

Throughout the Committee discussions the *United States* representative clearly showed his desire that the Committee should limit itself to rejecting the Soviet proposal, without attempting any amendment or substitution. Other representatives, however, considered that some resolution on the subject was called for. Dr Evatt (*Australia*), in particular, insisted that a positive approach was necessary. He felt that the remedy was not the prohibition of propaganda, on pain of criminal penalties, as proposed by the Soviet Union, for this would entail great practical difficulties and might endanger the fundamental right of freedom of expression. Neither was Government control or censorship the remedy. The ideal would be to have many newspapers with full access to news and opinions in their own and other countries so that every responsible view could get a fair hearing.

Dr Evatt then introduced a resolution which covered these points. The *Canadian* representative also introduced a short resolution condemning "all propaganda inciting to aggressive war and civil strife." The *French* representative also introduced a resolution in the same general sense.

Sir Carl Berendsen (*New Zealand*) spoke as follows:—

"The New Zealand delegation considers the resolution propounded by the Soviet Union to be, in the form in which it is presented, wholly unacceptable, and most strongly endorses the point of view in this respect which has been so admirably expressed by the representative of the United States.

"There is, of course, much in the resolution with which neither I nor any other sensible person could think of disagreeing. We are all of us opposed to war-mongering, and with any proper definition of that term we would all of us agree that it behoves every member of the United Nations and every right-thinking person not only to deprecate war-mongering, but to use every possible endeavour to eliminate it.

"But what is it that the delegate of the Soviet Union asks us to accept as 'war-mongering'? And who is it that we are asked to condemn as 'war-mongers'? I think there is some reason to believe that any opposition to Soviet policies is regarded by the Soviet delegation as war-mongering, a conclusion with which they will find very little agreement in this Assembly. And the list of those who are presented to us by Mr Vyshinsky and by other Soviet sources as war-mongers or something similar is obviously such as to call not for agreement, but for derision. I have no intention of going through that list, but let us take, for example, a few of those who have been so distinguished. President Truman, Mr Churchill, Senator Austin, Mr Dulles, and Mr Byrnes are a sufficiently illuminating group. No one who has had the privilege, as I have had, of knowing these gentlemen and their record before the world can possibly believe or have the slightest reason to believe that any one of this group could, by any stretch of imagination or by any perversion of the term 'war-monger,' truthfully be so described. Who is there indeed who would not be proud to have his name associated with that group of peace-loving men?