Union proposal, then the French proposal. As far as the other documents are concerned, I believe you have already defined the order of voting on them, so that this question seems to me to be perfectly clear and not to require any special voting procedure.

Mr. AHMAD (India): A point of order. One fact seems to have been overlooked. The Lebanese amendment refers only to paragraph (c). The amendment of France, Norway and Chile covers paragraphs (c) and (d). Therefore, in deciding the question as to priority between the amendments, we have to remember that in so far as paragraph (c) is concerned, we have to decide whether the Lebanese, the three combined, or the New Zealand amendment is farthest from the original text.

The original text reads: "...to help promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language and religion."

The amendment of France, Norway and Chile to paragraph (c) is as follows: "...to combat fascist ideology by removing the remnants of

fascism and collaborationism from the media of information."

The New Zealand amendment to that is: "...to forswear anti-democratic ideologies."

The Lebanese amendment to that is: "...to combat any ideologies whose nature could endanger these rights and freedoms."

Therefore, in so far as paragraph (c) is concerned, and irrespective of paragraph (d) -- because the Lebanese amendment does not refer to paragraph (d) -- we see that the Lebanese amendment is the widest: it does not single out any single ideology at all; it does not mention remnants of fascism at all; it says, "...to combat any ideologies whose nature could endanger these rights and freedoms."

I therefore submit that we have to take amendment paragraph by paragraph, because these three amendments are not all in reference to the same paragraph.

In so far as paragraph (c) is concerned, we should weigh which one of these three amendments is the farthest from the original text. If we weigh that, we will find that the Lebanese amendment to paragraph (c) is the farthest removed.

I have another point of order in reference to the Soviet Union amendment. The Soviet Union amendment has not been circulated to this Council. I presume that the representative of the Soviet Union refers to document E/AC.7/38; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT: No, I think it is document E/AC.7/30.

Mr. AHMAD (India): May I have your clarification as to whether it is document E/AC.7/38 or document E/AC.7/30?

The PRESIDENT: It is not document E/AC.7/38; it is document E/AC.7/30.



JK/jk

E/P.V. 118  
108-110

Mr. AHMAD (India): The Soviet Union proposal, therefore, is that paragraph (a) should be taken as the new amendment. Of course, this does not refer to any document at all. Document E/AC.7/30 was presented in the Social Committee while document E/441 was being discussed.

The document under discussion is not E/441, but E/547. It is a new document. Does the Soviet Union representative formally move that this paragraph (a) be taken as an amendment to paragraph 2 of Chapter I on page 5 of E/547. If that is his intention, then I have no hesitation in declaring that this amendment has the widest possible scope. But, in so far as the other three amendments are concerned, I submit we should examine them in reference to paragraph (c) alone and, in so far as that paragraph is concerned, I hope it is found that the amendment proposed by the Lebanese representative is furthest from the original text.

The PRESIDENT: I think the only thing we have to do now is to vote on these questions. I might perhaps be permitted to explain why the Chair ruled, as it did, that we should first vote on the amendment presented by the representative of the Soviet Union, then on the French, Norwegian, and Chilean amendments, then on the New Zealand amendment, and, finally, on the Lebanese amendment. This is because it is not so much a question of which amendment is the widest, <sup>but</sup> it is a question of which one is the furthest removed and which changes most radically the text before us.

It has been stated by the representative of the United Kingdom that the amendments proposed by the representatives of France, Norway, and Chile changes the text relatively little. Let me also say that the whole intention of this rule of procedure, which states that one should first vote on the amendment furthest removed, which will be found in parliamentary procedure everywhere, is to make it possible for every member of a parliamentary assembly to express, in voting, his opinion as clearly and as exactly as he wishes to do.

That is the whole intention of the rule. I submit that if we follow the procedure proposed and vote first on the amendment submitted by the representative of the Lebanon, many delegations will be prevented from expressing their opinions as exactly as they would want to. If we follow the other procedure --that also is quite clear from the debate-- you will allow them to express their opinions exactly as they want to in order to show their preferences among the different amendments.

That is the basis for my ruling. I think it is in accordance with general parliamentary procedure. However, as the question has been discussed and debated, I think we should take a vote. Before we do so, I shall say, in my function as Acting President at this session, that the Economic and Social Council should be very careful not to get into the bad habit of making decisions on questions of substance by voting on questions of procedure.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): After all your efforts at summing up, I want to ask a question.

You want everybody to be able to vote and express an opinion on each of these amendments. My difficulty is that if you take the French amendment first, presumably that means that is adopted. Then, the Lebanese amendment would not even be voted upon. The result of that would be that I, who has been saying throughout that I want to combat any ideology, am unable to express an opinion on that matter. That seems to me absolutely fundamental and is the widest thing before the Council at the moment. I think it would be an unfortunate thing if, from the point of view of procedure, the Council was prevented from voting on that.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): The representative of the United Kingdom has made substantially the remarks I made except for one difference.

I want to begin by saying now that except for that question of ruling that the President made, I do feel that while I do not want to delay by explaining what I did say before, I do think I said in my remarks that we would prefer the Lebanese amendment. If that did not prevail, we would have . . . great difficulty in accepting the three delegations' amendments.

Now, I am not quite clear where that leaves me. I remember the President at the last session of the Council advised the representatives to find their own way out of the dilemma, but it leaves me in the predicament that I have to vote against the three delegations' amendments in order to get a chance to vote for the amendment I prefer. If the vote was reversed, I should have voted for that one, and if that was lost, I would have to vote for the other.

Mr. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): The representative of the United Kingdom has explained the difficulties he would be in if we followed the ruling which the President has made, and if we first voted upon our amendment. He would accordingly not be in a position to vote for the amendment which he preferred. I should like to say that we would be in the same position as he is, if the Lebanese amendment were to be voted on first. I should like to say to the Council that in the case of the Lebanese amendment being voted on first, the French delegation would be very hostile to any manner of procedure which would avoid taking a vote. Accordingly, if the Lebanese amendment were to be

AD

E/P.V. 118  
122-125

voted on first, our delegation would be in a position of proposing an amendment to the Lebanese amendment in order to combat all fascist ideologies.

Mr. AHMAD (India): I have already made my position clear, and I submit to the President's ruling which no doubt was given after the consideration of what I had submitted. I really want to make sure that the amendment will be voted on paragraph by paragraph, because as I have said, all the three amendments are not identical.

The PRESIDENT: It has been requested by the representative of India that we should vote separately on the different paragraphs, and we shall do so.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon)(Interpretation from French):

It is difficult to satisfy everyone.

However, if we go back to the basic sense of the amendment, I think we shall arrive at the following conclusion: If someone had to vote on an amendment which was to include parts (a), (b), (c) and (d), and if he were to refuse to vote on this because he wished only to vote on (b), he could, after the voting had taken place on (a), (b), (c) and (d), vote on (b) separately. But if he voted only on (b) or (c) or (d), he would not have the possibility of voting on all of them together. Accordingly, I think that the Lebanese amendment includes the French amendment, at least in part (c), which includes all ideologies. If fascism is an ideology which threatens the rights of man, then fascism is included.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): I wonder whether this difficulty could not be resolved by being explicit and adding one or two words to the Lebanese amendment, so that it would read as follows: "to combat fascism and any other ideology whose nature could endanger these rights and freedoms." If that is not acceptable to the Lebanese representative, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon)(Interpretation from French): That amendment is not acceptable to the Lebanese delegation because it is dangerous, as the Lebanese delegation has already explained, to use the term "fascism" here.

Mr. BORIS (France)(Interpretation from French): If I correctly understood what the representative of Lebanon just said, his amendment is much narrower than mine because it does not comprise fascism.

We might perhaps come to a logical conclusion by adding our own amendment to the Lebanese amendment, which would then read:

"To combat any ideologies whose nature would endanger those rights and freedoms, and especially the fascist ideology, by removing the remnants of fascism and collaborationism from the media of information."

In that case, we should be taking into account everything that has been said here.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): I propose the closure of this discussion, and that the Council proceed to a vote.

The PRESIDENT: The United States representative has proposed the closure, and according to our Rules of Procedure that motion takes precedence. Does anyone wish to speak upon it?

Mr. AHMAD (India): I support the motion.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection, I consider the motion accepted. The debate is closed.

Perhaps I should not say anything myself, but as President I have to take the sense of the meeting; I think this debate has shown that there is a good chance that those who wish to vote in favour of the Lebanese amendment will be able to do so.

The Council will vote on the first amendment, proposed by the Soviet Union delegation, which is to the effect that the four points listed on page 4 of document E/A.C.7/30 should replace the four points (a), (b), (c) and (d) of point 2 of Chapter I of the provisional agenda.

Furthermore, I call the attention of the Members of the Council to the fact that there are two small changes to be made in the proposed text. In point 1 it should read "organization of a struggle" instead of the word "campaign". Point 2 reads "The unmasking of war-mongers and the organization of an effective campaign." That, too, should read "struggle".

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Second interpretation: original in Russian): I wish to remind you, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, that I propose points 1, 2 and 4 of the Soviet Union amendment to replace points (b) and (c) in the draft agenda, the Report of the Social Commission, Chapter I, paragraph 2 of page 5.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say that points 1, 2 and 4 on page 4 of document E/A.C.7/30 are intended to replace (b) and (c) of the original Report, not (a), (b), (c), and (d) but only (b) and (c), so that only (a) and (d) will remain.

If that is clear to the Members of the Council we will proceed to vote on the amendment submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 3 with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to the amendment proposed by the representatives of France, Norway, and Chile. The representative of India has requested that we should have a separate vote on the different paragraphs. Accordingly, we will first take up paragraph (c). It is proposed that the following words should be inserted after "relief": "To combat anti-democratic ideologies and remove the remnants of fascism and collaborationism from the media of information."

The amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.



MB/gr

E/P.V.118  
137-140

The PRESIDENT: We now have take up the amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation, also referring to paragraph (c). You will find the New Zealand proposal in document E/557.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): I am sorry to interrupt, Mr. President, but two versions of the New Zealand proposal have been circulated. One is E/557, which I accept. The other is a typed version which was circulated to the delegations. I am not concerned with the English translation, but I am concerned with the French translation. I have had some discussion with the translators and would suggest that the French translation in this typed copy should not be reporded, but the words should be used as were given in the provisional record yesterday, E/P.V.117, pages 42 to 45. A similar remark applies to the amendment to paragraph (d).

The PRESIDENT: The French translation is presenting some difficulties. The last version is the following: "Renier toute idee anti democratique."

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): I did not quite catch the exact words you gave, Mr. President, but I do not think they are the ones that are in the provisional records. The translators have the provisional records.

The PRESIDENT: It has been proposed that it should read: "Renoncer à toute idee anti democratique." But we cannot enter into any discussion on that. We will have to leave the translation to the Secretariat.

Mr. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): I really cannot vote on a text when I cannot understand its exact meaning. I must make every possible preparation on a vote. However, one does not seem to be able to have a French rendering, when French is one of the working languages.

The PRESIDENT: We have been working on this matter the whole afternoon, and the difficulty is to find a correct translation of the English word "forswear".

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): May I suggest that as I have accepted as a correct translation the wording given in the verbatim record of yesterday that should be used as the correct interpretation of my amendment.

Mr. BORIS (France): I am very much in favor of the New Zealand amendment. However, I absolutely must not accept it in the French version which is now presented to me. You can not renounce something which you have not had. If you renounce something, it means you professed those opinions. I simply cannot admit that anybody in my country ever professed those notions.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian): I also think that such a formula makes us guilty for the sins of someone else and I am afraid that this does not translate well into Russian either.

The PRESIDENT: That is certainly the difficulty. However, I suppose all the Members of the Council understand English well enough to know what is meant by "forswear". I suggest we vote on the English text and leave it to the staff of the Secretariat to translate the word into French in one or one hundred words, if it is found necessary.

The PRESIDENT: As that is accepted, we shall vote on the English text. The amendment of the New Zealand delegation as far as paragraph (c) is concerned is "...to help promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion," and then should be added the words "to forswear anti-democratic ideologies."

The amendment was rejected by seven votes to two, with nine abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Lebanon which is to the effect that in paragraph (c) we shall add the words "...to combat any ideologies whose nature could endanger these rights and freedoms."

The amendment was adopted by fourteen votes to none, with four abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall vote on paragraph (d). The first amendment is the one proposed by the delegations of France, Norway and Chile. The amendment adds the following words: "...to combat forces which invite war by removing bellicose influences from media of information."

The amendment was adopted by ten votes to five, with three abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the whole of the provisional agenda which has been proposed by the Social Committee.

The agenda was adopted by fifteen votes to two, with one abstention.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR)(Second interpretation; original in Russian): I should like to have it recorded in the verbatim report that the delegation of Byelorussia has voted against the draft agenda of the Conference for the motives which have already been expressed; namely, that one of the most substantial points covered by the Soviet Union and French amendments was not taken up by the Council.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR)(Second interpretation; original in Russian): I should like to remind the Members of the motives which caused the Soviet Union delegation to vote against the draft agenda proposed by the Social Committee. I formulated these reasons at the beginning of the discussion, and I should like merely to add that the Soviet Union delegation reserves its right to bring up the question again at a later stage of the discussion.

Mr. Papanek resumed the Presidency.

The PRESIDENT: Before we close the meeting, we will vote on the Report as a whole and the various draft resolutions as amended by the Council.

The Report and the draft resolutions, as amended, were adopted by sixteen votes to none, with two abstentions.

The Report and the resolutions were adopted by sixteen to none, with two abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank the representative of Norway most sincerely for having presided during this difficult meeting. I am glad that he finished the hard work.

Tomorrow at 10 o'clock, there will be a meeting of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations; at 10:30 a.m. the Plenary Meeting of the Council. If necessary, the Committee on Rules of Procedure will meet tomorrow morning if they do not finish their work tonight.

The agenda for tomorrow will consist of items 2, 3, 4 and 5 of today's agenda that we did not finish. Then, the agreements we have concluded with the specialized agencies will be taken up, with the International Telecommunications Union, the International Bank and the International Fund. In addition, we will have the items that will be agreed upon by the Committee on Rules of Procedure -- the calendar for the meetings in 1948 and all the other proposals that will come from the Committee on Rules of Procedure.

Those are the items we have and we shall finish them tomorrow. If we do not do so in the morning, we will continue in the afternoon and, if necessary, in the evening; but we shall adjourn this session tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 7:35 p.m.