



Saturday, 18 November 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Freedom of information (*continued*)

- (c) Question of the freedom of information and of the Press in times of emergency: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 C (XI) (A/1397) (*concluded*) 293
- (b) Interference with radio signals: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 B (XI) (A/1397 and A/C.3/L.112) (*continued*) 293

Chairman: Mr. G. J. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (Netherlands).

Freedom of information (*continued*)

[Item 30]*

(c) Question of the freedom of information and of the Press in times of emergency: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 C (XI) (A/1397) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the speakers whose names were on the list to explain their vote on the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting.
2. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) said his delegation had had to abstain in the voting, although resolution 306 C (XI) contained principles which his country supported. The terminology used in the text was at once too vague and too wide as, for example, in the case of the words "when they are compelled . . ." and the words "measures . . . shall be taken only in the most exceptional circumstances . . .".
3. He doubted whether the resolution made any real contribution to the progress towards freedom of information.
4. Mr. MOOLMAN (Union of South Africa) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting because in a time of national crisis and emergency the State was the sole judge with regard to the adoption of measures to restrict freedom of information. The resolution gave proof of the best of intentions but it did not take account of actual facts, and therefore its effectiveness was open to doubt. He pointed out that the Union of South Africa had passed through such periods of emergency but had never resorted to measures other than voluntary censorship.

5. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said that explanations of the voting were generally necessary because delegations had had some difficulty in determining their attitude and deciding how to vote. In the case under consideration, however, his delegation had, on the contrary, experienced no difficulty whatsoever, for its attitude with regard to the resolution proposed by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 306 C (XI) was a direct consequence to the Belgian Constitution of 1830. According to article 18 of that Constitution, the Press was free, and censorship could never be introduced. That provision, which at the time had seemed revolutionary, could still be considered very liberal and progressive.

6. Mr. MARIN (France) said his delegation had originally intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution but, since the adoption of various amendments had introduced an element of uncertainty into the text and altered its original meaning, it had been obliged to abstain.

(b) Interference with radio signals: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 B (XI) (A/1397 and A/C.3/L.112) (*continued*)

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of the draft resolution submitted by Chile at the 317th meeting concerning interference with radio signals (A/C.3/L.112).
8. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said the question of interference with radio signals, which had been discussed at the fourth session of the Sub-Commission on the Freedom of Information and of the Press and at the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council, and which was currently

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

being discussed in the Third Committee, had been introduced by the United States of America. That country wished to assure itself of the support of the United Nations in order to continue its propaganda campaign against certain Member States. That was the precise aim of the Chilean delegation, when, at the instigation of the United States of America, it had submitted to the Third Committee the draft resolution concerning interference with radio signals.

9. Ruling circles in the United States of America were attempting to intensify their propaganda to other countries and to develop their network of radio broadcasts in order to disarm the people morally, to weaken the democratic camp and to inspire distrust of the USSR.

10. The importance attached by the United States to that psychological weapon had been stressed when a Department of Psychological Warfare had been set up under the State Department to draw up a general plan for the propaganda campaign and co-ordinate the propaganda activities of the States signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty.

11. Apart from the British Broadcasting Corporation, many stations, for example stations in Italy, Turkey, France, Greece and Western Germany, reserved a large proportion of their broadcasts for American propaganda. With regard to Germany, whereas in the Eastern Zone broadcasting was placed at the disposal of the national population, in the Western sector the stations were instruments of American propaganda.

12. The United States which, through its "Voice of America" programme, had short wave broadcasts in over thirty languages, and which had twenty-three broadcasting stations in Western Germany, had sabotaged the Copenhagen convention on the assignment of wave-lengths. It had also violated the Cairo convention, for American stations broadcast on wave-lengths assigned to other countries or on wave-lengths which had not been assigned at all. Thus, in broadcasts to the people of the Soviet Union in their own language, the United States used twenty-two priority wave-lengths which had been assigned to the USSR.

13. It might indeed be said that the United States of America had declared radio war on the democracies. It was attempting to give an artificial and touched-up picture of its country, and abstained from mentioning, for example, the discriminatory laws and practices against coloured people in many of its states. He gave several relevant examples. Moreover, the United States issued tendentious and slanderous news on life in other countries. It presented the national policy of the USSR in an absolutely false light, and attempted, in its broadcasts to Eastern Europe, to set the peoples of those countries against the Soviet Union.

14. He denounced intervention by the United States in the life of other peoples. As an example, he quoted American broadcasts made at the time of the elections to the legislature in Italy, Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary.

15. But the people to whom those broadcasts were addressed knew very well where they came from. They were not unaware that the "Voice of America" willingly placed its microphones at the disposal of traitors and renegades. That explained the scant success of the broadcasts.

16. It was, indeed, because of the difficulties with which it was meeting, and not because of interference, that the United States had felt it necessary to raise the question in the General Assembly of the United Nations in order to cloak itself in its authority. The Organization should not be the dupe of those dishonest machinations. The draft resolution submitted to the Third Committee was in contradiction to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Every people had the right to defend itself against the false news issued by the United States under its propaganda system.

17. His delegation considered that adoption of the Chilean draft resolution would in no way contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security but, on the contrary, would introduce an element of discord between peoples. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

18. AZMI Bey (Egypt) remarked that some representatives had attributed the initiative for the draft resolution under consideration to the United States. In reality the initiative had been taken by the Sub-Commission on the Freedom of Information and of the Press, the members of which were all experts appointed in their personal capacity and not as representatives of governments. When Mr. Binder, who was a national of the United States, had submitted his draft resolution, he had done so in his own name and not as representative of the United States.

19. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the statements made and the course of the discussion since the 317th meeting compelled him to speak a second time on the question under consideration.

20. Some representatives, including those of the United States and Lebanon, had maintained that the USSR had not respected the principles of freedom of information because it had interfered with radio signals.

21. The whole question depended on the definition of "freedom of information". If, as those representatives appeared to believe, it means the right to transmit any kind of information, then it included the right to publish the most untruthful and slanderous information and information likely to endanger the cause of peace and impair friendly relations between peoples. Fascist or nazi propaganda and propaganda of racial or national hatred would have to be admitted.

22. The Lebanese representative had said (317th meeting) that the psychological war must be encouraged under the pretext that it might contribute to greater understanding between the peoples. The USSR, for its part, felt that psychological warfare was the prelude to actual war. It thought that the true partisans of peace should take measures to put an end to that psychological warfare, which was contrary to the vital interests of all the peoples.

23. Representatives of the Soviet Union had several times repeated in the United Nations that the principle of freedom of information was no excuse for propaganda in favour of a new war, or fascist or nazi propaganda. Moreover the General Assembly, at its second session, had adopted its resolution 110 (II) inviting Member States to take measures to combat propaganda for a new war and to contribute to the strengthening of friendly relations between the peoples by diffusing information of a peaceful nature.

24. It was obvious from the foregoing that any theory that freedom of information consisted in diffusing any information whatsoever was radically mistaken. It would be equally unsound to rely on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to justify such a theory.

25. The representatives of the United States, Lebanon, the United Kingdom and others had said that the USSR had interfered with certain broadcasts from the United States and the United Kingdom and had concluded that that country had rendered itself guilty of infringement of the principle of freedom of information. That allegation was false. It was not only the right but also the duty of every State to take measures to defend itself against certain propaganda. Any aggression, of any nature whatever, should be condemned and repelled.

26. The only means of removing the interference in question was to put an end to all hostile propaganda. It was obvious that if the attitude of all countries were correct and friendly, it would not be necessary to interfere with radio signals.

27. His delegation felt that adoption of the Chilean draft resolution would be a boon to the instigators of psychological warfare and would not contribute to the maintenance of peace. It would vote against the draft resolution.

28. Mr. KOUSSOFF (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said the question of interference with radio signals was one of those which the ruling circles in the United States insisted on bringing before the United Nations in order to obtain the Organization's support for its imperialist policy.

29. The object of that attempt was to prepare a climate favourable to a third world war. The United States delegation had said nothing about the substance of the question. It had not explained why the United States radio broadcasts were unacceptable in democratic countries. It had confined itself to asserting that its country enjoyed the benefits of freedom of expression and that the sole aim of the radio broadcasts was to describe life in the United States of America.

30. Obviously, if that were true, the governments concerned would not have had to take measures against the United States radio broadcasts. By contrast, to form an opinion of the freedom of opinion and broadcasting allegedly prevailing in the United States, it was only necessary to refer to the statements published in an article in the magazine *New Republic* of 27 May 1950. He quoted passages from that article showing that liberal commentators were being systematically dropped from the programmes of certain United States radio broadcasting stations for the sole reason that they had taken part in a meeting of progressives or a peace congress or had expressed themselves as somewhat less than enthusiastic about the policy of General Mac Arthur. Freedom of opinion did not in fact exist in the United States, because the information media were in the hands of certain groups which decided arbitrarily what the public should or should not know. The news material broadcast on such a basis was replete with lies and slanders.

31. He asked the members of the Committee how some of them could be surprised and hurt by the fact that peoples defended themselves against such lies. The

broadcasting of such lies was hardly compatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. If the facts were examined, it was impossible to assert, as the representative of the United States had asserted at the 317th meeting, that the broadcasts directed to the USSR and the peoples' democracies were peace-loving or harmless and that their sole aim was to give a picture of life in the United States of America. On 18 August 1950, twenty-eight United States senators had demanded that psychological warfare against the Soviet Union should be waged more vigorously. The broadcasts of the "Voice of America" were merely a weapon in psychological warfare, an instrument in the campaign against the democracies, against peace and against the maintenance of friendly relations between States.

32. For those reasons the Byelorussian delegation was opposed to the Chilean draft resolution and would vote against it. It believed that that text was inconsistent with resolution 127 (II) of the General Assembly, which laid down the essential principle that news should be honest and accurate and without malicious intent.

33. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation, together with those of India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Mexico and the Philippines, was submitting amendments to the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.112).

34. It was proposed that a fourth paragraph should be added to the preamble, to read as follows:

"Considering that peace amongst nations rests on the goodwill of all peoples and governments and that tolerance and understanding are prerequisites for establishing goodwill in the international field,"

and that a further paragraph should be added after the final paragraph of the operative part, to read as follows:

"Invites all governments to refrain from such radio broadcasts as would offend the sensibilities of the peoples everywhere, and in so doing conform strictly to an ethical conduct in the interests of world peace by reporting facts truly and objectively".

35. The reason for submitting those amendments was that the major Powers, as he had been able to ascertain from personal experience, employed radio broadcasting for propaganda purposes and to make unkind remarks about one another. The smaller nations did not wish to become involved in any ideological struggle, whatever its nature. If the Third Committee and the General Assembly decided to request the major Powers to endeavour to disseminate their culture, art and literature and refrain from insisting upon their political interests, they would be rendering a great service to the cause of peace.

36. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that her delegation would vote against the practice of jamming and interference with radio broadcasts without any reservation whatever. It had agreed to act as co-sponsor of the joint amendments just submitted—which should serve as guiding principles for radio broadcasts—because foreign stations, broadcasting distorted reports, could be heard in Iraq.

37. Mrs. MENON (India) observed that the debate had brought out two positions clearly: the desire of certain countries to broadcast news material of any kind

whatever freely and the reluctance of others to permit radio broadcasts which they deemed biased to enter their territory.

38. The smaller nations were in a difficult position, because although they believed in freedom of information, they also believed in the necessity for the elimination of propaganda. If the Indian delegation had been really convinced that the enormous sums spent on radio broadcasting by the major Powers had been destined solely to disseminate their culture, it would not have associated itself with others in submitting the joint amendments. Most of the news material broadcast, however, was not information but propaganda. That was the reason why the new governments in the Far East ought to have the right to organize their own radio broadcasting services in such a way as to avoid giving hostile propaganda free range. Once propaganda had been identified and eliminated, there was no reason to oppose freedom of information, because the only way to restore confidence was to give every country an opportunity of knowing what was happening in other countries.

39. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) observed that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation dealt solely with interference with radio signals, whereas the amendments introduced a new idea connected with the actual nature of the radio broadcasts.

40. He thought a recommendation on those lines should be drawn up, but to submit it as an amendment to his own draft resolution would be tantamount to merging two different ideas and would prolong the debate.

41. Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) said that his delegation, while appreciating the soundness of the reasons behind the joint amendments, would prefer to support the original proposal made by the Chilean representative, namely, that the Committee should first dispose of the specific question of jamming, as dealt with in the Economic and Social Council resolution.

42. If the sponsors of the amendments insisted on maintaining their position, they might consider it appropriate to prepare a separate draft resolution. The matter of jamming of radio signals presented a well-defined subject; the joint amendments covered a much wider and more complex concept, which the Committee should not be asked to rule upon in the current debate.

43. Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) thought that the joint amendments would link two different matters and would place difficulties in the way of the adoption of the Chilean draft resolution.

44. It would be preferable, in his opinion, to adhere to the original text and make the joint amendments into a separate draft resolution.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) regretted that the amendments could not be made into a draft resolution; it would weaken their meaning. It was the attacks broadcast by certain Powers which provided other Powers with the pretext for interference with radio signals. The amendments were based upon the concurrent presence of the two sets of circumstances. They would be more justified if they were linked with resolution 306 B (XI) of the Economic and Social Council than if they were submitted as a separate draft resolution.

46. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) agreed with the Saudi Arabian representative. Obviously, interference with radio signals was a reprehensible practice, but it was to be regretted that biased broadcasts could be used as a pretext to justify it. The purpose of the joint amendments was to supplement the Chilean draft resolution and to protect smaller countries, which had no means of defending themselves against propaganda broadcasts, against the major Powers, which had powerful broadcasting stations at their disposal. The two questions—that of interference and that of the nature of the broadcasts—were inseparably related to the interests of the world and of peace.

47. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that although two separate ideas were involved, they were interrelated. In the opinion of the USSR delegation their relation was that of cause and effect: even if that opinion were not shared, it must be taken into account. He stressed that the link between the two questions would not vanish if they were dealt with in two separate resolutions.

48. He would prefer that method because he feared that the world would interpret a single resolution dealing both with the accuracy of information and with the jamming of broadcasts as justifying such interference whenever the jammed broadcasts were tendentious or contrary to truth. Nothing should, however, justify the lamentable practice of interfering with radio broadcasts.

49. His delegation had expressed its desire to take part in any action by the General Assembly intended to reduce the volume of false or distorted information. But, with the best will, it could not entirely support the joint amendments, which went beyond what the United Nations could do while still properly preserving freedom of information. The joint amendments contained such terms as “sensibilities of peoples” and “ethical conduct” which were not only very vague but might have dangerous consequences. The United Nations had given its attention to the question before and had adopted positive texts, such as resolution 127 (II) of the General Assembly and resolution 2 of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information (E/Conf.6/79, page 22). The joint amendments added nothing to those texts.

50. It was proposed to invite the governments “to refrain from . . . radio broadcasts . . .”. He felt bound to point out that, in some countries, the Press and radio were private undertakings not subject to government control. The adoption of that provision would be tantamount to inviting governments to establish such control where it did not exist, to the detriment of freedom of information.

51. In order to remedy those weaknesses and while fully preserving the guiding idea of the joint amendments, he proposed that the Committee should deal with the question of the accuracy of information in a separate resolution which would retain the preamble proposed by the sponsors of the joint amendments and would be followed by the following text:

“Recalling its resolution 127 (II) and the resolution No. 2 adopted by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information held in Geneva from 23 March to 21 April 1948,

“Invites all Member Governments to take the necessary steps within their competence to prevent

the diffusion of false or distorted reports likely to injure friendly relations between States.”

52. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) preferred a single resolution which would not only confront the United Nations with the problem of interference with radio broadcasts—which was a complex problem, and the virtual monopoly of frequencies exercised by certain Powers was not one of its least serious aspects—but which would also attempt to protect all countries from the harmful effects of radio propaganda in order to avoid possible recourse to the hateful practice of jamming.

53. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) explained that he had originally had objections of principle to the amendments and had feared that the Committee could not adopt such amendments after the statements made by the USSR and Polish representatives. Since the sponsors had, however, affirmed that their amendments were not due to the accusations made by certain delegations, he was willing to incorporate them, with certain changes, in his draft resolution.

54. He accepted the text of the new preamble.

55. He believed, however, that the phrase “as would offend the sensibilities of peoples everywhere” in the last paragraph was vague and not strong enough to condemn any broadcasts. He therefore suggested that it should be replaced by the following: “that would mean unfair attacks or offensive slanders against other peoples anywhere”.

56. He also proposed the addition, after the paragraph proposed by the sponsors of the joint amendments, of a new and last paragraph with the following text:

“Invites also Member States to give every possible facility so that the people may know objectively the activities of the United Nations in promoting peace and in particular to facilitate the reception and transmission of the United Nations official broadcasts.”

57. Mr. DE MARCHENA Y DUJARRIC (Dominican Republic) congratulated the Chilean representative on his decision.

58. He himself also believed that the problems raised by radio broadcasts formed an indivisible whole, as the Mexican representative had said when speaking of the virtual monopolies of frequencies.

59. He would, however, remind the Chilean representative that, in law, slander was always offensive. He would therefore ask the Chilean representative to agree to the deletion of the word “offensive” from the fourth paragraph of the operative part of the new text.

60. His delegation was the more willing to accept the fifth paragraph which Mr. Santa Cruz had proposed to add to the operative part of the draft resolution since it was in conformity with the policy followed by the Dominican Republic, where the official United Nations broadcasts were faithfully re-broadcast every day.

61. Mr. RODRIGUEZ ARIAS (Argentina) also welcomed the decision of the Chilean representative, which enabled him to vote unreservedly and without any doubts for the revised text of the original draft resolution on interference with signals (A/C.3/L.112), the principle of which he approved altogether.

62. Miss SUDIRDJO (Indonesia) thanked the Chilean representative for the goodwill with which he had

received the joint amendments. She accepted the paragraph proposed by the Chilean representative.

63. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) argued strenuously in favour of using the word “sensibilities” in the text: it might be applicable to certain commentaries which, while not really unfair or slanderous, were nevertheless likely—among other effects—to stir up racial prejudices.

64. Mr. EREN (Turkey) said he would have preferred the original text of the draft resolution which had censured, as it ought to, the practice of interference, whereas the draft resolution as altered by the amendments was becoming vague and unprecise. If, however, the original text was no longer before the Committee, he would prefer the new version proposed by the Chilean representative.

65. Mrs. SAMPSON (United States of America) approved the modifications proposed by the Chilean representative and hoped that the sponsors of the joint amendments would accept them.

66. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) said he would have preferred to see the two different ideas reflected in two separate resolutions. On the one hand, interference should be eliminated even if intended to blanket mendacious broadcasts, while, on the other, it was obvious that mendacious broadcasts should be penalized. He had already stated at the 318th meeting that while he was in favour of penalties, he could not agree to jamming in any circumstances.

67. Complaints from the State concerned might be filed with an organ of the United Nations instructed to study the facts whenever a case was referred to it. Under a procedure to be agreed upon, that organ might force guilty stations to broadcast corrections of their own mendacious reports.

68. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) suggested that it would be advisable to request the Committee to decide whether to adopt a single draft resolution embodying both ideas or two separate draft resolutions.

69. Mr. DE MARCHENA Y DUJARRIC (Dominican Republic), remarking that the Committee was caught in a vicious circle, moved the adjournment.

70. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for adjournment to the vote.

The motion was rejected by 19 votes to 17.

71. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) thanked the Chilean representative for his willingness to include most of the joint amendments in his draft resolution.

72. He would, however, press the Committee to vote on the words “or which would offend their sensibilities” as an amendment to be inserted in the fourth paragraph of the operative part of the revised text between the words “anywhere” and “and, in so doing”.

73. He explained that he considered some such qualifying clause indispensable if it was intended to avoid such deplorable situations as that experienced by the Arab peoples for three years owing to reports in the world Press which were not only erroneous but also tactless.

74. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) also thanked the Chilean representative for his response to the joint amendments and for the improvements which he had made.

75. She would stress that the sources of false or distorted reports which the new text was meant to condemn were not those denounced during the debate by the various delegations which had opposed adoption of the original Chilean draft resolution. She was glad to note that most delegations had not misconstrued the intentions of the sponsors of the joint amendments and had understood that the apprehensions underlying those amendments did not in any way weaken their opposition to the principle of interference.

76. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that with the Chilean representative's acceptance of the joint amendments the procedural situation had changed.

77. He therefore proposed, as a formal amendment, that the last paragraph of the text which he had proposed earlier in the meeting should be substituted for the fourth paragraph of the operative part of the revised joint amendment.

78. He could not, unfortunately, agree to the Saudi Arabian representative's amendment to the fourth paragraph of the operative part, although, as representative of an Arab country, he was well aware of all the harm done to the Arab peoples by the slander campaigns of the foreign Press and radio. He shared Mr. Baroody's indignation and desire to avoid a recurrence of such a situation, but he could not accept such a vague expression as "the sensibilities of peoples", which could all too easily be abused by governments wishing to limit freedom of information within their territories.

79. Mr. KHOCHBIN (Iran), as one of the authors of the joint amendments, said he would not press for inclusion of that expression in the draft resolution.

80. Mr. BRAÑA (Cuba) noted that it was very difficult to decide on proposals which were not circulated in written form. The new draft which had, rather unexpectedly, been presented to the Committee not only expanded the original Chilean draft, but, in certain respects, changed its character.

81. He thought that delegations should be given more time before the vote was taken so that they might make sure, in particular, that the text would not be used as a pretext for censorship.

82. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) reassured the Cuban representative on that score. He recalled that the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information had defined the rare cases in which censorship could be applied in time of peace.

83. The representative of CUBA having stated that he would not press his point, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Lebanese amendment to the fourth paragraph of the operative part of the revised text.

84. Upon a proposal by Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) agreed to submit his text as an addition, rather than as a substitution to the fourth paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution.

The addition to the text proposed by the Lebanese representative was rejected by 12 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the Saudi Arabian delegation to insert, in

the fourth paragraph of the operative part, the words "or which would offend their sensibilities" between the words "anywhere" and "and, in so doing".

The amendment was rejected by 16 votes to 13, with 15 abstentions.

86. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean draft resolution in its final form.

87. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that as his delegation was opposed to the draft resolution as a whole, he would abstain from voting on the amendments.

88. Mr. ROY (Haiti) asked for a vote by parts.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 36 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

89. Mr. BRAÑA (Cuba) requested that a roll-call vote should be taken on the first paragraph of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

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

Abstaining: Pakistan.

The first paragraph of the operative part was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 1 abstention, 16 delegations not being represented at the time of the vote.

90. Mr. BRAÑA (Cuba) asked that a roll-call vote should also be taken on the second paragraph of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

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

Abstaining: Israel, Pakistan, Yugoslavia.

The second paragraph of the operative part was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions, 16 delegations not being represented at the time of the vote.

The third paragraph of the operative part was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph of the operative part was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph of the operative part was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

91. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Chile (A/C.3/L.112) as a whole, as revised.

The draft resolution was adopted by 39 votes to 5.

The meeting rose at 2.55 p.m.