

*1. Measures to be taken against Propaganda and the Inciters of a New War*

In a fiery speech during the opening debate, Mr. Vyshinsky (Soviet Union) launched an offensive against what he described as "the steadily increasing propaganda of a new war." The main burden of his accusation was directed against the press of the United States, which, he declared, was waging a furious campaign to justify the armaments race which that country had initiated in pursuit of a policy of world domination. Perhaps the most novel feature of the speech was that a number of "capitalist monopolies," "organs of the American reactionary press," and prominent individuals were singled out by name for attack. Mr. Vyshinsky concluded by moving a resolution which called for the condemnation and prohibition of war propaganda (particularly in the United States, Turkey, and Greece) and speedy action on the decisions taken by the Assembly the previous year on the reduction of armaments.

In the First Committee Mr. Vyshinsky's allegations were repeated and supplemented in the most emphatic language by Dr. Bebler (Yugoslavia) and Dr. Manuilsky (Ukrainian S.S.R.). In reply, Mr. Austin (United States) strongly defended the principle of freedom of expression and declared that the Soviet proposal demanded suppression and censorship, which were contrary to the principles of the Charter. Mr. Hector McNeil (United Kingdom) declared that while uncontrolled private arms-manufacture and war propaganda were undoubtedly related, lack of progress on the essential and urgent subject of disarmament had been caused primarily by the attitude of the Soviet Union. He asked why the Soviet resolution had cited only the United States, Turkey, and Greece. Had not intemperate and irresponsible language also been used in Bulgaria, Egypt, and Moscow, and, indeed, in the Assembly itself?

More than twenty other States expressed opposition to the Soviet resolution, in whole or in part. The United States representative clearly showed a desire that the resolution should be rejected outright; other representatives, however, considered that a resolution of some kind on the subject was called for. Dr. Evatt (Australia) in particular insisted on the need for a positive approach. Censorship or the prohibition of propaganda, in his view, would endanger freedom of expression. What was wanted was full access to news and opinion so that every responsible view could get a fair hearing.

Sir Carl Berendsen declared that to New Zealand the form in which the Soviet resolution was presented was wholly unacceptable. While every one was opposed to war mongering, who would agree that such men as President Truman, Mr. Churchill, Senator Austin, Mr. Dulles, and Mr. Byrnes could be described as warmongers in any sense of the term? The New Zealand delegation considered,