

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



Tuesday, 16 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting.....	357
Freedom of information: report of the Third Committee (A/2294).....	357
Human rights. Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples: report of the Third Committee (A/2309 and Corr. 1)	367

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).**Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting**

Pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss items 29, 30, 60, 21 and 23 of the agenda of the General Assembly.

On the proposal of Mr. Al-Jamali (Iraq), it was decided by 16 votes to 9, with 20 abstentions, to discuss agenda item 67.

Freedom of information: report of the Third Committee (A/2294)

[Agenda item 29]

Mrs. Harman (Israel), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2294).

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will note from the report which has just been submitted that there are seven draft resolutions on which a decision must be taken.

2. Before proceeding to the vote on these seven draft resolutions and the amendments to them, certain delegations wish to explain their vote, and, for that purpose, I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

3. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation considers it necessary to state its position on all the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly on the question of freedom of information.

4. On the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the USSR delegation has already pointed out that it is the duty of the Organization to prepare measures and recommendations designed to promote the dissemination of truthful information, free from any pressure or dictation by private editorial monopolies, trusts and syndicates, and to strengthen peace and security and the development of international

co-operation and friendly relations among States. The USSR delegation has also stressed the necessity of preparing measures and recommendations with a view to preventing the utilization of information media for incitement to war and for spreading fascist or Nazi propaganda in favour of racial and national exclusiveness, hatred, contempt and hostility among nations. At the same time, as the USSR delegation has pointed out, the United Nations Charter imposes on all Members of the Organization the task of contributing to the solution of economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and of strengthening and developing trade and economic relations among nations on the basis of equality and of respect by States for the independence and sovereignty of other States.

5. The delegation of the Soviet Union, like many other delegations, has adduced concrete instances showing that the Press and other information media in the United States, the United Kingdom and France were being used for propaganda for a new war, for the dissemination of false and slanderous information and for incitement to hatred among nations.

6. In the light of these facts, the USSR delegation considers that all the recommendations on the question of freedom of information which have been prepared in organs of the United Nations, especially at this session of the General Assembly, should in the first place correspond to the aforementioned objectives, which arise from the Charter of the United Nations.

7. The delegation of the Soviet Union has taken concrete steps to promote the solution of those highly important problems; it has submitted to the General Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.125] providing, in the first place, for the adoption of the necessary measures, including legislative measures, to ensure the implementation of the General Assembly resolution of 3 November 1947 [resolution 110 (II)] on the measures to be taken against propaganda and incitement to a new war. The USSR proposals are inspired by the

desire to prevent the utilization of information media as an instrument for incitement to war, for fascist propaganda, for incitement to national hostility and hatred and for the dissemination of false and slanderous information. These proposals are based on the idea that the Press, radio, cinema and all other means of information and artistic expression must serve the cause of peace and the interests of the nations and of the greater part of the population of the world. If the General Assembly were to take that course, it would help to give effect to the most important principles of the United Nations Charter. The Third Committee, however, chose a different course. It declined to settle the principal problems of freedom of information and prepared inconsequent draft resolutions which ignored the most important problems of freedom of information.

8. An example of such a draft resolution is the one [A/2294, draft resolution A] confirming the Draft Convention on the International Right of Correction and opening it for signature. The Draft Convention on the International Right of Correction describes in detail the methods whereby corrections on a given communication are to be given to the press. It even contains the most petty technical details of the proposed procedure for correction, and even goes so far as to determine the length of the corrections. It completely disregards, however, the question of how to combat effectively the flood of false and slanderous information against other countries which, as has been shown by pertinent examples, are being disseminated wholesale by the Press of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other countries of the North Atlantic bloc. Thus the draft convention cannot contribute to the achievement of one of the fundamental tasks of the United Nations with regard to freedom of information, namely, to help to prevent propaganda for a new war and to put a stop to the dissemination of false and slanderous information.

9. In view of these considerations, the USSR delegation will vote against the proposal for approving this draft convention and opening it for signature.

10. Since the basic tasks of the United Nations with regard to freedom of information still remain unsolved, the USSR delegation cannot agree with the absolutely unfounded praise given to the work of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press in draft resolution C. It may well be asked why, if the sub-commission indeed performed constructive work, a decision was taken to abolish it.

11. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers the work of the sub-commission to be unsatisfactory and will vote against draft resolution C.

12. As regards future work of the United Nations with regard to freedom of information, the USSR delegation considers it to be incorrect to base all such work on the report of a rapporteur especially appointed for that purpose by the Economic and Social Council, as is proposed in draft resolution B. In view of the variety and complexity of the problems of freedom of information, which affect the interests of literally all countries, there can be no grounds for believing that the efforts of a single person will suffice and can replace collective discussion and the preparation of practical measures. Moreover, there is the danger that the rapporteur might willingly or unwillingly become the tool

of those who have hitherto prevented the solution of basic tasks of the United Nations with regard to freedom of information.

13. In view of these considerations, the USSR delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolution B, unless the Assembly adopts the amendments [A/L.126] submitted by the Polish delegation, which eliminate the fundamental defect of the draft resolution.

14. The delegation of the Soviet Union will vote against draft resolution F on convening an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to prepare a code of ethics for journalists. This whole question has nothing to do with the United Nations, since it is a matter for the professional Press organizations, which are competent to deal with this matter.

15. The Assembly also has before it draft resolution D, on information facilities in under-developed regions of the world, and draft resolution E, on false and distorted information. Both these drafts are unsatisfactory, since they divert the United Nations from the solution of the principal problems relating to freedom of information, while trying to create the impression that constructive work has been accomplished. Such draft resolutions cannot serve any useful purpose and the USSR delegation will abstain from voting on them.

16. Mr. BOURGES MAUNOURY (France) (*translated from French*): The draft resolutions approved by the Third Committee represent real progress in United Nations activity in the matter of freedom of information. Among the measures recommended, my delegation, I feel bound to say, attaches particular importance to the Convention on the International Right of Correction now open for signature, and to technical assistance to under-developed countries for strengthening their Press and information services.

17. The text of the draft convention proposed by the French delegation in Geneva in 1948 [E/Conf. 6/42] and adopted by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information by a large majority was revised and adopted in 1949 by the General Assembly [resolution 277 (III)], but its opening for signature was deferred in the hope that it might be supplemented by the adoption of other instruments on related subjects. This draft convention represents the first practical instrument available to States wishing to use it to promote the publication and exchange of accurate and reliable information concerning their position with respect to each other and so to increase mutual understanding and trust among their peoples. Without placing any constraint upon the Press and information organs of those countries, and with a minimum of administrative machinery required, this convention will, we are convinced, prove an effective safeguard against some of the more regrettable abuses of international reporting.

18. As for the draft resolution concerning technical assistance, it is a further contribution to the great structure of international technical co-operation, the corner-stone of which was laid four years ago by the President of the United States. We have always regarded the development of a competent Press, with adequate facilities, in the countries which are in the process of development as an essential part of their economic and social advancement.

19. My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions approved by the Third Committee.
20. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America): With reference to the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Third Committee on freedom of information, the United States delegation is prepared to vote for them, with one exception. With reference to draft resolution A, the United States delegation opposed the opening for signature of the Convention on the International Right of Correction when the matter came before the Third Committee, and its reasons for so doing were set forth fully at that time. I should like, therefore, merely to explain briefly why my delegation is unable to vote for the draft resolution now before us.
21. We find in this draft convention an unlimited right to initiate a correction and no means of determining whether the offending article or the correction itself is an accurate presentation of the facts. Nor is there any assurance that any publication will pay any attention to the correction. If the publication is a reputable one, it will print the correction without the necessity for a treaty. If it is an irresponsible one, then there is no way under this draft convention to force the printing of a correction. A far greater and more effective safeguard against inaccurate reporting is to increase the supply of news and the sources of news, so that editors and readers may judge for themselves, by comparing reports, what is to be believed.
22. In the second place, it is our belief that the convention is likely to be a source of disagreement and friction among nations. It obliges the nation receiving a correction to make it available to its Press, even though it disputes the facts alleged in the correction. A government is thereby placed in the position either of disseminating information which it believes to be in error or of openly disregarding the treaty, and, if it chooses the latter course, it opens the way for a serious controversy with another government.
23. In short, the convention now before the General Assembly offers little prospect of achieving its objectives; it could make these objectives more difficult of attainment.
24. In the course of our deliberations in the Third Committee, we have produced a number of proposals which tend towards a constructive line of action in the field of freedom of information. We are looking forward to a comprehensive report by the rapporteur elected by the Economic and Social Council. We are anticipating a study by the Council and UNESCO which will speed the development of independent domestic news media in under-developed countries. We have a convention on hand to protect the rights of foreign correspondents to gather and transmit news, which should permit a more expansive flow of news everywhere. All these are the positive ways to meet our problems. They make the Convention on the International Right of Correction an unnecessary and probably a hazardous step.
25. With respect to the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union delegation (A/L.125), the United States delegation will vote against it. This draft resolution was thoroughly considered by the Third Committee and a number of amendments, several of which were adopted, were submitted. The Soviet Union draft resolution, as amended, was then voted upon by the committee and it was rejected by a roll-call vote of 19 in favour, 21 against, with 12 abstentions. The decision of the Third Committee in rejecting the USSR draft was a wise one. The sole purpose of that draft was to furnish the basis for a propaganda attack by the Soviet Union and other delegations against the United States, the United Kingdom and France. As I made clear in the debates in committee, these charges that the United States, the United Kingdom and France are engaged in hate campaigns and in propaganda for war come with ill grace from governments which have turned the Press, radio and motion pictures of their countries into one gigantic vehicle for fomenting hatred and fear of the rest of the world and which make every possible effort to shut off their peoples from knowledge of the outside world.
26. In conclusion, the General Assembly has before it a number of important and useful draft resolutions on freedom of information, resolutions which, as I have previously noted, will really contribute to strengthening news media and to increasing the flow of news. It would seem to be completely unnecessary, therefore, for the General Assembly to adopt the USSR draft resolution, which is submitted merely for propaganda purposes and which serves no useful purpose.
27. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): The position of my delegation on the several draft resolutions included in the report of the Third Committee was made clear in the course of the debate in committee. I wish to give here a brief explanation of the negative vote which my delegation will cast on the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union (A/L.125).
28. This draft resolution is so drafted as to give the impression that it is intended against propaganda for war, aggression, hate towards other nations and slander. Its terms are calculated to appeal to the desire for peaceful co-operation among nations, a desire so deeply rooted in the conscience of all peoples and frequently echoed by many delegations in this Assembly. They are calculated to induce other delegations to support a motion which, in fact, is far from being inspired by such lofty principles and motives.
29. I do not intend to enter into a detailed analysis of the draft resolution, because I think it is more appropriate in this place and on this occasion to explain our attitude in more general terms. This draft resolution is not the first proposal which has been submitted by the Soviet Union in the same or similar terms. The repetition of similar proposals, however, has not prevented the USSR Government from continuing to use the whole propaganda machine at its disposal for unprecedentedly hostile and aggressive actions against my country and, indeed, against other nations as well. The Government of the Soviet Union has apparently found the repetition of similar proposals in the United Nations compatible with the well-known conduct of its agencies towards other nations.
30. The merit and value of a piece of legislation, and similarly of a resolution of the General Assembly, does not lie in the words put on paper but in the effect they are supposed to cause by their application. A proposal like this draft resolution cannot be dissociated from the attitude and actions of the mover of the proposal.

He is supposed himself to espouse and to give effect, through his conduct, to the provisions of the draft resolution proposed for general adoption. If the conduct and activities of the Soviet Union Government and its subordinate agencies are viewed in relation with the proposed draft resolution, only two alternative conclusions offer themselves: either its terms must be deemed incompatible with the conduct and activities of the Soviet Union Government, or the Soviet Union Government does not feel itself bound by the provisions recommended for adoption to other governments.

31. It is obvious that in neither of the two possible cases could any useful effect of the resolution be expected, and the resolution necessarily loses any practical meaning whatever. Moreover, its adoption, without causing improvement in international relations, is likely to befog the real issue and promote the impression that the Soviet Union Government is the champion of friendly relations among nations.

32. We cannot prevent the USSR from considering the United Nations as a privileged propaganda platform to be used for patent misrepresentation, distortions, invective and demagoguery in speeches, instead of accepting it as an international forum where constructive solutions to international problems have to be sought. But we cannot and do not intend to go as far as to vote for propaganda resolutions which defeat the main purpose of the United Nations. In the field covered by the Soviet Union proposal, there is, however, much to be done. But what is necessary is not lip service but deeds and, in this respect, the Soviet Union Government could immensely contribute to the fulfilment of the alleged aims of the proposed draft resolution.

33. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation associated itself, in the Third Committee, with the delegations of France, Egypt, Lebanon and Yugoslavia in sponsoring the draft resolution on the Draft Convention on the International Right of Correction. In so doing we were motivated by the conviction that the draft resolution, if adopted, would be a practical means of upholding freedom of information.

34. As the small nations have repeatedly emphasized, one evil which destroys confidence in freedom of information is the inequality existing between those nations and the more highly developed countries with respect to the dissemination of information. In the face of that evil, the proper exercise of the international right of correction may prove very useful in the common effort to equalize opportunities and provide the small nations with the means of making themselves heard by the great Powers and known throughout the world as they really are.

35. Moreover, the stagnation in this Organization of the three draft conventions that have been proposed since the Conference held at Geneva in 1948, and whose fate is inseparably linked in General Assembly resolution 277 (III), cannot be justified in the case of the draft on the right of correction. The latter has all the necessary qualifications for going forward; and if we consider it generally useful and desirable, we are not justified in holding up its entry into force in the more or less illusory hope of reaching agreement on the other two. My delegation, as we stated in the

Third Committee, prefers this step to none at all, but we shall vigorously pursue our objective of achieving concrete action with respect to the draft conventions on freedom of information and the transmission of news. We are, moreover, convinced that once the right of correction is given effect and is instrumental in establishing the confidence and balance which are now lacking, we shall have prepared the way for the approval and implementation of the other draft conventions.

36. As to the objections raised, my delegation does not share the fear that the convention authorizes undue interference by governments in matters of information. The procedure provided for in the draft convention and the fact that it does not make publication of corrections mandatory are sufficient safeguards against any tampering with what we in Uruguay regard as the inviolable independence of the journalistic profession. The draft convention has on the other hand also been criticized because it does not make publication of corrections mandatory. This objection, too, appears to us unjustified. We do not believe that the convention will be less effective because it does not require such publication. In general, we have great respect for those professionally concerned with information, and we are convinced that a properly substantiated correction will always carry great moral weight, even though its publication in the organ to which it is addressed cannot be made compulsory. The existence of this right will increase the responsibility of journalists, and, through the correction of errors, it will be possible to avoid the repetition and dissemination of the incorrect information.

37. For these reasons my delegation supports the draft resolution and in so doing, we expect, as we said in committee, that the contracting parties will make use of this right as the Charter requires in respect of all obligations undertaken by Members, that is, in good faith.

38. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): I should like simply to explain the meaning and scope of the amendments proposed jointly by the Yugoslav and Lebanese delegations.

39. It will be noted that the text of draft resolution A, which urges Members of the United Nations and other States which participated in the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information to sign the Convention on the International Right of Correction, does not take into account, in using the word "sign", the consequences which the convention attributes to the act of becoming a party to the convention. The text itself lays down, as do all other conventions, that the mere signature of a legal document does not make it binding, or cause it to enter into force; in addition to signature, another legal operation known as ratification is necessary. It would seem impossible, therefore, that the General Assembly should simply wish to ask States to sign the convention without ratifying it. Thus the use of this term "sign" runs counter to the Assembly's intention.

40. Moreover, the text of the convention itself provides for other methods of becoming a party to the convention. Articles VII and VIII deal with accession to the convention without prior signature. Thus for that

reason also the use of the phrase "sign the convention" is not appropriate.

41. There is a third reason why this word "sign", or the expression "signatory States" is not in accordance with the intention underlying the convention. The reason is this: article IX, containing what is called the "colonial clause", in other words, the clause stipulating the automatic application of the provisions of the convention to all the territories controlled by a metropolitan State, speaks of a "signatory metropolitan State". If we agree that signature alone does not make the convention binding, if we agree that there are methods other than signature and ratification, that is to say, that States can also become parties to the convention by accession, it seems contradictory to speak simply of the signatory metropolitan State, because those who may have acceded to the convention but not signed it might in that case regard themselves as not bound by these stipulations.

42. It is for these reasons, which do not concern the substance of the convention or the intentions behind it, that the Yugoslav and Lebanese delegations have joined in submitting the two following amendments [A/L.131] to draft resolution A submitted by the Third Committee. In paragraph 1 of the operative part, replace the words "to sign" by the words "to become parties to". This would cover signature, ratification and the other method of becoming a party, namely, accession. In the same paragraph 1 of the operative part, the words "signatory metropolitan State" should be replaced by the words "contracting metropolitan State". The same amendment should be made in article IX of the draft convention annexed to the draft resolution.

43. These are purely formal changes, intended solely to bring the text into conformity with the intentions of the Assembly.

44. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): The attitude of the Polish delegation towards the draft resolutions on freedom of information submitted to the General Assembly today is prompted by the following considerations.

45. During the Third Committee's discussion of the work of the United Nations in connexion with information and the Press, the Polish delegation emphasized the need to put into effect General Assembly resolution 110 (II) of 3 November 1947, which condemned all propaganda, wherever conducted and in whatever form. There have been many examples, quoted by the Polish and other delegations, illustrating the appalling use being made by the forces of aggression of such media of information as the Press, radio, cinema and television. These forces are trying to sow hatred among nations by lies, slander and insinuation. They seek to accustom nations to the idea that war is inevitable. They are trying to poison men's minds by resuscitating Hitler's theories of the supremacy of one people over another. In the United States, these activities are co-ordinated and financed in high places, with the assistance of the State Department, the War Department and the Central Intelligence Agency, as has been officially admitted by representatives of the State Department. Mr. Compton, for one, the head of the International Information Administration of the State Department, admitted as much in statements made on 21 May and 10 November 1952. Thus in the United

States—and in other countries in the Atlantic bloc—not only has no step been taken to give effect to the resolution of 3 November 1947, but, on the contrary, systematic action has been undertaken to poison men's minds with war propaganda. Attempts have also been made to influence other peoples in the same direction, in particular with the aid of slanderous radio campaigns.

46. The United Nations cannot close its eyes to this state of affairs. In accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the peaceful purposes of the Organization, the General Assembly must call upon all States to combat war propaganda, which is a threat to peace.

47. We must not be content, however, with a mere platonic appeal for the cessation of war propaganda. The Assembly must also, at the same time, indicate specific means of achieving this end. We know that the incitement to war that is being conducted in the Press, over the air and through other media of information, is dictated by the monopolies which are making enormous profits out of armaments. The Press and radio must therefore be made independent of dictation by monopolies, so that information organs can disseminate truthful and objective information aimed at strengthening international peace, the reinforcing of friendly relations and international co-operation and increasing respect among States for each other's independence and sovereignty.

48. The draft resolution proposed by the Soviet Union delegation [A/L.125] provides such an opportunity. Its adoption would lead to the application of the principles enunciated in General Assembly resolution 110 (II) of 1947. However much the Tito representative may try in vain to impugn the intentions of the USSR as set forth in this draft resolution, that text calls upon States to take all necessary steps, including legislative action, to suppress any abuse of the Press and of media of information for purposes contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. The effectiveness and appropriateness of such legislative steps can be illustrated by examples from many countries. Such laws exist in Poland, in the USSR, in the People's Republic of China, in the German Democratic Republic and in other peoples' democracies. Thanks to those laws, abuses in the dissemination of information likely to constitute a threat to peace become impossible. In these countries, abuses of this kind are prohibited and punished as crimes against the fatherland.

49. The Polish delegation notes at the same time that none of the draft resolutions adopted by the Third Committee contains recommendations for counteracting war propaganda. They confine themselves to making general statements and discoursing on the subject of so-called freedom of information, which, however, is violated daily in the countries of the aggressive Atlantic bloc in the case of progressive newspapers defending the cause of peace. In this connexion, it is significant that at the very time when the Third Committee was discussing the question of freedom of information, the French authorities were ordering the closing down of the offices of the Polish emigrant newspaper in France, *Gazeta Polska*, a newspaper which was started during the Hitler occupation, under which it defended the cause of liberation from Hitler's yoke. Many of the

Poles who used to deliver this newspaper during the occupation paid for their support of it with their lives. Today, the French authorities suppress this paper, guilty of having defended peace. This is the way in which the governments of the Atlantic aggressive bloc understand freedom of information. Such freedom is for war-mongers, while journalists and newspapers defending peace are persecuted.

50. The Polish delegation considers it the duty of the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly to promote action by the United Nations in the field of information and the Press, and not to concern themselves with an artificial body of rapporteurs. This is the aim of the amendments proposed by the Polish delegation [A/L.126].

51. The Polish delegation represents a people who ardently desire peace and who play an active part in all international efforts designed to maintain peace. It was at Wroclaw, in Poland, that the International Congress of Intellectuals was held in 1948, which was the starting point for the powerful world movement in defence of peace. In 1950, in Warsaw, the capital, we welcomed the World Peace Congress which, prohibited by the British authorities, could not be held in the United Kingdom.

52. At the present session of the General Assembly, the Polish delegation requested [A/2229] the inclusion in the agenda of an item relating to measures to improve the international situation and to avert the threat of a new war. The Polish delegation considers that the fight against war propaganda and the increased dissemination of the idea of peaceful international co-operation are ways in which the United Nations can make a substantial contribution to the cause of peace.

53. This is why the Polish delegation warmly supports the USSR draft resolution and calls upon all other delegations which have at heart the cause of peaceful and friendly co-operation among nations to vote in favour of this text. Media of information must not, as in the imperialist countries, be an instrument for arousing hatred in international relations; they must be an instrument for the dissemination of the idea of peace and must help to raise the moral level of society.

54. Mr. MANI (India): I should like to explain briefly the vote of my delegation on the draft resolutions contained in the report now before the General Assembly.

55. We shall be in a position to vote in favour of all the draft resolutions except that which concerns the Convention on the International Right of Correction.

56. In past discussions of this subject, my delegation has upheld the principle of the right of correction on the international level, but we have held also that these conventions should not be signed piecemeal and that the work on the draft convention on freedom of information should be completed, both conventions being simultaneously thrown open for signature. Since the draft convention on freedom of information is still in the discussion stage, we have thought it premature to have the convention on the right of correction thrown

open for signature now. We are therefore voting against the adoption of the convention at this stage.

57. I should like to say a few words with regard to the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/L.125). My delegation fully supports the General Assembly resolution [110 (II)] of 3 November 1947 concerning measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war. We should have liked the draft resolution to be non-controversially worded but, unfortunately, certain of its paragraphs introduce an element of controversy. In particular, I draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the USSR draft resolution, which speaks of "preventing the use of the Press, radio, cinema and all other media of information". The concept contained in this paragraph, we feel, may lead to limitations and legislative restrictions being placed on freedom of information. We have always believed that the best way of ensuring freedom of information is to make more information available and, as this paragraph is likely to be interpreted in such a way as to condone legislative restrictions on freedom of information, we are unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution but shall abstain.

58. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): My delegation will support all the draft resolutions on the subject of freedom of information contained in the report, with the exception of draft resolution A which deals with the Convention on the International Right of Correction. We are abstaining on this draft resolution because we believe that it is premature and that it should have awaited the time when the code of ethics was in operation, and when the General Assembly or the Third Committee had had an opportunity to discuss the draft convention on freedom of information which there has been no time to discuss during the present session.

59. Although we are abstaining in connexion with this draft resolution, we shall nevertheless support the amendments [A/L.131] submitted by the delegations of Yugoslavia and Lebanon because we feel that they improve the text.

60. With regard to the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/L.125), we should have liked to support certain of its paragraphs but are quite unable to adhere to other passages because of the accusatory manner in which they are presented.

61. We would therefore request the President to conduct the voting on this proposal as follows. We should like a vote to be taken first on the preamble of the draft resolution, down to and including the words "war propaganda has increased" in the second paragraph. We should like the remainder of the second paragraph of the preamble to be voted upon separately. In the case of the third paragraph of the preamble, we should like a separate vote to be taken on the words "nazi, fascist and any other". We have made our position on the introduction of the concepts of nazism and fascism in resolutions of this kind very clear, because many of us believed that there were certain perverted democracies which were disseminating propaganda which was as deleterious and nefarious as that which had been propagated by the nazis, the fascists and the exponents of other "isms".

62. May I also request the President to take the vote on this resolution in the following manner. We ask for

the deletion, in the paragraph which begins "Recommends", of the words "all" and "including legislative steps". The reason why we ask the deletion of the phrase "including legislative steps" is obvious. We cannot bind our governments beforehand by imposing on them such a phraseology. I ask for the deletion of sub-paragraph 2 of the operative part.

63. If, when the vote on this draft resolution is taken, my request is also taken into consideration, we may be able to vote for it. Otherwise, we shall abstain on that draft resolution.

64. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers it necessary to explain its vote on the question of freedom of information.

65. Taking its stand on the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, the Byelorussian delegation considers that the task of the United Nations with regard to freedom of information is to prepare measures and recommendations to promote the dissemination of truthful information which is likely to strengthen international peace and security and the development of international co-operation and friendly relations among States, as well as to prevent the use of information media for incitement to war, propaganda of fascist and nazi views, racial and national exclusiveness and hatred, contempt and enmity among nations.

66. The urgent necessity of preparing such measures and recommendations arises primarily from the fact that, in contravention of the United Nations Charter and well-known decisions of the General Assembly, war propaganda in the United States and a number of other countries is not only continuing, but is becoming ever more unbridled. Various monopolies, trusts and syndicates in the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other countries in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc are, as is admitted by public opinion in these countries, stifling freedom of information, imposing their will on Press and information organs and, in pursuance of their narrowly selfish interests, using information media for incitement to war and for arousing enmity and hate among nations. They are making every effort to prevent the dissemination of truthful information likely to strengthen international peace and to develop peaceful co-operation among nations.

67. The United Nations Charter, and especially Article 1, imposes on all Member States the obligation to maintain international peace and security and develop friendly relations among nations. It is quite obvious that the content of news dispatches must be in conformity with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations laid down in the Charter, and must be directed towards the implementation of these high purposes and principles.

68. In its resolution [110 (II)] of 3 November 1947, on "Measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war", the General Assembly unanimously condemned any form of propaganda conducted in any country with the purpose of, or with a view to, creating or aggravating a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression. Nevertheless, this General Assembly resolution is not being fulfilled by the United States, the United Kingdom,

France and other countries of the Anglo-American bloc. The newspapers, magazines and other sources of information in those countries are full of hatred and slanderous attacks against the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the peoples' democracies, and issue constant calls for war against these countries. The monopolistic Press of the United States is conducting an especially intensive campaign to incite enmity among nations. In the countries which belong to the Anglo-American bloc, public figures who come forward in defence of the rights of peoples, against war and for the maintenance and strengthening of peace are badgered and even persecuted.

69. The position with regard to freedom of information is quite different in the USSR and the peoples' democracies. In the USSR and the peoples' democracies, the Press, radio and other information media help to strengthen peace, co-operation and friendship among nations. In the Soviet Union, the Press, radio and all other information media belong to the people; they serve the interests of the people, and contribute to peaceful reconstruction and to the education of the masses in a spirit of co-operation and friendship among all nations. In the USSR, war propaganda in any form whatsoever is regarded as the gravest crime against humanity. The legislative organs of the People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Albania and the German Democratic Republic have passed laws in defence of the peace, laying down severe penalties for war propaganda.

70. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that neither the draft resolution approved by the Third Committee on the Draft Convention on the International Right of Correction nor that draft convention, are such as to promote the solution of the problems confronting the United Nations with regard to freedom of information. The draft resolution and the convention do not in fact serve to combat propaganda directed against the cause of peace and designed to arouse enmity and hatred among peoples, but, on the contrary, promote such propaganda.

71. It is clear that the United Nations should not approve such documents. In view of these considerations, the Byelorussian delegation cannot vote for the draft resolution approving the convention on the right of correction; nor can it vote for the other draft resolutions, which are not directed towards ensuring real freedom of information.

72. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will vote for the draft resolution [A/L.125] submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, because that draft is in full conformity with the requirements of the United Nations Charter and provides for the adoption of concrete measures to promote the dissemination of truthful information for the strengthening of international peace and security and the development of peaceful co-operation and friendly relations among nations. The proposals in the USSR draft resolution are imbued with the desire to prevent the use of information media for purposes of incitement to war, for fascist propaganda, for incitement to national enmity and hatred and for the dissemination of false and slanderous information. The USSR proposals are based on the principle that the Press, radio, cinema and all other

media of information and graphic representation should serve the cause of peace, the interests of the peoples and the interests of the vast majority of the world population. For these reasons, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, which is anxious that the Press and other information media should be placed at the service of the people and at the service of peace and the development of friendly relations among nations, had supported and will support the USSR proposals and will vote for them.

73. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the vote in respect of the seven draft resolutions attached to the report of the Third Committee (A/2294).

74. With regard to draft resolution A, two amendments [A/L.131] have been moved by the delegations of Lebanon and Yugoslavia. We shall vote on the amendments.

The first amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 5, with 20 abstentions.

The second amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions.

75. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A as amended.

The draft resolution as amended was adopted by 25 votes to 22, with 10 abstentions.

76. The PRESIDENT: Before passing to the vote on the next draft resolution, I wish to point out to the Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution A means that the Convention on the International Right of Correction will be open for signature at the close of the present session of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General will take the necessary steps to have the text of the convention prepared for the signatures of States that wish to become parties to it, and to have equally authentic texts prepared in Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. Delegations will be notified in the *Journal* when the convention will be ready for signature.

77. We now come to draft resolution B.

78. The Polish delegation has submitted three amendments (A/L.126) to draft resolution B. The Assembly will now vote on the first amendment, which calls for the deletion, in the first paragraph of the preamble, of the words "and is the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated".

The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

79. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the second Polish amendment, which calls for the deletion of the third, fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble.

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

80. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the third Polish amendment, which calls for the deletion of the second part of paragraph 2 of the operative part, commencing with the words "on the basis of the rapporteur's report".

The amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B.

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

82. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolutions C, D, E and F, to which no amendments have been submitted.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

83. The PRESIDENT: There are two Soviet Union amendments (A/L.129) to draft resolution G. The Assembly will now vote on the first amendment, which calls for the addition, at the end of paragraph 1 of the operative part, of the words "provided that they agree with the particular resolution".

The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the second amendment, which calls for the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part.

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

85. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution G.

The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

86. The PRESIDENT: In addition to the draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee, there is a draft resolution which has been submitted by the Soviet Union delegation (A/L.125).

87. The representative of Saudi Arabia has requested that we should divide the vote on the Soviet Union draft resolution not only into separate paragraphs but also into separate phrases; in one case, the vote would be on a separate word. In the interest of simplicity, and in view of the fact that all the divisions amount to amendments for deletion, I suggest that we vote on the suggestions as amendments. The result would be exactly the same, but I believe that the procedure would be simpler. If there is no objection on the part of the representative of Saudi Arabia and on the part of the General Assembly, I shall put the suggestions of the representative of Saudi Arabia to the vote in the form of amendments. As there is no objection, I shall proceed in this manner.

88. The first amendment would be the deletion of the second part of the second paragraph of the preamble of the USSR draft resolution, beginning with the words "in certain countries".

The amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 6, with 40 abstentions.

89. The PRESIDENT: The next amendment would be the deletion, in the third paragraph of the preamble, of the words "nazi, fascist and any other".

The amendment was adopted by 13 votes to 6, with 36 abstentions.

90. The PRESIDENT: The next amendment applies to the first paragraph of the operative part, and calls for the deletion of the word "all" from the phrase "should take all necessary steps".

The result of the vote was 5 in favour, 5 against, and 45 abstentions.

The amendment was rejected.

91. The PRESIDENT: The next change suggested is the deletion of the words "including legislative steps" in the same paragraph.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 43 abstentions.

92. The PRESIDENT: The final amendment is the deletion of sub-paragraph 2 of the operative part.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 43 abstentions.

93. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the Soviet Union draft resolution [A/L.125] as amended. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Iraq, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Afghanistan.

Against: Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Chile, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma.

The draft resolution was rejected by 35 votes to 9, with 14 abstentions.

94. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (*translated from Russian*)): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions on freedom of information submitted to the General Assembly.

95. My delegation voted in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/L.125), which recommends that all States Members of the United Nations should take all necessary steps, including legislative steps, with a view to ensuring the implementation of the General Assembly resolution [110 (II)] of 3 November 1947 on "Measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war".

96. It is well known that despite the fact that this resolution was unanimously adopted by the General

Assembly five years ago, war propaganda is still continuing and is being intensified in a number of countries. The American Press, controlled as it is by private monopolies, trusts, and syndicates, gives wide publicity to the statements of war-mongers who call for war against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. Not only in the United States, but also in the United Kingdom, France and several other countries which are members of aggressive blocs, the information media—the Press, radio, cinema and television—are used by monopolistic circles for war propaganda. In those countries not only has nothing been done to stop the attempts to foment war hysteria and psychosis, to incite enmity and hatred towards peace-loving peoples and States and to spread all sorts of falsehoods and slander about them in order to justify a policy of aggression, but such attempts have received every kind of encouragement.

97. The United Nations cannot and should not tolerate such a situation any longer. Its Charter, in particular Article 1, obliges all Member States to maintain international peace and security and to develop friendly relations among nations. It is quite obvious that the type of information provided should be determined by, and should further, the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

98. The proposals submitted by the USSR delegation were in conformity with these provisions of the Charter. They provided for the adoption by the General Assembly and the governments of the States Members of the United Nations of measures designed to promote the dissemination, independent of dictation by monopolies interested in inciting to war, of truthful information aimed at strengthening international peace and security and developing peaceful co-operation and friendly relations among nations.

99. However much the Yugoslav representative, in unison with the United States representative, may endeavour to distort the true purposes of the USSR draft resolution by his false statement, it must be clear to everyone that the whole purpose of the proposals of the Soviet-Union was to prevent the media of information from being used for war-mongering and the dissemination of war propaganda. Those proposals were based on the premise that the Press, radio, cinema and all other media of information should serve the cause of international peace and security.

100. For these reasons the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supported the Soviet Union draft resolution.

101. With regard to the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Third Committee, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted against draft resolution A, proposing that the convention on the international Right of Correction should be opened for signature. That convention cannot effectively contribute to the fulfilment of any of the basic obligations confronting the United Nations in the field of freedom of information, namely, to put an end to propaganda in favour of a new war and to the dissemination of false and slanderous information intended to arouse hatred among peoples.

102. We supported the Polish delegation's amendments to draft resolution B, on the future work of the United Nations in the field of freedom of information. Those amendments considerably improved the text of the draft resolution by eliminating the confusing word

ing of the first paragraph of the preamble and correcting those provisions in the draft resolution which wrongly make all the work of the United Nations on the problem of freedom of information depend on the report of the rapporteur appointed by the Economic and Social Council. Since the Polish amendments were rejected, my delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

103. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted against draft resolution C, which expresses appreciation for the work of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. We consider that the sub-commission did not perform the task assigned to it. At no point in its career did it draw up or present to the General Assembly any recommendations against the use of media of information and the Press to provoke war and enmity and hatred among peoples.

104. My delegation abstained from voting on draft resolutions D and E. The former contains no concrete measures for promoting the development of information media in under-developed countries, and the latter does not indicate any way of combating the dissemination of false and distorted information, but is content with general phrases.

105. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted against draft resolution F, which calls for an international conference to consider and approve a code of professional ethics for journalists, since that question has no direct relation to the work of the United Nations.

106. In the form in which the draft resolution entitled "Dissemination of resolutions of the United Nations" was submitted to the Third Committee, it was unacceptable to my delegation. In paragraph 1 of the operative part, the General Assembly urges governments to make every effort to disseminate resolutions adopted by any principal organ of the United Nations. However, it does not state that such dissemination of any particular resolution requires the acceptance by the government concerned of that resolution. The Soviet Union amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part, calling for the addition of the words "provided that they agree with the particular resolution", rectified that omission. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore voted in favour of the Soviet Union amendment. My delegation also considered paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution superfluous, since the United Nations has a special Department of Public Information concerned with disseminating information about the work of the United Nations, including information about the resolutions adopted by the various organs. It is therefore unnecessary to emphasize in the resolution the need for drawing particular attention to the dissemination of resolutions which have been adopted. My delegation therefore supported the Soviet Union amendment to delete paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

107. Since the Soviet Union amendments were not adopted and the draft resolution was retained in its original form, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted against it.

108. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation voted for the USSR draft resolution (A/L.125).

109. The United Nations was founded in order to ensure international peace and security. In fulfilment

of that function, the General Assembly adopted, at its second session in 1947, resolution 110 (II), on measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war. There has been no decrease in war propaganda, however, since the adoption of that resolution. Quite the contrary, it has been on the increase in certain countries.

110. The imperialist Powers, headed by the United States, have formed a number of aggressive blocs, such as the one constituted by the North Atlantic Treaty, thus providing themselves with the conditions required for starting another new world war. They are trying to prepare public opinion for another world war; an important part in this campaign is being played by the Press, the radio, the cinema and other media of information. The capitalist monopolies, particularly in the United States, which started the armaments race, have also taken over the media of information in order to be able to intervene in the domestic affairs of the other countries and to wage a propaganda campaign of aggression and war. The imperialist Powers, headed by the United States, started a war of aggression in Korea and are at present at war with the peoples of Vietnam, Malaya and the champions of freedom in the dependent countries, especially on the continent of Africa. They have been substantially assisted in this by the Press and media of information which are owned by the monopolies. The leading members of the North Atlantic bloc openly misuse freedom of information for purposes of war propaganda, the incitement of enmity among peoples, the dissemination of nazi and fascist ideologies and the incitement of racial and other forms of discrimination. Media of information are also misused to defend aggression, to interfere in the domestic affairs of the peoples' democracies and to vilify popular liberation movements.

111. The concept of freedom of information is thus completely perverted and, as it is understood by those who today would instigate a new world war, it means freedom to disseminate lies and slander, freedom to spread fascist and nazi lies, freedom to stir up hatred among the peoples and to disseminate propaganda for a new war of aggression.

112. If the General Assembly is to fulfil its function it should take a firm stand against this position. The General Assembly must therefore take up once again the question of the measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war, since it is the desire of the peoples of the entire world that the dissemination of information should serve the cause of mankind, the peaceful co-existence of all peoples, and the struggle for peace and security.

113. It is clear that the notion of freedom of information includes, in the very first place, peace, democracy and friendship among peoples and, at the same time, active opposition to war, to fascism and to all that threatens mankind in its desire and efforts to attain peaceful development and a happy future.

114. The Czechoslovak people, who are fulfilling their five-year plan, are occupied in peaceful construction, which is the basis of their national life. They have therefore also taken steps to safeguard the peace by adopting a law forbidding and punishing war propaganda, as has already been pointed out by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR. The Czechoslovak

people want to live in peace and to build for themselves a happy and peaceful future.

115. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation voted for the USSR draft resolution, which particularly stressed the importance at this time of freedom of information — that is to say, the importance of securing that the dissemination of information is not misused to harm mankind but used in the struggle for peace. Freedom of information can become an important factor in work for peace by helping to remove the barriers between peoples and to strengthen peaceful relations among them. True and undistorted information will help to foster friendly relations among nations. As the USSR draft resolution served the cause of peace, the Czechoslovak delegation, which consistently follows its Government's policy of peace, voted for that draft.

116. The third Committee in its report (A/2294), submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly draft resolution A, concerning the Draft Convention on the International Right of Correction. The Czechoslovak delegation voted against that draft resolution in the Third Committee, and it did so again here, for the following reasons.

117. Under resolution A, the United Nations is to urge all Members of the United Nations and the other States which were invited to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information to sign the Convention on the International Right of Correction, and to decide that the said convention shall be opened for signature at the close of the present session of the General Assembly. The General Assembly has again taken up the question of freedom of information after a lapse of two years, when war propaganda in the leading countries of the imperialist bloc is flourishing as never before, and when media of information are being misused for the purpose of intervening in the domestic affairs of peace-loving States and stirring up hatred among them, instead of serving to strengthen friendly relations among the peoples.

118. In the circumstances, the primary task of the United Nations should be to take effective steps to safeguard the peaceful coexistence of peoples and to fight actively and effectively against war propaganda and nazi and fascist ideas. The draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee, however contained no provisions for taking any such measures. Instead the Third Committee proposed that the Assembly should make a recommendation concerning a draft convention on the right of correction, a convention which conflicts with its primary task, the struggle for peace. The convention on the right of correction does not even provide for the proper correction of false and distorted information. It merely shows that such correction is technically possible, but it does not ensure that false, distorted or defamatory information shall in fact be corrected. Thus the proposed convention on the right of correction evades the question of how slander and false information should be effectively combated. The adoption of such a convention, which bears no relation to the task of combating war propaganda and the dissemination of nazi and fascist ideas, and does not even give any guarantee that false or distorted information shall be corrected, is nothing but an attempt, at the present time, to divert attention from the primary purpose of the United Nations and to mislead public opinion into

believing that the Organization is in fact fulfilling the tasks entrusted to it in the field of information.

119. For those reasons the Czechoslovak delegation voted against draft resolution A.

120. Mrs. ASMAN (Iraq): My delegation voted for a great many of these draft resolutions concerning freedom of information. We are particularly interested because we believe that freedom of information is essential for the development of friendly relations among nations, and we welcome the importance attached in draft resolution D to the proper development of public information in under-developed countries, and the particular emphasis that was placed on the development of independent domestic information enterprises. My delegation is convinced that if more impartial information were available, news concerning the intense struggle that is taking place today for freedom and self-determination all over the world could not be suppressed as it is being suppressed today.

121. Real freedom of information must be maintained in order to keep this world organization and the public opinion of the world adequately acquainted, not with one-sided expositions of viewpoints, but with the many facts, so that the whole complex of the problems may be exposed. Unfortunately, this is not the present state of affairs. Here in the United States, which is a great democracy and which has a great and free information service which can create public opinion, how much does the American public know of the terrible things that are taking place in North Africa? Millions of people are involved. What and how much does the American public hear about it? Even the debates in the United Nations on these issues are partially reported. What chance have the representatives of the Tunisian or Moroccan people to get their voices across to the public? Who does create American policy?

122. My delegation believes that the only hope lies in the development of independent domestic information services which can inform the world on the particular problems, aspirations and hopes of each people, and which can also permit the world to hear of their despair before that despair flares into irremediable harm against peace. We welcome the United Nations efforts in favour of the development of these independent information services.

123. My delegation hopes, in particular, that the international conference of professionals will meet and draft an international code of ethics, because we are certain that such a code would be of great value in contributing towards the understanding and friendship of peoples all over the world.

Human rights. Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples: report of the Third Committee (A/2309 and Corr. 1)

[Agenda item 30]

124. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: The Third Committee devoted twenty-two meetings to this item, which was referred to it by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council having transmitted to the Assembly the relevant draft resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights

(Council resolution 440 (XIV)). I have the honour to present the Committee's report.

125. The debate brought out divergences of views which the General Assembly will find summarized in paragraphs 8 to 17 of the report. Despite the marked differences of opinion, there a strong desire was manifested to achieve a text which could command a maximum of support, it being clearly understood that the measure of agreement attained on the recommendations under discussion was of particular importance. A number of amendments and sub-amendments were before the Committee.

126. With regard to draft resolution A, a new first paragraph was incorporated in the preamble, the original text of which, as drafted by the Commission on Human Rights, was replaced by a new formulation omitting references to slavery. It will be noted that in paragraph 2 of the operative part, "other recognized democratic means", were added to plebiscites to be implemented preferably under the auspices of the United Nations and not, therefore, necessarily, as proposed originally. A new paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted which would make it incumbent upon States administering Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories to prepare the indigenous populations in a practical way for self-government. There were two alternative texts of draft resolution A before the Committee to which amendments were moved. The United Kingdom withdrew its draft resolution after the voting on draft resolution A had taken place. The representative of Lebanon asked that his draft resolution be left pending since he did not wish to withdraw it. The Committee therefore adopted a motion not to vote upon it.

127. Draft resolution B, as adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, was before the committee in the form of a draft resolution of the General Assembly presented by the Lebanese representative. Some amendments were incorporated, and there was a discussion as to whether it would be more appropriate that the substance of this draft resolution should be considered by the Third Committee or by the Fourth Committee, or by a meeting of the joint Third and Fourth Committees, and as to how it could be co-ordinated with decisions of the Fourth Committee. A new paragraph was therefore added asking that the draft resolution should be placed on the agenda of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories at its next session, to be held in 1953.

128. A third and new draft resolution was presented to the Committee requesting the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to continue its work on the right of self-determination of peoples, for further consideration by the General Assembly.

129. I have the honour, therefore, to place these three draft resolutions, A, B and C, before the General Assembly for approval.

130. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has already decided not to have any general discussion of these draft resolutions, A, B and C. A number of amendments have been proposed to them, and certain delegations have asked to be allowed to explain their votes. In view of the fact that the draft resolutions

were exhaustively considered in the Committee, and since there are fewer than half the number of draft resolutions that appeared in the report with which we have just dealt, I would suggest to the General Assembly that explanations of vote might be restricted in this case to seven minutes each, in accordance with our usual custom.

131. I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union for an explanation of vote.

132. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the USSR feels bound to explain its vote on the draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee on the right of self-determination of peoples.

133. The principle of the self-determination of peoples is one of the most important principles of the United Nations Charter and has been very properly included among the fundamental purposes and principles of the Organization. Article 1 of the Charter proclaims that one of the purposes of the United Nations is "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples". In view of the importance of that principle, the General Assembly at its fifth session [resolution 421 D (V)] acknowledged the right of peoples and nations to self-determination as a fundamental human right, and at the sixth session decided to include in the covenant on human rights a special article reading as follows: "All peoples shall have the right to self-determination" [Resolution 545 (VI)]. The General Assembly also asked the Commission on Human Rights to submit recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples. As we know, the commission submitted such recommendations, and the Third Committee based upon them draft resolution A which is being considered by this meeting of the General Assembly.

134. The USSR delegation supported all those decisions of the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights. The USSR delegation also supported the present draft resolution A in the Third Committee, although the draft has a number of substantive defects which weaken its efficacy. The USSR delegation has taken a favourable attitude towards all decisions aimed at implementing the right of peoples to self-determination because the principle of the self-determination of peoples is one of the most fundamental principles on which the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR is based.

135. The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples has found its fullest and most harmonious expression in the Soviet Union. The multinational USSR can serve as an example of the enormous success that may be achieved by the proper application of the principle of self-determination of peoples, based on true equality of rights, mutual understanding, mutual respect and the co-operation of free peoples and nations, great or small.

136. The USSR delegation considers it both timely and necessary that the Third Committee should have submitted draft resolution A; that draft recommends that States which administer Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories should not only recognize but should also promote the realization of the right of self-determination of the peoples of such Territories

and facilitate the exercise of that right. This decision is in full conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Such a decision is vitally necessary. The United Nations cannot and has no right to overlook the daily and flagrant violations of that highly important principle of the United Nations Charter, the principle of self-determination of peoples, by the colonial Powers which administer Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

137. The governments of States which administer Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories are bound by the Charter to promote to the utmost the progressive development of the peoples of those Territories towards self-government or independence. In fact, exactly the contrary is happening. The governments of colonial Powers, especially the United States, the United Kingdom and France, are conducting a policy of flagrant discrimination against the indigenous inhabitants of their colonies. They not only fail to take any measures to develop self-government, but also cruelly suppress the national liberation movements of the colonial peoples. In many countries whose peoples no longer wish to submit to the foreign yoke, the national liberation movement has taken the form of an armed struggle. That has happened in Vietnam, Malaya and Kenya. In other places, such as Tunisia and Morocco, punitive operations by the armed forces of the administering Powers have created conditions of serious tension.

138. In these circumstances it is clearly not enough for the principle of the self-determination of peoples to be confirmed by the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly is in duty bound to take concrete measures for the realization of this right, especially for the peoples of Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories, for which the United Nations has assumed a special obligation under the Charter.

139. Draft resolution A is a first step in that direction, and the USSR delegation will vote for it.

140. The USSR delegation supports and will vote for draft resolution B, which obliges administering Powers to transmit information on the extent to which the right of peoples to self-determination is exercised by the peoples of the Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories under their jurisdiction. The objections of the colonial Powers to that draft resolution prove their wish to avoid submitting such information and thus to prevent the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories and Trust Territories from exercising their right of self-determination, in contravention of the obligations undertaken by these Powers under the Charter.

141. The USSR delegation might have been able to support draft resolution C if the amendment of the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, which clarifies the essential paragraph of the draft resolution, had been adopted.

142. The objections of the colonial Powers to the adoption of draft resolutions A and B merely confirm the necessity of continuing to prepare recommendations with regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories and Trust Territories.

143. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom): In explanation of its vote on draft resolution A, my delegation had

no alternative but to vote against it in committee, since we considered it biased, discriminatory and unrealistic. We regret very much that, after all the interesting speeches and hard work in committee, a draft resolution should have emerged in this form. My delegation has contributed as much as it could to that work, and has done its best to steer the discussion along the path of statesmanship and moderation. It is no fault of ours if our attempts have failed.

144. It is not necessary for me to comment upon the draft resolution in detail. The fact that the universal principle of self-determination, for which my Government has demonstrated its respect, has been converted into a so-called "right", applicable only to the peoples of the world who happen to inhabit Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, is condemnation enough. The motives which inspired this flagrant discrimination are as obvious as they are deplorable. In addition, the draft resolution perpetuates a confusion between the idea of self-government and the idea of political independence, indicates that plebiscites under United Nations auspices are the best method of promoting the progress of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, which is obviously quite untrue, and suggests that the outward forms of political independence are more important than the substance. It makes no mention of the political aspirations of peoples inhabiting the metropolitan territories of States, many of whom live in ignorance and under oppression and have no voice in the management of their affairs.

145. My delegation therefore voted against this draft resolution without hesitation and with a clear conscience. We only trust that those who voted for it will realize as time goes on that denunciation is no substitute for international co-operation, and that by passing resolutions of this kind they in fact defeat their own purposes and render a grave disservice to the United Nations.

146. As regards draft resolution B, I wish to reiterate that my Government publishes comprehensive political information concerning the territories for whose foreign relations my country is responsible. This information is readily available to any delegation interested, but my Government will not supply information in the form requested under the resolution in direct contradiction with the terms of the Charter.

147. As regards draft resolution C, my delegation voted against this because, in my Government's opinion, the Commission on Human Rights is not the proper organ to discuss the question of self-determination.

148. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America): The United States delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A and on the amendments which we have proposed. My delegation ordinarily does not favour the submission of amendments in a plenary meeting after an item has been thoroughly debated in committee; but in this case, because procedural difficulties prevented the principal elements in the United States amendments from ever coming to a vote in the Third Committee, we are reintroducing two amendments to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

149. The United States Government and the American people believe wholeheartedly in the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations; and they believe

that the right of self-determination should be exercised by peoples of all territories, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. For this reason, the United States delegation would like to be able to vote for draft resolution A, but it cannot do so in view of certain defects in the present text of that draft resolution, particularly as regards its application to a limited group of territories, and as regards the suggestion that the democratic processes of our territories be placed under the auspices of the United Nations.

150. The United States delegation asks for a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble, because it wishes to have an opportunity to vote against this paragraph. In our view, this paragraph contains an incorrect statement of fact. We cannot admit that the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories under United States administration do not, as this paragraph would imply, fully enjoy all fundamental human rights.

151. My delegation would not consider paragraph 2 of the operative part fully satisfactory unless the General Assembly adopted the two amendments which it has submitted. According to the present text of that paragraph, the right of self-determination should be exercised only by the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. This is a restriction on the right of self-determination which, in the view of my delegation, falls so far short of the concept expressed in the Charter that we should not endorse it. If a right is valid for one group of peoples, it is equally valid for all peoples.

152. There is another difficulty. The present text of paragraph 2 of the operative part would place not only "plebiscites" but also "other recognized democratic means" under the auspices of the United Nations. This seems completely impractical to my delegation. Furthermore, in so far as this might involve placing our own democratic processes, or those of the territories under our administration, under the auspices of the United Nations, it is impossible for us to accept. We would be unable to vote for this paragraph as long as it contained this concept.

153. Finally, my delegation asks for a separate vote on paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution. The substance of this paragraph has considerable merit, and it recommends policies which we follow in the territories under our administration, but nevertheless it seems to us that it is inappropriate in this draft resolution. This is particularly true since, in our view, it detracts from the universal character of the draft resolution. Deletion of this paragraph would improve the draft resolution by focusing greater attention on its main purpose—to bring about greater respect for the right of self-determination of all peoples.

154. In conclusion, the United States delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A if the first and last paragraphs are deleted and if paragraph 2 of the operative part is improved. My delegation earnestly hopes that these changes can be made as it desires to vote for the draft resolution. The United States delegation believes that any draft resolution on self-determination should command the support of an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly. It believes this because a draft resolution on so vital a matter should

be so phrased as to appeal to the whole General Assembly and not only to a small majority.

155. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) (*translated from French*): Today the General Assembly has before it a draft recommendation of considerable importance.

156. Draft resolution A, though not firmly enough worded, recommends that the States Members of the United Nations shall respect and uphold the principle of self-determination of all peoples and nations. It recommends that States responsible for the administration of dependent territories shall recognize the right of the peoples of those territories to administer themselves, their wishes being ascertained through plebiscites or other democratic means. It also recommends, pending the effective enjoyment of that right, that practical steps shall be taken to prepare those peoples for complete self-government or independence.

157. Draft resolution A is in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter, in particular Articles 1, 73, 76 and 55, regarding the right of self-determination of peoples and the universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex or religion. For that reason, the Polish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A.

158. The Polish delegation will vote against the United States amendment [A/L.132], which is intended to bury the practical implementation of the right of dependent and colonial peoples to independence under general phrases.

159. The Polish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution B, which, like draft resolution A, was drawn up on the basis of the decision taken by the General Assembly at its sixth session [resolution 545 (VI)] and forms a valuable complement to it. These two draft resolutions form a logical whole. The aim of draft resolution B is to make it easier for the United Nations to obtain information on the political progress of dependent peoples, such information being indispensable if the United Nations is to fulfil the obligations incumbent upon it under the Charter and confirmed in draft resolution A.

160. These two draft resolutions, A and B, were approved in the Third Committee by an overwhelming majority, but not before they had been discussed at length and had provoked bitter opposition on the part of the colonial Powers. The delegations of those Powers alleged among other things that the colonial peoples still lacked the necessary maturity to administer themselves, and that many years of trusteeship administration by more advanced countries would be needed before they reached a stage of development which would allow of self-government. Those arguments show the complete hypocrisy and bad faith of these Powers. On the one hand, as many delegations to the Third Committee have shown, the colonial States actually keep the countries under their domination at an extremely low standard of living, exploit them ruthlessly and withhold from them even the most elementary means of education. On the other hand, whenever it suits their convenience, they use as an argument a state of affairs which is merely the result of their own policy, in order to demonstrate that the conquered peoples would not be capable of self-government. Whatever arguments the colonial

Powers may use against the practical implementation of the right of self-determination of peoples, those Powers cannot reduce the vast proportions which the movement of national liberation is now assuming among the dependent and colonial peoples. The bloody struggle of the peoples of Vietnam, Morocco, Tunis, Togoland and many other countries against the colonizers is proof of this.

161. The General Assembly should not confine itself to the adoption of these two draft resolutions concerning international respect for the right of self-determination of peoples; it should also see that they are put into effect.

162. The Polish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution C, provided that it is amended in the manner proposed by the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR [A/L.133]. The amendment in question makes this resolution more specific by adding, to the sentence by which the Commission on Human Rights would be asked "to continue preparing recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination", the words "including the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories".

163. The Polish people have always supported the struggle of colonial and dependent peoples for their freedom. We are moved to do so by a profound sympathy for the aspirations of the nations and peoples of the world towards liberty, in a spirit of brotherly solidarity. We do so in the deep conviction that respect for the independence of nations is an essential factor in the maintenance of peace, as also in the implementation of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter.

164. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The principle of the self-determination of peoples is of universal application. It is in this sense that it was included in the United Nations Charter. The draft resolutions which are being submitted to the General Assembly's approval, however, make recommendations for its application in favour of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories and Trust Territories only. The Belgian delegation wishes to set forth the reasons why it cannot accept such a limitation.

165. The concept of Non-Self-Governing Territories is not very clear. The terms in which it is defined in the Charter are ambiguous. Many Members of the United Nations wish it to be restricted to those Territories to which eight States have spontaneously admitted that Chapter XI of the Charter is applicable. The Belgian delegation protests strongly against this restrictive interpretation. It maintains that all indigenous peoples whose backward condition prevents them from administering themselves completely should benefit from the same guarantees. Such was the rule which prevailed in the League of Nations and which the Members of the League, now Members of the United Nations, never contested at that time.

166. An interpretation of Chapter XI unduly limiting the number of peoples to benefit by the obligations which it lays down would be especially open to criticism if it had the effect of confining to a few peoples a right of self-determination whose enjoyment is guaranteed in the Charter to all peoples. Outside the Non-Self-

Governing Territories and Trust Territories, many peoples claim this right and aspire to exercise it.

167. These include peoples belonging to States, old and new, of complex ethnic, religious or cultural structure, within which nationalistic movements for autonomy or separation have appeared.

168. They also include peoples affected by the territorial changes that occurred at the end of the war, without their having been previously consulted.

169. Finally, they include peoples, totalling several hundred million, who enjoyed full independence before the war and who have been totally or partly deprived of it, even if they are still nominally sovereign States. At each session of the Assembly, political refugees belonging to these peoples, and their one-time leaders, address appeals to the United Nations and claim for their fellow-countrymen the right to regain their independence.

170. The draft resolutions submitted by the Third Committee ignore all these peoples. Among those who have given their approval to these proposals are the USSR, its two members which are seated with us and the two other States closely linked to it. Yet in those countries any manifestation of national feeling which is not in favour of the USSR itself is ruthlessly condemned and suppressed. The right of secession on the part of the federated republics is admittedly to be found in article 17 of the Constitution of the USSR, but to the exclusion of numerous nationalities which do not constitute federated republics. Even subject to those limitations, however, it is in fact non-existent, for no one could invoke it without committing an act that is severely punished as being calculated to weaken the power of the Soviet Union and the unity of the proletariat.

171. The Members of the United Nations that opposed the draft resolutions on the self-determination of peoples comprise the countries of Western Europe, the Scandinavian countries, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. These are the States which, by virtue of their institutions and democratic traditions, enjoy the highest prestige in my country. In the course of their history they have fought, as we have, for the right of self-determination of peoples.

172. The texts before the General Assembly would thus lack any authority in my country. Our century-old support for the great principle of the self-determination of peoples, which these texts distort and mutilate, obliges us to oppose their adoption.

173. The remarks I have just made are directed chiefly to draft resolutions A and B. I have, however, a special remark to make on draft resolution B. At its [402nd] meeting on 10 December, the General Assembly adopted a resolution maintaining the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories for a further three-year period. I had the honour to state on that occasion that the Belgian Government, having regard to the interpretation given to Chapter XI, would consider whether there was any reason for it to continue to take part in the work of that committee. Draft resolution B would affect the resolution adopted barely a week ago, by extending the powers of that committee to a field in which my Government has always challenged its competence. Its adoption would therefore

constitute a very important new fact which my Government would have to take into account in its decision regarding its further participation in the committee's work.

174. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): The Australian delegation will vote against the three draft resolutions, but I should like briefly to state our opposition to draft resolutions A and B.

175. Draft resolution A, though cast to some extent in general terms, appears to us to have for its object the amendment or extension of the Charter provisions relating to Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. In its effect, it confuses and distorts some of the most important provisions of the Charter. The Charter devotes three whole chapters to the principles and procedures applicable and directed to the orderly and gradual attainment of self-government or independence by the peoples of territories not yet able to stand alone in the modern world. These chapters have been carefully drafted. To extend or alter this workable code is both dangerous and unwise.

176. The principle of self-determination is a valuable one, but, in the view of my delegation, has nothing to do with the attainment of self-government or independence by the peoples of territories. The principle is one which comes into existence only when the territories concerned have reached such a state of development where they can decide for themselves when they can properly, realistically, and with a full realization of their position avail themselves of the right of self-determination.

177. Draft resolution B likewise, in the view of my delegation, attempts to alter the Charter by means of recommendation. Article 73 e of the Charter is quite clear, at least to my delegation. It says that Administering Powers should "transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories...".

178. Australia, as a signatory of the Charter and a loyal Member of the Organization, gladly undertakes this obligation, and we have, in fact, carried it out. The present draft resolution attempts to impose further obligations on us without our consent.

179. Although we might of our own free will submit additional information that is over and above the information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions, we cannot agree to an attempt to compel us to go beyond our Charter responsibilities, which we accepted in good faith and according to our reasonable interpretation — indeed, I would say, according to the literal interpretation — of the precise words of the Charter.

180. For these reasons, my delegation will vote against draft resolutions A and B. They form part of a campaign, as I see it, which some countries, I regret exceedingly to have to say, see fit to wage against what they call colonialism. They see in this colonialism everything bad and identified with exploitation. They ignore, or pretend to ignore, all or most of its achievements. Many States now Members of this Organization have been led, by the friendly tutelage of a mandate

system and by this self-same colonialism, to the attainment of their complete sovereignty and independence.

181. We in Australia do not wish to exploit in any way, and do not exploit, the territories under our control. We have undertaken the responsibility to help them to a point where they can govern themselves, and we intend to carry our work through despite the attack made upon the so-called colonial Powers. We shall do this because we have a responsibility to the peoples of these territories, and we shall not fail them.

182. The administration of a territory is difficult and also very costly. It would be more helpful to us if the United Nations would offer constructive suggestions or constructive criticism instead of attacking us and other colonial Powers on imagined pretexts and complicating and hindering our work accordingly.

183. There is, in our judgment, no good which can come out of these two draft resolutions. They do not help the peoples of the Territories, whether Trust or Non-Self-Governing, and they do not help us, the Administering Powers, in carrying out our responsibilities towards them. They attempt to alter the Charter, a document which should not be altered without full and rational consideration and which cannot be altered except in accordance with the precise terms laid down in the Charter. We therefore cannot support such draft resolutions.

184. In conclusion, it should be said again, and remembered, that General Assembly recommendations cannot alter the Charter. To pass resolutions by however large a majority which have this objective is futile and, in our view, is calculated not to bring credit to the General Assembly.

185. Mr. BOURGES - MAUNOURY (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation has already explained in the Economic and Social Council and the Third Committee why draft resolutions A and B, constituting recommendations concerning the right of peoples to self-determination, are not acceptable to the French Government. We deeply regret that a noble principle that was once proclaimed by the French Revolution and has ever since guided France in its policy towards all citizens of the French Union has, in the hands of countries whose devotion to democratic institutions is most suspect, become an instrument of aggressive demagoguery aimed at promoting disintegration, secession and disorder.

186. We have been pleased to note that the countries with the oldest democratic traditions and a long record of devotion to the cause of human rights have joined with us in opposing these recommendations. My Government cannot in any way act on or accept these recommendations, since they violate the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and unjustly discriminate in the matter of human rights between States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories and other Member States and because they constitute interference, which is all the more serious and all the less acceptable as the law which they purport to apply is in no way limited or defined. Their adoption by the Assembly will inevitably lead to discord among nations and weaken the position of the United Nations in the world.

187. The French delegation will vote against the two draft resolutions. It also urgently appeals to all dele-

gations that have the true interests of the United Nations at heart not to permit the adoption of dangerous recommendations which can only lead to results contrary to the purposes of the Charter itself and might endanger the future and the very existence of the Organization.

188. With regard to draft resolution B, which refers to the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, the French delegation recalls its previous remarks concerning this body made before the Assembly on 10 December 1952 [402nd meeting]. The adoption of that draft resolution would extend the powers of the committee so as to make it even more unconstitutional than it now is. The French delegation is therefore bound, on behalf of its Government, to make the strictest reservation concerning the attitude it will adopt with regard to the committee.

189. Profiting from its experience, the French delegation will also vote against draft resolution C, which obviously can only produce new discriminatory recommendations that would be as superficial or as contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter as those which we reject today.

190. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that it must explain its vote on the right of peoples to self-determination. We have already had an opportunity of giving our views on the question in detail in the Third Committee, and I shall therefore be brief.

191. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has already pointed out that acknowledgement of the right of peoples to self-determination and the measures to be taken for the practical implementation of that right are extremely important for the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The adoption even of these recommendations, which my delegation regards as extremely inadequate, might promote the implementation of the important right of peoples to self-determination, and this would satisfy the fundamental interests of many peoples still in a condition of colonial dependence.

192. We are witnessing the unprecedented growth of a struggle for national liberation in the countries of Southeast Asia and in the Near and Middle East. The struggle of the peoples of Korea and Vietnam and of Malaya, Tunisia, Morocco, Kenya and other colonial countries for freedom and independence against the United States, British and French colonialists, who are doing their utmost to keep these peoples under their rule, is flaring up and spreading day by day. The ruling circles of the United States, the United Kingdom and France have done all in their power to strike at the national liberation movement, especially in the areas where the threat to them is greatest, and thus to halt the collapse of the colonial system.

193. It would not come amiss to remind certain persons once again that the peoples of the world are ever more insistently demanding that the colonial yoke should be abolished and that mutual relations among nations should be based on the principle of respect for the sovereign and equal rights of all peoples. The seventh session of the General Assembly should heed their voice. The principle of the self-determination of peoples is extremely important. This principle lays

down all the postulates for establishing relations among peoples and States throughout the world which would exclude all types of discrimination, both against individuals and against any people or State. This principle is bound to strengthen the real peace and security of the peoples and increase their material and spiritual well-being. The correct application of the principle of self-determination of peoples, based on real mutual understanding and brotherly co-operation in peaceful and constructive labour in all branches of economic and cultural activity, is found in the USSR. The task of the United Nations is to promote the universal application of the high principles of the Organization, thus strengthening peace and international security.

194. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has always advocated and continues to advocate not only the inclusion of an article on the rights of peoples to self-determination in the covenant on human rights, but also the adoption of recommendations designed to ensure the observance and realization of this right. We consider that the adoption by the Commission on Human Rights and the confirmation by the seventh session of the General Assembly of recommendations concerning international respect of the right of peoples to self-determination is inadequate, since the recommendations do not cover all the subjects included in the concept of the right of all peoples to self-determination; in fact, they are concerned only with legal equality. Nevertheless, they represent a considerable step forward towards the implementation of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples, which has been recognized by the United Nations. That is why we supported them.

195. Paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A states that "the States Members of the United Nations shall uphold the principle of self-determination of all peoples and nations" and shall respect the independence of those peoples and nations. This provision is in conformity with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. It stresses the right of all peoples and nations freely to determine their economic and cultural status. The necessity of adopting that paragraph arises from the fact that the colonial Powers, especially the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Belgium, recognize the right of peoples to self-determination in words only, and systematically violate this right by their deeds.

196. The systematic violation of the right of self-determination by the colonial Powers is proved by the many facts which were adduced during the discussion of this question in the Third Committee. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A states that "the States Members of the United Nations shall recognize and promote the realization of the right of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories who are under their administration and shall facilitate the exercise of this right". This recommendation also corresponds to the purposes and principles of our Organization. Its adoption is necessary because the colonial Powers responsible for Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories are not fulfilling the provisions of the Charter concerning the progressive advancement of the peoples of these Territories, and are making every effort to prevent them from exercising their right of self-determination. When the question was dis-

cussed in various organs of the United Nations, the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and other States made every effort to prevent the adoption of proposals which were in accordance with that principle; they tried and are still trying to render those proposals devoid of meaning and to reduce them to empty phrases.

197. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR also supported draft resolution B, in which it is proposed that the General Assembly should recommend that States Members of the United Nations responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories to include in the information transmitted by them details regarding the extent to which the right of self-determination is exercised by peoples of those Territories. The transmission of such information is a corollary of the Charter and of the principle of self-determination itself. The representatives of the colonial Powers have frequently alleged that the Charter does not impose on the administering Powers any obligation to transmit such information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories. It is absolutely clear that these assertions of the representatives of the colonial Powers are incompatible with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and that their object is to avoid the transmission of such information, in contravention of the Charter.

198. As I have already said, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, although it considers the recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination to be inadequate, supported them for the reasons I have stated. We shall support them now for the same reasons and shall vote for them.

199. Mr. POLITIS (Greece): When paragraph 2 of the operative part of draft resolution A, as submitted by the United States, was being discussed by the Third Committee, the Greek delegation suggested that there should be added, after the words "other recognized democratic means", the words "consistent with the principles contained in this resolution". This qualification of the words "democratic means" seems, to my delegation, to be useful, for it ensures that the democratic character of the means of implementing the right of self-determination of peoples will not be open to challenge. The United States representative in the Third Committee accepted this Greek amendment which, had the text proposed by the United States been voted on then, would have been incorporated in the text of the draft resolution.

200. I move that the same words of the Greek amendment, that is to say, "consistent with the principles contained in this resolution", should be added after the words "democratic means". This would enable my delegation, and possibly other delegations as well, to support the United States amendment (A/L.132).

201. I should now like to add a few words. In case the United States amendment establishing the principle of universality is adopted, I should like to be put on record as having made the following statement.

202. The Greek delegation, while welcoming the resolution of the General Assembly recognizing that the popular wish for self-determination should be ascertained through plebiscites under the auspices of

the United Nations or other recognized democratic means consistent with the principles contained in the resolution, deems it necessary to stress that wherever wholesale persecutions, expulsions, deportations or genocidal practices in recent years have forcibly altered or are altering the ethnic composition of a territory, the vote of the present inhabitants of the territory shall not and cannot be considered as the criterion of its national allegiance. In such cases, appropriate criteria should be internationally agreed upon, taking into consideration the special circumstances relating to each territory.

203. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now come to a decision in regard to the three draft resolutions which are before it (A/2309).

204. Draft resolution A deals with the rights of peoples and nations to self-determination. I have been asked by certain delegations to submit to the General Assembly that this draft resolution should be considered as an important question under rule 84 of the rules of procedure, which includes questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System.

205. Certain amendments have been submitted to this draft resolution—one orally, by the Greek delegation, within the last two or three minutes. This amendment would add to the United States amendment [A/L.132] to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution—which ends with the words "or other recognized democratic means"—the words "consistent with the principles contained in this resolution". As the United States delegation has indicated its willingness to accept that sub-amendment, it will not be necessary to vote on it until a vote is taken on the United States amendment.

206. The United States delegation has submitted two amendments [A/L.132] to this draft resolution, which will now be voted on. The first is for the addition, after the word "peoples" at the beginning of paragraph 2 of the operative part, of the words "of all territories, including those".

The amendment was rejected by 28 votes to 22, with 5 abstentions.

207. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the second United States amendment. This calls for the replacement of the words "or other recognized democratic means, preferably under the auspices of the United Nations", after the word "plebiscites", at the end of paragraph 2, by the words "under the auspices of the United Nations or other recognized democratic means".

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

208. The PRESIDENT: The United States delegation has requested a separate vote in respect of the first paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 3 of the operative part of draft resolution A. We shall now vote on the first paragraph of the preamble. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philip-

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

Against: Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France.

Abstaining: Israel, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, China, Ecuador.

The first paragraph of the preamble of resolution A was adopted by 38 votes to 13, with 9 abstentions.

209. The PRESIDENT: A vote will now be taken on paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Paraguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama.

Against: Union of South Africa, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway.

The paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

210. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

Abstaining: Turkey, Ecuador, Israel, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Thailand.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 40 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.

211. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution B.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 39 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.

212. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution C, to which an amendment has been moved by the Ukrainian SSR (A/L.133), calling for the addition at the end of paragraph 1 of the operative part of the words "including the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories". We shall vote first on this amendment.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.

213. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution C.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

214. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Czechoslovakia for an explanation of vote.

215. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): During the discussion in the Third Committee of the recommendations on international respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, the Czechoslovak delegation had the opportunity to express its views regarding that right.

216. The efforts of the colonial and dependent peoples to rid themselves of colonial exploiters and their struggle for independence meet with the support and sympathy of all progressive men and women. The Czechoslovak people side fully with the oppressed and exploited peoples in the colonial countries and hope that their struggle for national independence will achieve rapid and complete success.

217. In the colonial and dependent territories, long established and newly arrived colonizers are resorting to terror, the suppression of human rights, racial discrimination and the annihilation of the indigenous population by military action in their fight against the legitimate desires of the peoples to achieve national and political independence through the development of the forces of progress and democracy. Even in the United Nations, the Colonial Powers are attempting to deny the right of peoples to self-determination and to prevent the Organization from lending effective support, in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, to the peoples of colonial and dependent territories in their legitimate struggle to achieve national and political independence and autonomy. This attitude of the old and new colonizers was clearly revealed by the vote taken on the draft resolutions in the Third Committee. And while the representatives of the colonial Powers adduce arguments in the General Assembly against the adoption by the United Nations of recommendations designed to give practical effect to the right of peoples to self-determination, thousands of valiant fighters are dying in Korea, Vietnam, Malaya, Tunisia, Morocco, Kenya and elsewhere.

218. The repression of the national liberation movement in the colonies and in the sphere of influence of the traditional colonial Powers, carried out with the assistance of American imperialism, can no longer hold up the growing resistance of the colonial peoples, who are fighting with growing intensity and determination for their national independence. Not only is the United States waging war against the Korean people but, under the Mutual Security Act, it is financing campaigns against the forces of progress throughout the world, and therefore against the national liberation movement. By financing and supplying arms, the United States wages war not only against the Korean people, but also against the peoples of Vietnam, Malaya and other countries. It had therefore become the main force of world reaction in the campaign against the right of peoples to self-determination. The purpose of United States penetration in colonial areas is not only to acquire sources of raw material but also, particularly in recent times, to obtain strategic bases. The colonial Powers, mutually bound by aggressive pacts, are meditating their plans of aggression against the colonies. They see in the dependent countries a reservoir of raw materials and manpower for a future war and are building their military bases against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

219. The peoples of the dependent countries, however, are resolutely opposed to the misuse of their territories for military purposes. They want peace and to be allowed freely to develop their economic, political and cultural life, and they are striving to obtain the

right freely to decide their own fate. The United Nations must help these people to achieve self-government. That is why it is fully consistent with the provisions of the Charter and with resolution B for States which are responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories to submit reports indicating the extent to which the peoples in those Territories enjoy the right of self-determination. The struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for national liberation will put an end to foreign domination, and neither terror, nor repression, nor military measures by the administering Powers can prevent it from becoming ever wider and more intense.

220. The Czechoslovak delegation has always sided with enslaved peoples in their struggle against their oppressors. It has always assisted and continues to assist the efforts of those peoples to achieve national and political independence and autonomy.

221. Although the Czechoslovak delegation did not consider the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly to be completely satisfactory, as it was merely designed to achieve legal equality among peoples, yet its provisions would give practical effect to the principle of the self-determination of peoples; it was therefore an important contribution to the strengthening of peace and security among nations. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A and B as submitted by the Third Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.