



CONTENTS

	Page
Freedom of information: (a) Report of the Rapporteur on Freedom of Information (E/2426 and Add.1 to 3, E/2427 and Add.1 and 2, E/2439 and Add.1, E/2535, E/L.587); (b) Encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises (E/2534); (c) Production and distribution of newsprint and printing paper: report of the Secretary-General under Council resolution 423 (XIV) (E/2543) (continued).....	121

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Chile, Philippines.

The Rapporteur on Freedom of Information.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Freedom of information: (a) Report of the Rapporteur on Freedom of Information (E/2426 and Add.1 to 3, E/2427 and Add.1 and 2, E/2439 and Add.1, E/2535, E/L.587); (b) Encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises (E/2534); (c) Production and distribution of newsprint and printing paper: report of the Secretary-General under Council resolution 423 (XIV) (E/2543) (continued)

[Agenda item 12]

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) observed that the much discussed question of freedom of information affected the highest values of mankind and was therefore bound to arouse the greatest interest. The course modern civilization would take would depend upon its solution.
2. The Rapporteur had presented to the Council a report (E/2426 and Add.1 to 3), the result of a sustained effort deserving of appreciation. However, the fruits of his labour fell short of what the Council had expected when, in its resolution 442 C (XIV), it had decided to entrust a rapporteur with the task of preparing "a substantive report covering major contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information" and of submitting "recommendations regarding practical action which might be taken by the Council".

3. The Rapporteur had started out by presenting, in chapter I, his views on the concept of freedom of information, placing the question in its proper historical perspective. While he had described the movement through which man's simple, natural curiosity had transformed itself through the ages into a noble desire to improve his culture by conquering the truth, he had failed, on the other hand, to show how the Socratic concept of freedom of expression could have led to the concept of information as a commercial enterprise which was prevalent to-day. As long as freedom of information had been an absolute ideal, the slightest restriction placed upon it could rightly have been condemned in its name, but as soon as information became a business, one was on much less solid ground. The newspaper, which had been a sanctuary or forum, had become nothing more than an advertising machine. The privilege of moulding, or even of creating, public opinion now rested with the commercial enterprises.

4. That evolution of the very nature of information shed a new light on the question of freedom of information. The problem was whether absolute freedom of information was consistent with the exercise of that freedom for commercial purposes. The commercial information enterprise in the form of the Press consortium, the news agency, the radio station, for which the transmission of information was no more than a profit-making venture, now separated the source of information from its destination.

5. The Rapporteur seemed not to have taken that basic factor into account, but to have approached his study from a traditional point of view which no longer corresponded to the facts. That was the main failing of the report.

6. But that was not all. Although the Rapporteur's chief task had been to create, through his work, an atmosphere conducive to the adoption of practical measures, he had introduced into his report, thus accepting responsibility for them, statements from certain private groups, including the Freedom of the Press Committee of the Inter-American Press Association, which contained intolerable insults to governments of States Members of the United Nations. That was a serious matter. The Rapporteur, by inserting in his report the findings of the Associated Press or the International Press Institute had, to say the least, committed an error of judgment. Moreover, the information he supplied was at times contradictory. For instance, he stated in one section of the report that there was no censorship in Cuba, and a few pages further on that censorship there was very strict.

7. With regard to the under-developed countries—and he objected to the use of that term in a disparaging sense—the Rapporteur had shown little understanding. Still echoing the views of the aforementioned institutions, he accused those countries of restricting freedom of information but did not take into account the fact that certain restrictions were inevitable in the era of political instability in which most under-developed countries currently found themselves. Even

a traditionally freedom-loving country such as the United Kingdom could be compelled to sacrifice principles to the requirements of public order, as it was doing in Kenya. Neither was France entirely blameless in that respect, as the situation in Tunisia and Morocco showed. He asked by what right, then, the smaller countries which were still in a state of evolution, which had to defend not only their principles but their very existence and which, unlike the more privileged countries, could not afford unrestricted freedom of information, were called to account.

8. The Rapporteur had not approached the problem in the right way. As it stood his report seemed to be the result of what the Venezuelan representative had called a "police investigation". The United Nations could expect a more thorough study of the whole question, which took current realities into account, rather than a series of often unjustified criticisms which could only injure the feelings of governments to the detriment of that atmosphere of harmony which was essential to joint action.

9. He wished also to correct certain incomplete and tendentious data concerning Ecuador contained in chapter V, section C, of the report. Those data, supplied by the Freedom of the Press Committee of the Inter-American Press Association, were no more worthy of credence than the information provided by the Associated Press, another concern which felt that information need not necessarily be based on an actual knowledge of the events and facts reported.

10. The Rapporteur's failure had nothing to do with his moral character which was beyond reproach; it should be ascribed rather to his idea of how the question should be approached and to the form in which he had presented his report. The report was not so much his own as that of the major commercial enterprises. The failure of the initial effort did not prompt his delegation to take an irrevocable position against the appointment of a rapporteur. In its view, the overriding consideration was that the United Nations should continue to give careful consideration to the question of freedom of information. However, he would rather see the task assigned to a committee of the Council or to a small group of experts.

11. Most of Mr. López's proposals were satisfactory but the delegation of Ecuador favoured their adoption in the form suggested by the French delegation. Its draft resolution (E/L.587) contained explicit terms of reference for the rapporteur and would certainly prevent the next report from likewise resembling a police investigation.

12. Ecuador wanted freedom of information but freedom should not serve as a pretext for furthering the interests of large commercial undertakings to the detriment of those of the peoples of the world.

13. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) observed that although the question of freedom of information had been studied by the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations for many years, scarcely any progress had been made. No solution was possible so long as efforts were made to define the concept in abstract terms; the only consideration was the interests of the owners and the personnel of information agencies, and the problem was not dealt with in a comprehensive way, primarily from the standpoint of the interests of the man who read the newspapers, listened

to the radio, attended the cinema or watched television.

14. No action would be effective unless every Member of the United Nations adopted as its chief objective the implementation of the principles of the Charter and the maintenance of international peace and security. It was because the resolutions adopted on the question and the draft convention on freedom of information¹ were not based on those principles that they could not contribute to the solution of the problem of freedom of information.

15. The joy with which millions of people had welcomed the current relaxation of international tension, their desire for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues, which would make possible the peaceful co-existence of all nations, showed that the principles embodied in General Assembly resolution 110 (II) concerning propaganda for war were fully in keeping with the aspirations of mankind and should serve as the basis of any convention on freedom of information.

16. Unfortunately those who had drawn up the draft convention had disregarded those principles; there was, on the contrary, an attempt to conceal behind abstract and high-sounding phrases the desire of some to prevent any action likely to promote real freedom of information. That was convincingly shown by the fact that the Drafting Committee had rejected the USSR proposal which had been animated by the principles of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 110 (II)². That attitude was a reflection of the opposition of certain circles that were trying to involve their countries in war and, in the United States of America, had already secured the adoption of a law aimed at promoting interference in the internal affairs of other sovereign States. Those circles, which interpreted the wishes of powerful economic interests, were not interested in real freedom of information; they sought to obtain unlimited latitude for the provocation and preparation of a new war.

17. It was a tragedy that, in their own countries and sometimes in foreign countries, those financial groups were the sole owners of almost the entire Press and other information media, which they used to further their own interests. Whatever the United States delegation might say, such a situation was incompatible with real freedom of information. The United States representative preferred to raise once again the case of William Oatis, which had nothing to do with the item under consideration since it concerned only that journalist's activities against the Czechoslovak Government which, on Oatis' own admission, constituted violations of Czechoslovak law.

18. It was also that concept of freedom of information which led United States monopolies to persecute all progressive elements in the fields of science and culture. On that subject some very enlightening articles had appeared in the United States Press itself, such as the article in the *New Republic* of 19 June 1953 on the destruction of books considered subversive, or the article by Robert M. Hutchins in the magazine *Look* of 9 March 1954 entitled "Are Our Teachers Afraid to Teach?"

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Annexes*, agenda item 29, document A/AC.42/7, annex.

² *Ibid.*, document A/AC.42/7 (in which the text of the USSR proposal (A/AC.42/L.4/Rev.1) is incorporated).

19. Lies, slanders and distorted facts were other weapons frequently utilized by certain Press agencies. For example, the Government and public opinion of Guatemala had recently been subjected to so many of them that they had had to expel two United States journalists.

20. Such methods could not contribute to the lessening of international tension or the strengthening of peaceful co-operation among nations. That was why a remedy had to be found for the situation.

21. An examination of the report on freedom of information led the Czechoslovak delegation to the conclusion that Mr. López' recommendations (E/2426, chap. VI) contributed nothing to a solution. The Rapporteur used inadmissible language, which had no place in official documents of the Council, to describe the peoples' democracies, to which he variously referred as the "Cominform nations" and "satellites". Such methods showed the spirit in which the report was drafted.

22. It was in chapter V that the author's bias was most apparent. Mr. López noted that there were two basically opposed schools of thought on the question of propaganda for war, and false and distorted information. The first held that the best remedy lay in the fullest and freest possible supply of news and that therefore United Nations action to facilitate the free flow of information was all that was required. The other school asserted that the only remedy lay in the outright suppression of hostile propaganda, and false and distorted information. The Rapporteur recalled, and rightly so, that the latter position had been taken in 1947 by the USSR representative when he had proposed that the governments of all countries be called upon to prohibit, on pain of criminal penalties, war propaganda in any form and to take measures for the prevention and suppression of such propaganda. Instead of confining himself to that objective statement of the facts, the Rapporteur did not hesitate to come out in favour of one of the alternatives by asserting that it was not feasible, for the time being at least, to seek the outright prohibition and suppression of hostile propaganda and of false or distorted information by means of international legislation. In other words, war propaganda could be given a free rein. However, the Rapporteur was aware of the dangers inherent in the situation and therefore suggested in his draft resolution No. 2 (E/2426, chap. VI) that the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace, signed at Geneva in 1936, should be revitalized. The effectiveness of that instrument and the value of revitalizing it were best shown by the fact that the Second World War had broken out less than two years after its entry into force in 1938.

23. The report contained no constructive proposals. For example, draft resolution No. 1, after recalling the difficulties encountered in the drafting of article 2 of the draft convention on freedom of information, recommended the adoption of a general formula, which was no solution at all, since it failed to mention war propaganda and the dissemination of false and distorted information. Moreover, it was proposed to include in the draft convention a clause providing that the contracting parties should meet together five years after its entry into force for the purpose of reviewing article 2 in the light of their experience of its practicability. Thus the solution was postponed once again. The Council had not advanced beyond the situation

that had existed five years before and he saw no need for appointing a new rapporteur.

24. The Czechoslovak delegation would express its views on the other draft resolutions when they were studied in the Social Committee, but meanwhile it wished to draw the Council's attention to the whole-hearted approval that hundreds of millions of honest people had given to the resolutions of the Second Congress of Partisans of Peace, held at Warsaw in 1950, including a resolution on war propaganda. That resolution called upon the parliaments of all countries to enact legislation in defence of peace which would prohibit war propaganda in any form on pain of criminal responsibility. The desire of those millions had found no response in the United Nations in spite of the adoption at the second session of the General Assembly of resolution 110 (II) on measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war. On the contrary, that universal desire for peace had become the target of the attack by Mr. López, who characterized the World Council of Peace as "a Communist-led" organization (E/2426/Add.1, annex B). Only the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, faithful to their peace policy, had adopted laws to protect peace. In Czechoslovakia, any person who attempted to disrupt the peaceful co-existence of peoples was prosecuted by law.

25. The Czechoslovak delegation was convinced that the solution of the problem of freedom of information lay in the adoption of measures likely to ensure that information media would no longer be utilized for war-mongering purposes and would be devoted exclusively to the building of a better future and the struggle for the maintenance of peace.

26. If the United Nations showed itself incapable of acting along those lines, it would disappoint the hopes that hundreds of millions of people still had in the Organization and would fail in its historic mission.

27. The PRESIDENT invited the observer for the Philippines to speak on the question of freedom of information.

28. Mr. REYES (Philippines) pointed out that the report on freedom of information (E/2426) contained two references critical of the Philippines.

29. The first referred to the intimidation of the staff of a newspaper which had published articles alleging that irregularities had been committed during the Presidential election in 1949. He wished to make it clear that the reference was to the act of a local political group condemned by public opinion. It would be unfortunate if the incident was viewed as the result of a deliberately fostered and systematically applied Government policy, but that was what one might infer from a reading of the report. The Philippine delegation considered it most regrettable that the incident should have been reported under the heading "Internal censorship and the suppression and coercion of media of information" (chap. V, section C), which catalogued measures adopted by a number of governments to restrict freedom of information. The reader might be led to think that similar measures restricted freedom of information in the Philippines whereas there were no such restrictions.

30. The second criticism of the Philippines concerned an adverse decision by the Supreme Court against a journalist who had refused to divulge his sources of information. That judgment could not be legally as-

sailed, for while it was true that Philippine law supported the principle that a newspaperman was not compelled to reveal his sources of information, it went on to add: "unless the court . . . finds that such revelation is demanded by the interest of the State." The state of affairs could be remedied only by amending legislation. Congress, with the full support of public opinion, attached such great values to freedom of expression that it had immediately initiated a study of how the law could be amended so that it could not be used arbitrarily to restrict access to sources of information or to endanger free dissemination of information obtained.

31. The supplementary report mentioned the Philippines on several occasions (E/2426/Add.1) but those references merely confirmed the absence of censorship of information media. Other documents relating to item 12 of the agenda recalled the fact that it was the Philippine delegation that had proposed to the General Assembly in 1946 that a conference on freedom of information should be held. That conference had taken place at Geneva in 1948 and had been attended by the representatives of fifty-seven States. The main basis of United Nations action in the field of information since then had consisted of the three draft conventions and forty-three resolutions adopted during that conference³.

32. The Philippine delegation had already made clear its position on many important questions dealt with in the Rapporteur's main recommendations, both in the Council and the General Assembly. It had repeatedly expressed its desire that the final drafting of the convention on freedom of information should be completed with controversial article 2 redrafted if necessary along the lines recommended by the Rapporteur in his draft resolution No. 1 (E/2426, chap. VI). It had also supported the proposal to encourage information personnel to adopt an international code of ethics, and helped to facilitate the extension of certain programmes of technical assistance to under-developed countries in order to assist them to develop their information facilities.

33. The Philippine delegation was also one of those which had opposed the appointment of a rapporteur on freedom of information at the fourteenth session of the Council. Its position had been that the task should be entrusted to a group of experts and not to a single person. However, it considered, like many other delegations, that the Rapporteur had done useful work by providing the United Nations, the governments and the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations with a synthesis of the current situation in the field of freedom of information, an objective evaluation of the successes and failures so far encountered, and constructive suggestions for further action.

34. Among the problems mentioned by the Rapporteur in his report there were two which had particularly concerned the Philippine delegation.

35. The first was the growing need to balance the rights and responsibilities of information organs. At the current time, which might be described as the hydrogen age, it was important that all countries, especially those that had the most powerful information media, should be satisfied with nothing less than the

truth. No longer could anyone afford the luxury of trifling with facts when it only needed a few careless words to unleash a chain reaction of misunderstanding, fear and hysteria which might lead to a war of extinction.

36. The second was the increasing importance of developing information media in under-developed countries. International understanding, indispensable to the peace of the world, was a matter of reciprocity. It was becoming more and more unsatisfactory that the flow of information should be in one direction only. Like any free society, the community of nations could expand only if all its members were equally free to make their voices heard. It was undoubtedly a good thing that the voice of the West should reach Asia, but it would be much better if the voice of Asia could reach the West with equal force and clarity. Out of such a dialogue between East and West might arise real understanding among peoples, the only guarantee of a better future.

37. The Philippine delegation was thus pleased to note the importance attached by the Rapporteur to the development of information media in the under-developed countries. It believed with the Indian and Yugoslav delegations that a major effort was required in that field, and it had looked forward eagerly to the recommendations to be submitted on that subject. It was not of great importance whether such recommendations came from a committee of the Council, as some had suggested, or from the Rapporteur himself, if the Council decided to continue his mandate. The important thing was that they should be brought forward without delay.

38. Freedom of information had indeed been the subject of numberless discussions, and it was time to take action. The matter was too important to remain shelved among the unfinished business of the United Nations and deserved something more than pious phrases.

39. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to submit his observations on the matter before the Council.

40. Mr. BEHRSTOCK (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) wished to furnish some information on the contribution made by UNESCO to the preparation of the report on freedom of information (E/2426) and the Secretary-General's report on the encouragement and development of independent domestic enterprises (E/2534).

41. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had been very pleased to place at the disposal of the Rapporteur and Secretary-General all the information it possessed on the matters dealt with in those two reports and to note that the authors of those studies had clearly indicated the extent of its contribution with regard to certain aspects of freedom of information, a contribution which was of course due from it by virtue of the provisions of its Constitution. At its first and at succeeding sessions the UNESCO General Conference had adopted a series of resolutions to translate into a positive action programme the obligations it had assumed under its Constitution. One of the main features of that programme was that UNESCO had firmly decided to join its efforts to those of the United Nations in order to co-operate in the development of freedom of informa-

³ See *Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information* held at Geneva, Switzerland, from 23 March to 21 April 1948 (E/CONF.6/79).

tion, and it had collaborated in organizing the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information held in 1948 and had taken part in the work of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press ever since that Sub-Commission had been set up.

42. When it had been decided to terminate the terms of reference of the Sub-Commission and to appoint a rapporteur, the latter had been specially invited to obtain the assistance of UNESCO. The Council had also associated UNESCO with the task entrusted to the Secretary-General of examining suitable measures for the encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises.

43. The UNESCO General Conference had instructed the UNESCO secretariat to co-operate unreservedly in those two tasks. Within the limits of its resources UNESCO would continue in 1954 to give the Council all the assistance it might require.

44. With regard to the future, the UNESCO General Conference would be asked to adopt a programme and budget for 1955 and 1956 at its next session in November. Continuing the policy so far followed, the Director-General of UNESCO had already provided for the continuation of help to the United Nations in the field of freedom of information in the draft programme to be submitted to the General Conference. He would also be pleased to submit to the General Conference any decision affecting UNESCO which the Council might take at the end of the current discussion so that the future work of UNESCO in that field would take full account of the desires of the Economic and Social Council.

45. The PRESIDENT invited the observer for Chile to speak.

46. Mr. MELO LECAROS (Chile) pointed out that the supplementary report submitted by Mr. López (E/2426/Add.1) contained some incorrect references to Chile. The Chilean delegation proposed to reply in writing to the Rapporteur's allegations so that the members of the Council would have a correct idea of the situation in Chile.

47. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that Mr. López' report had been criticized from all sides and that its only defender had been the United States of America. That was understandable, for the Rapporteur, instead of dealing with the problem in an objective way and with all the conscientiousness that the terms of reference given him by the United Nations demanded, had produced a work which was a mediocre repetition of the opinions of information monopolies, mostly American, such as the Associated Press, the United Press and the International News Agency. He had not even taken the trouble to collate the information supplied by those agencies with that obtained from the countries he had criticized.

48. It might be thought at first sight that the Rapporteur had endeavoured to examine all the problems arising in the field of information, but it quickly became clear that his chief aim had been to comply with the wishes of the monopolists concerned and that he had merely reproduced their point of view in order to lead the United Nations to adopt it.

49. That attitude was in contradiction with the purposes and principles of the United Nations as set forth in Article 1 of the Charter: to maintain international

peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations and to achieve international co-operation. In that connexion, resolution 110 (II) should be remembered, in which the General Assembly had condemned all forms of propaganda likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace and requested the Government of each Member State to take appropriate steps to promote, by all means of publicity and propaganda available to them, friendly relations among nations and to encourage the dissemination of all information designed to give expression to the undoubted desire of all peoples for peace. The provisions of the Charter and the General Assembly's resolution clearly showed the essential principles by which States Members of the United Nations should be guided in solving the problem of freedom of information. On the one hand, they should promote the dissemination of true and authentic news likely to strengthen peace and friendly relations among peoples, and on the other hand to combat all nazi, fascist, racist and other propaganda liable to threaten peace and friendly relations between peoples.

50. The Rapporteur had deliberately avoided the real problem. When he had tried to define freedom of information, he had not realized that such liberty existed only where it furthered the cause of peace, and that there could be no question of freedom when that information was used to disseminate war-mongering propaganda. Neither had he thought of finding out who were the owners of information media in countries which were supposed to have freedom of information.

51. On the contrary, it was clear that he had wanted to present a favourable picture of the situation existing in certain countries, especially the United States of America, and through the use of lies and slander to paint a dark picture of the situation in the USSR and the peoples' democracies.

52. If he had wanted to be objective, he would have examined the USSR Constitution and could have seen that under the law, every citizen was guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly and freedom of street processions and demonstrations, and that those civil rights were ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communication facilities and other material requisites for the exercise of those rights. In the USSR any group of citizens, any scientific, sports or other institution, any collective or State farm could have its own newspaper. In 1953, over 8,000 newspapers with a total circulation of over 41 million had been published. Apart from that, hundreds of magazines and other periodicals were published in all the languages of the Soviet Union; thousands of the country's factories, plants, educational establishments, enterprises and institutions had their own newspapers. The Rapporteur had not taken any of those facts into account.

53. He asserted that the Soviet Press was a State monopoly, but that very choice of words revealed the source to which he owed his statement. It had been quite ridiculous for him to allege that freedom of criticism was limited, since one had only to open a Soviet newspaper to see numerous criticisms with respect to shortcomings in production or the incompetence of this or that person, as well as concerning economic, scientific and other developments. Naturally they did not contain sensational items because Soviet

newspapers did not sell their articles as did the capitalist Press. Neither were they the echo of their masters' voice. While in the USSR the Press belonged to millions of workers, labourers and peasants, in the United States of America it was the millionaires who selected news. The Rapporteur had not questioned the right of the Hearst group or the Associated Press to process news and to publish only what they wanted. Every day there could be found in the Hearst Press, lies, slander and war slogans which only misled and poisoned public opinion. In that connexion he read out several significant titles of articles which had appeared in American newspapers, and stated that it was impossible to find articles of that type in the Soviet Press.

54. The Rapporteur had incorrectly described the condition of foreign correspondents in the USSR when he had alleged that it was increasingly difficult for them to enter the USSR and to do their own work properly after their admission. No obstacles were placed in the way of the movements of foreign correspondents in the Soviet Union. He recalled that at the end of 1953 and the beginning of 1954 two groups of American journalists had paid a long visit to the Soviet Union. During the period from January 1953 to February 1954 there had been fifty foreign correspondents in the USSR, not to mention business representatives and representatives of sports organizations, who had received all necessary travel authorizations. The real difficulty faced by American correspondents was not in obtaining a USSR visa but rather in obtaining a United States passport; it was well known that passports issued by the United States were valid for all countries with the exception of the USSR and the peoples' democracies, in the case of which special permission was necessary.

55. The Rapporteur's report even contained obvious untruths, such as his allegation that Soviet citizens could not speak to foreigners. That statement was so ridiculous and so unfounded that it would have been unworthy of mention if it had not appeared in a United Nations document.

56. Moreover, he had exceeded his terms of reference when he had mentioned the fact that the USSR was not taking part in the work of certain specialized agencies. That was a question which had nothing to do with freedom of information.

57. In short, he had tried to fill his report with as many slanderous statements as possible in order to please American monopolies. He had tried to escape his responsibility by publishing the memorandum of the International Press Institute in the annex of his

report, but that had only served to bring out his unfairness.

58. Lastly, the Rapporteur had not hesitated to alter the official name of the peoples' democracies, which he called "the Cominform countries" or the "satellites" behind the "iron curtain". Those were terms used by the American Press as a psychological weapon in the "cold war", and it was inadmissible that they should appear in a United Nations Document. He (Mr. TSARAPKIN) protested most vigorously against that procedure, which was one more proof of the Rapporteur's partiality.

59. The Rapporteur had not examined the substance of the question of freedom of information. He had based his report on the differences existing between countries where information media were in the hands of powerful monopolies, and others where, as a result of a revolution, capitalist enterprises had been replaced by public bodies that severed the interests of the people and he had done that in such a way as to imply that freedom of information existed in the former group of countries.

60. When he had examined the question of freedom of information in the United States of America, the United Kingdom or France, he had not mentioned the fact that information media were controlled by plutocratic circles which utilized them for war-mongering. Under the United States Constitution, every citizen had the right to publish a newspaper, but since that required a capital of several million dollars, the Press was, as a result, concentrated in the hands of a few millionaires who enforced their desires and imposed their points of view. The Hutchins report drew attention to the reduction in the number of newspapers in the United States, where independent publishers were absorbed by the large monopolies. That report also pointed out that 40 per cent of the newspapers had no competition to cope with, and that the circulation of newspapers owned by fourteen persons, represented 25 per cent of the total circulation, which meant that those persons were able to mould the opinion of a quarter of the population of the United States. Similarly, sources of information were in the hands of three Press agencies, which belonged to the owners of newspaper enterprises. Under those conditions, it could well be asked where freedom of information came in.

61. On account of the late hour, he suggested postponing the rest of his statement until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.