

States to establish their world dominion. To prove this point Mr Vyshinsky mentioned a number of books, articles, and speeches and named several personalities, including especially James F. Byrnes (formerly Secretary of State of the United States), whose book "Speaking Frankly" was considered by Mr Vyshinsky to be typical of a "provocative attitude" towards the Soviet Union, and also Secretary of Defence Forrestal.

The intention of the "American reactionaries," he continued, was either to allure by economic aid or to subjugate by force. The United States was seeking to secure the kind of peace it wanted by dollars—through the Truman-Marshall plan—and by power—through its military strength and its monopoly of atomic weapons, which it hoped to keep.

Mr Vyshinsky argued that the legal suppression of war propaganda had nothing to do with freedom of the press and opinion, or democratic rights. A free press in civilized and democratic States did not preclude limitations imposed in the interest of society, public morals, and public discipline; and, in fact, in such countries as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and others which opposed the Soviet Union proposal, the press was so restricted. Legislation imposing severe punishments was not considered to violate the freedom of the press in cases where the State intervened to protect public morals.

Mr Austin (*United States*), on the other hand, declared that the Soviet proposal demanded suppression and censorship, which were contrary to the principles of the Charter. Compulsion, force, and penalties must not stand in the way of the free expression of views, he said. Besides, he considered that the proper place for full consideration of the rights and responsibilities of the press and of other means of communication was the Conference on Freedom of Information, which was to open in March, 1948. Mr Austin challenged Mr Vyshinsky's charges against several of the persons and publications which he had cited.

Wherever censorship has been proposed, he said, it had always been aimed at the suppression of bad propaganda. However, the power to suppress bad propaganda had often been used to suppress good propaganda. Whenever censorship was established, some kind of Government agency was empowered to determine whether a publication was for the benefit of the people or not. It should be left to the individual himself to form his own opinion of the truth on the basis of a free flow of information. What would become of freedom if it were left to censors all over the world to determine what is war-mongering and who are war-mongers? According to Mr Austin the Soviet Union proposal diverted attention from the