

44 .F 76/1: Un 35/10

9694
F-76/1
Un 35/10

UNESCO AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

GOVERNMENT

Storage

DOCUMENTS

OCT 4 1979

FARRELL LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 19, 1979

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1979

50-080

KSU LIBRARIES



✓
A11900 913976

10/28/61 : 1/10/7. AY

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DONALD J. PEASE, Ohio
DAN MICA, Florida
MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland
WILLIAM H. GRAY III, Pennsylvania
TONY P. HALL, Ohio
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi
FLOYD J. FITHIAN, Indiana

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JOEL PRITCHARD, Washington
MILICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana

JOHN J. BRADY, Jr., *Chief of Staff*
SANDRA P. REINHARDT, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

DON BONKER, Washington, *Chairman*

TONY P. HALL, Ohio
FLOYD J. FITHIAN, Indiana
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana

ALAN E. VAN EGMOND, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
LAWRENCE B. SULC, *Minority Staff Consultant*
CAROLE A. GRUNBERG, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
FARIBORZ S. FATEMI, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

	Page
Hon. John E. Reinhardt, Director, International Communication Agency--	2
George A. Dalley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.....	6
Glen O. Robinson, chairman, U.S. delegation to the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference.....	14
Elie Abel, Harry and Norman Chandler professor of communication, Stanford University, and member of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, UNESCO.....	29
Jerry W. Friedheim, executive vice president and general manager, American Newspaper Publishers Association.....	46

APPENDIXES

1. Chronological highlights of "World Information Order" issues in international organizations: 1946-79.....	61
2. Text of draft declaration on fundamental principles concerning the contribution of the mass media to strengthening peace and international understanding, the promotion of human rights and to countering racialism, apartheid and incitement to war, UNESCO General Conference Twentieth Session, Paris, 1978.....	63
3. Statement of the Representative of UNESCO, Leon Davico, Director of the Office of Public Information at the Committee to Review United Nations Public Information Policies and Activities.....	67

UNESCO AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1979

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:20 p.m. in room 2255, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tony P. Hall presiding.

Mr. HALL. I think we will start as a "committee of one," and in just a few moments the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Bonker, will pop in and chair the rest of the meeting.

As far as introduction to this meeting, it is relative to the subject of flow of information across national borders, and this free flow of information has been debated in different U.N. forums since the U.N.'s creation. In the last decade, the idea of a new "World Information Order" has received increased attention, particularly in UNESCO, and it has become an important topic of discussion on the new world economic order.

In November 1978, UNESCO's 20th general conference adopted by consensus a declaration on mass media.¹ The U.S. delegation was very successful and negotiated a consensus which addressed some legitimate Third World concerns about international news flow and at the same time sacrificed nothing that would inhibit press freedom.

The purpose of the hearing of the subcommittee of International Organizations is to examine major issues involved in the new world information order, particularly stemming from last year's UNESCO General Conference, to assess the U.S. position, the position of other country groupings, and implications for the United States of the new world information order, and to determine possible initiatives on this subject in the forthcoming meetings of international organizations.

The witnesses are Mr. John Reinhardt, director, International Communication Agency, and U.S. Ambassador to the 1978 UNESCO General Conference; Mr. George Dalley, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Social Affairs, Department of State, and a member of the U.S. delegation to the 1978 UNESCO General Conference; Mr. Glen Robinson, U.S. Representative to the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference, sponsored by the International Telecommunications Union; Mr. Jerry Friedheim, executive vice president and general manager, American Newspaper Publishers Association; and Mr. Elie Abel, professor of communications, Stanford University, and member of the UNESCO International Com-

¹ See appendix 2, p. 65.

mission for the Study of Communications Problems, and former dean, Columbia University School of Journalism.

The first three panelists are before us, and I would suggest that the three of you possibly summarize your testimony and then be open for questions; then we will bring the second panel on of Mr. Abel and Mr. Friedheim.

We probably should start off with Mr. Reinhardt.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. REINHARDT, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AGENCY

John E. Reinhardt was nominated by President Carter as Director of the U.S. International Communication Agency on February 6, 1978. His nomination was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on March 17, 1978.

Mr. Reinhardt served formerly as the eighth Director of the U.S. Information Agency. He was the first Director to come up through USIA's career ranks, and he is now the first Director of the U.S. International Communication Agency. The USICA is a new federal agency that replaces and carries on the activities of the U.S. Information Agency and the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. REINHARDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a prepared statement which is somewhat longer than the 5 minutes that you have allotted us. I will give a condensed version of the statement and submit the prepared statement, with your permission, for the record.

The statement is the product of a certain amount of thought, and I hope perhaps you will draw on it in your questions, comments, and observations. The basic thought of the prepared statement is that the new world information order presents us as a society with certain real risks, but also genuine opportunities; that we cannot make the risk go away or capitalize on the opportunities by passive detachment from the debate; and that therefore we must pursue a path of creative engagement, which we have already begun and must continue.

The major issue coming out of UNESCO does not concern a diagnosis of the world's communication ills. It is broadly conceded that there are widespread disparities and dependencies between the information capacities of the industrialized world on the one hand, and those of the developing countries on the other. They hear us very clearly, but we do not hear them clearly, and they do not hear themselves very well. That is not a healthy situation for the international body politic.

It should be one goal of the new order, as we put it in a UNESCO resolution that obtained unanimous acceptance, to provide what we call "an expanded opportunity to hear the authentic voice of differing societies and cultures in a dialog made progressively more equal."

The issue in contention is how that objective should be achieved. One tendency, represented by the draft Mass Media Declaration of last year and by at least the staff work of UNESCO's MacBride Commission, is to set out duties and responsibilities for the world's press which would be policed by nation states or by international bodies.

We have fought that tendency and have prevailed so far, but there are strong forces behind it and they will yield ultimately only if we can show our alternative approach can succeed.

That alternative approach is not prescriptive but structural in character. Why reduce the quantity or quality of information circu-

lating in the world? Why not expand it by joining hands to build up communications capacity everywhere? Our strongest initiative in support of this approach has been the U.S. proposal—again, unanimously adopted at UNESCO—to consider establishing a consultative group in which both public and private sector energies could be combined to focus available resources on the meeting of priority needs.

There will be a preparatory meeting of experts from some 30 countries here in Washington for this purpose in early November. Other OECD countries have given strong support to this initiative. The Soviet Union has not registered opposition, and we have seen to it that they will be invited to the meeting. The leaders of the non-aligned movement collaborated with us in drafting and passing the UNESCO resolution, although some would prefer the seemingly quicker path of summoning an international fund into being. We are guardedly optimistic about the prospects of success.

Mr. Chairman, if we do seize the opportunities and capitalize on them, we can infuse into the new world information order the basic values of our own first amendment. That should be our goal.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Reinhardt's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. REINHARDT, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to join with you today to explore the dimensions and the implications of what has come to be known as the New World Information Order. Perhaps we can begin by giving it its proper or official name. As adopted by the U.N. General Assembly last December, what we are talking about is:

"* * * a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order, intended to strengthen international peace and understanding and based on free circulation and wider and better-balanced dissemination of information." (UNGA Res. 33/115B, December 18, 1978.)

I quote this formulation because the United States Government had an important hand in its phrasing, and because we have vital interests to defend and to promote through the future process of its further elaboration. That is the basic thesis I wish to present to you today.

If I may be permitted one preambular word, it would be to reacquaint you with the relevant portion of the U.S. International Communication Agency's mandate. In 1978, as an incident of our reorganization, we were asked by the President:

"To assist in the development and execution of a comprehensive national policy on international communications, designed to allow and encourage the maximum flow of information and ideas among the peoples of the world. Such a policy must take into consideration the needs and sensitivities of others, as well as our own needs."

That is USICA's charter in this field. We now share policy responsibility for international communications and information with the Departments of State and Commerce. We are pleased to be here with our State Department colleagues today.

The New World Information Order has a quite recent international history, having emerged from deliberations of the Non-Aligned Movement no earlier than 1976. I understand that Mr. Dalley will be reciting that history for you, including the important involvement of UNESCO. There is a substantial sense in which the history does go further back, from the proclamation of political and military non-involvement at Bandung in 1955 through a second stage of economic self-assertion at the U.N. in 1974 to the insistence on cultural integrity at the Non-Aligned summit in Sri Lanka in 1976. Throughout these events there is the recurrent theme of ending undue dependence on the industrialized nations—a theme with which we sympathize.

But information relationships are sensitive and delicate, much more so perhaps than trade in hard goods or military and diplomatic cooperation. We are talking about the kind of information American citizens and voters are going to receive about questions of international relations on which their representatives must make decisions. We are talking about cultural relations in the broadest sense: the kind of image we are free to publish about ourselves, and the quality of impressions we receive from other societies. We are talking ultimately about whether a stable world order can be founded on suspicion or whether it requires the clearest possible international understanding.

So we are right to approach the idea of a New World Information Order with misgivings. Americans generally are not attuned to the acceptance of any kind of order when it comes to information. We would rather risk mediocrity, and some would say worse, in the content of our organized communications than to invite the government in to impose an order. That is what our First Amendment is all about, that governments shall impose no order on free speech or a free press. This then is one immediate point of resistance, that we prefer creative disorder to a paralyzing or single-purpose order.

Americans also resist signing on to any statement of goals that lacks definition. Our Constitution would never have been ratified if it had contained nothing more than its preamble. What, we are right to ask, is in this New World Information Order? Where is it going to take us? There have been some preliminary definitions issuing from the Non-Aligned Movement that, frankly, we find unacceptable. They would entail such things as a wholesale withdrawal of radio frequencies from current users, and a possible abolition of international copyright for published works entering the Third World. Here again we resist.

But this resistance can and must be contained within a broader posture of creative engagement in the elaboration of the "New Order" idea. That is not simply because the idea has now been accepted by U.N. consensus. It is because the momentum behind the effort to redress neocolonial status in the world, to remedy historic disparities and dependencies as they are called, is in any event irresistible. Our own history and sense of mission are favorable inclined to this evolution. We might have been able to divert or defer the evolutionary pressure for a while, but eventually it would break through. And we are in far better condition to shape the future course of the "New Order" as co-architects than we would be if we were following a policy of detachment. This is a central point, on which I would like to spend a further moment.

In a widely circulated staff study entitled "The New World Information Order" and issued in November 1977, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee suggested that the United States could be either a major loser or a net gainer from the "New Order," depending on how it is shaped. That is, if I may interpolate my own somewhat simplifying views, we could either suffer the introduction of a regime of censorship in the world or gain world respect for a regime of freedom. Both of these forces now contend for acceptance but neither can currently claim that it prevails. Suppose the Third World countries attain eventual parity in the halls of international discourse, will they not be likely to favor freedom for their own voices rather than repression? That is the uncertainty, as I see it, but also the opportunity. Both exist whether or not we join our shaping hand.

The struggle between conflicting tendencies is already there, within and among the societies of the world. It seems more likely that we can influence the outcome through creative engagement than through a kind of passive disengagement. Although Americans are properly skeptical of sweeping and ill-defined new policy directions, we have learned that when a large number of countries join their energies behind such proposals the sound defense of our national interests counsels engagement. And we are better off moving in early rather than late.

There is a tendency on the part of the Non-Aligned "Information Order" proponents to urge steps in parallel with the development of the "New International Economic Order" (NIEO). Thus we have already been approached to support the creation of an International Fund for communications and information—modeled after the troublesome NIEO Common Fund. The International Fund would be financed by increased dues or voluntary payments going to UNESCO, a centralizing drain on available resources. This time, however, we have a creative alternative for systematic bilateral collaboration—with which to counter the (in our judgment) unrealistic International Fund proposal. I should like to conclude my testimony by reciting for you some of the positive initiatives we have taken and can take to channel international energies into what we think can be constructive directions.

I have already mentioned the full text of the "New Order." It was American negotiators who defined the "Order" as something that would be "more just and more effective," so as to denote an evolutionary process building on the present order rather than breaking radically from it. And it was American negotiators who succeeded in trying the "New Order" to the attainment of international peace and understanding and in basing it on the "free circulation" of information. These are fundamentally important changes because they stand opposed to the introduction of statist controls or censorship as permissible instruments for building a world "Order."

In a parallel UNESCO resolution, it was again American negotiators who amended language that calls for changing "the situation of dependence of the developing world in the field of information and communication" so that it described the goal as one of attaining "relationships of interdependence and cooperation." Needless to say, we consider this as far preferable to separatist or adversary positions.

In this same "New World Information Order" resolution, which was adopted unanimously, we called for an "expanded opportunity to hear the authentic voice of differing societies and cultures in a dialogue made progressively more equal." This is a statement of objectives sustained by our own First Amendment, and again calls for open rather than constricted avenues of communication.

Throughout, the U.S. negotiating strategy has been to de-emphasize normative prescriptions for information flow and to stress structural solutions for information imbalances—thereby promoting improved equality through conditions of freedom. American negotiators looked at the highly ideological debates of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems and succeeded in getting unanimous UNESCO support for a request that the Commission "address themselves * * * to the analysis and proposal of concrete and practical measures leading to the establishment of a more just and effective world information order." We have more recently submitted a listing of such practical measures—on matters such as international tariffs and postal rates—for the Commission's consideration.

The major U.S. initiative at the last UNESCO General Conference was a proposal for creation of a Communications Development Consultative Group, as a forum where developed and developing countries alike could draw together communication needs and available resources in a systematic and coherent fashion. The initiative would also engage the powerful creative energies of the private information industries, whose participation is essential to the realization of any just and effective new order. This concept is our "counter" to the idea of an International Fund, which would unacceptably centralize authority in UNESCO and levy financial demands to which we are not in a position to respond. On November 6-9, there will be a preparatory meeting of experts on this whole structural question here in Washington, which I am sure my State Department friends will invite you and your staff to observe. We have guardedly optimistic hopes for the success of this venture.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe our overall purpose should be to make the New World Information Order resemble as much as possible the order prevailing in our own "new world"—the United States of America. Ours is still a new and vibrant world in this domain, still experimenting with the modes and uses and relationships of communication. Congress is right now considering basic revisions to the Federal Communication Act, to give it the suppleness thought needed to accommodate new technologies and services. Minorities and women are seizing the levers of policy and of private assistance to gain improved access to all forms of media. The ideas of freedom and of social justice are alive in this country, as are the opportunities for different people to come to understand each other. These are still fresh ideas, and their attractiveness is not limited to our borders. Indeed I believe the evolving American idea of communication is every bit as irresistible as is the impulse to throw off colonial dependencies. The two are in fact congruent or can be fashioned so.

In our striving to enhance the information and communication capacities of others, and to eliminate the obstacles to interchange of ideas that may be found in existing international structures or arrangements, we fulfill the highest objectives of our own first amendment. Thank you.

Mr. HALL. Thank you very much.

In the House of Representatives we have a vote right now, and I have approximately 7 minutes to go over and vote on the final passage

of a piece of legislation. So, if we can stand in recess for about 10, at the most 15 minutes; I will be back shortly.

[Whereupon, a short recess was taken.]

Mr. HALL. We might as well proceed with the panel. This is going to be one of those days. Quite often, when we have a committee meeting like this we might go 2 hours before we have a rolcall; then, sometimes we have committee meetings where every 20 minutes they are ringing that bell. So, you are going to have to bear with us. I think it is going to be one of those days where I am going to be running in and running out.

So, we will go ahead with Mr. Dalley.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. DALLEY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

George A. Dalley, who was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs on May 1, 1977, has served in various positions in the private sector and in government involving responsibility for the development of domestic social policies. Immediately after graduation from the Columbia University School of Law in 1966, Mr. Dalley served briefly in the Equal Opportunity Office of the U.S. Department of State as liaison to Dr. Kenneth Clark's study of foreign service recruitment. He left the Department to become Assistant to the President of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc., an urban research institute headed by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark.

In 1970, Mr. Dalley joined the Washington, D.C. Office of the Law Firm of Strock and Strock and Lavan as Associate Counsel. While associated with the firm, he served as General Counsel to the Children's Foundation, a private nonprofit foundation involved in issues concerning the welfare of children. In 1971, Mr. Dalley was appointed Assistant Counsel to the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives and as Counsel to the Subcommittee on Civil Rights Oversight, was responsible for legislative oversight of federal implementation of the civil rights laws.

Mr. Dalley left the Committee in 1973 to become Administrative Assistant to Congressman Charles B. Rangel of New York, in which capacity he served until appointed to his present position.

Mr. DALLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Communications issues are becoming increasingly critical to the global economy in general and to North-South relationships in particular. The demand by Third World countries to establish a new world information order is a challenge to us to understand the underlying issues and factors involved, which have cultural, political and economic implications. The gist of Third World demands reflects their growing conviction that a Western monopoly on the global communication system deprives the Third World of the opportunity to transmit its own views or values.

The main demand associated with these grievances includes a throwing off of the dominance of transnational corporations as vestiges of colonialism and its threats to sovereign and cultural integrity:

- An establishing of independence and equity in access to global communication resources;

- An expansion of assistance programs to speed communications development;

- Promotion of the Nonaligned News Agency Pool;

- Imposition of duties, encumbrances, and responsibilities upon the media;

- A mandated right of reply when inaccuracies in the media are alleged;

- Legitimizing limitation of access to news sources;
- The right to censor or restrict flow of information across national borders; and
- Establishment of a supranational tribunal to monitor media behavior.

The full realization of this concept could have profound negative consequences for the United States—not just for the media industry but also for business, government, and national security.

On the other hand, some sort of a new information order, cooperatively developed rather than prescribed solely by the nonaligned nations, could provide the United States and all countries with assistance which would increase the capacity of all people to communicate more freely and effectively.

It will take patience and forbearance to bring this about. The desire for communications development by some is as strong as the motivation for media repression by others. Both are facts of life we have to reckon with, since the issue of international information equity is gaining momentum.

At the 20th General Conference of UNESCO three resolutions recognized the aspirations of the developing countries to seek, "a more just and effective world information order," and subsequently similar recognition was accorded in the special political committee of the United Nations General Assembly last fall.

On the specific resolutions calling upon UNESCO to endorse the new world information order the United States and seven of its allies abstained. At the United Nations the General Assembly, following the conference, a consensus resolution on this issue developed because the nonaligned nations agreed to a formulation of the new world information order concept which made clear that such a concept must be based on the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information.

How should the United States react to the Third World campaign for a new world information order? And what have we been doing about it?

First, we must make others understand that the new world information order as proposed by its most militant spokesmen is not acceptable to the United States. Second, the creation of a more just and effective world information order must be an evolutionary process requiring the cooperation of both the first and second worlds, as well as the third.

In particular, it will require the cooperation and involvement of the countries with advanced technological capacities—especially the United States, which is still regarded as the principal source of technical assistance.

Indeed, there is truth in some of the complaints, validity in some demands for rectifying certain inequities and injustices, and grounds for recognizing the destabilizing influence on the world of the massive imbalance of communications resources.

As evidence of our commitment to address this imbalance we are engaged in several initiatives. At the Paris conference we made an offer to assist Third World efforts in improving professional training in broadcasting and journalism. We have also offered the facilities of INTELSAT and other communications satellites to the developing

world for the dissemination of educational programing in the remote areas.

In keeping with our emphasis on practical approaches, the United States obtained the adoption of two resolutions at the Paris General Assembly. The first requested the MacBride Commission to analyze and propose concrete and practical measures leading to the establishment of a more just and effective world information order.

The second resolution invited the Director General of UNESCO to convoke a conference on institutional requirements for a collaborative communications development structure. These projects and resolutions are a part of the U.S. response to global communications needs; but we must do more. We must emphasize that there cannot be a more efficient world order of communication without improvements in its base, the national and regional system upon which it rests.

Any restriction upon journalists seeking to gain needed access to sources of information, any harassment of professional media personnel, any blocking of the entry or exit of information across national borders, any suppression of the fundamental rights of individuals to express themselves—any of these tend to limit the flow of information and keep the truth from being disseminated to people of the world, and thus jeopardize the entire global communications process.

In short, the United States has some complaints about the present world order of information, too, and has suggestions for its improvement.

This December, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO will hold a conference of American media specialists for the precise purpose of developing an American agenda for what a better world communication order should be and what approaches might be undertaken to bring it about. We feel that it is high time we devoted less time to defending ourselves from complaints. We believe it is time to stop reacting and begin acting to foster our ideas and our convictions. The key question to the answer will be how American values and American technological prowess can accommodate the communications requirements of our increasingly diverse world.

In part, this job has already been done by Prof. Elie Abel in a paper he prepared for the MacBride Commission, entitled "Communication for an Interdependent Pluralistic World";¹ it is a response to the paper drafted by Mr. Masmoudi of Tunisia on the new world information order. It challenges a number of assumptions, examines areas of possible agreement, and ends with a listing of those issues on which he insists the United States can never compromise.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that while we are sympathetic to the aspirations of the developing world in seeking improvements in the world's communications and are willing to expand the dialog and action programs on this matter through appropriate international instruments and structures, we will vigorously oppose ideas in conflict with free speech and an increased flow of information.

We have brought all these matters to your attention to provide some notion of the realities and challenges we face in dealing with today's international communications issues. The realities require us to recognize other nations' and people's aspirations. We are far more likely to

¹ See p. 36.

see essential characteristics of expression survive and prevail in today's interdependent world if we adopt a cooperative attitude toward Third World media concerns.

There is much that can be done to improve the status quo. Our long-range national interest will be better served if we seek improvement via diversity and multiplicity rather than through uniformity or conformity—including insistence on our own brand of orthodoxy.

Thank you.

[Mr. Dalley's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. DALLEY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

THE NEW WORLD INFORMATION ORDER AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, communication issues are becoming increasingly critical to the global economy in general and to North-South relationships in particular. The demand by Third World countries to establish a new world information order is a challenge to us to understand the underlying issues and factors involved, which have cultural, political and economic implications. The gist of their demands reflects their growing conviction that a Western monopoly on the global communication system deprives the Third World of the opportunity to transmit its own views or values.

The explosive growth in communication technology in the last two decades coincided with the process of decolonization. The increasing penetration of Western communications into the Third World has come to be perceived by some as a new attempt to reassert the domination of the former colonial powers. The first official manifestation of this view came at the Non-Aligned Summit meeting in Algiers in 1973. The Heads of State called for, inter alia, "reorganization of existing communication channels which are the legacy of the colonial past." A non-aligned conference in Lima in 1975 recommended accelerated cooperation among non-aligned countries to decrease their dependence upon foreign countries, and this theme was re-articulated at non-aligned country meetings in 1976 in Tunis, Mexico City and Colombo. The drive to reduce the influence of international communications by major news agencies owned or controlled by the U.S., U.K., France, and the Soviet Union was reflected in a July 1977 meeting of 58 nations in New Delhi and in the recommendations of that meeting, which were ratified at a meeting of foreign ministers held in Sri Lanka in August. The principal action called for was the establishment of a pool of Third World news agencies.

These concerns were also being reflected in UNESCO, which in the last 30 years has had its membership augmented by almost a hundred new nations—nearly all former colonies, almost all poor. Increasingly, the developing nations have come to view communications as essential support for their development efforts; and when they perceived foreign media as hampering these efforts, they sought help in the international arena to counteract such influence.

Accordingly, resolutions concerning the mass media have been approved by the last five UNESCO General Conferences and at a variety of other intergovernmental meetings and regional conference convened by UNESCO.

The 1970 General Conference directed the UNESCO Secretariat to assist member states in formulating mass communication policies in such a way as to integrate communications into the national development process. The 1972 General Conference called upon the major communicating countries to recognize their international responsibilities to prevent the mass media from becoming vehicles for "the domination of world public opinion or the source of moral and cultural pollution." Further, it warned that the one-way flow from only countries with dominant influence over international communications might seriously harm the cultural values of other countries and called for a code of ethics for communication. The 1974 General Conference mandated a series of regional intergovernmental meetings on communication policies. The first two of these have now been held. At the Latin American Conference in San Jose in 1976 conferees dwelt upon the domination of information channels by the advanced countries, calling it "cultural aggression." They insisted that a "free flow of information will really exist only when all countries have equal access to all sources of

information and take part on an equal footing in the control over and use of international channels of information."

The Asian regional meeting on communication policies was held this spring in Kuala Lumpur. It adopted a declaration and 51 recommendations, including demands for reduced tariff rates for developing countries and proposals for the establishment of the regional training institutions specializing in journalism, as well as conducting a feasibility study for the establishment of a world press institute. Another recommendation calls for the establishment of an Asian network for news exchange which would provide a comprehensive plan to assist all the press agencies of Asia and Oceania in satisfying their technical and professional needs. The Declaration proclaims that there is no contradiction between freedom of information and communication policies which tend to integrate the development of the media with the over-all planning of national development.

Though there are aspects of commonality in all communication systems, their functions and objectives will vary according to the degree of development of a given country and according to its social system and political philosophy. It is because of this diversity—particularly norms regarding freedom of information—that attempts by UNESCO to develop guidelines governing the behavior of nations in the communications area have generated so much controversy.

The first was UNESCO's effort to deal with a present response to a future possibility—the advent of direct broadcasting satellites, capable of being received on home television sets.

The possibility alarmed many countries—particularly those in the Soviet bloc and the Third World who feared their citizens might be subjected without their permission to massive incursions of foreign ideas and influences. Accordingly, in 1971 UNESCO developed a draft resolution governing the use of direct satellite broadcasting and providing that direct satellite broadcast signals must not be transmitted without prior consent of receiving countries.

At the 17th General Conference of UNESCO the United States stood alone on a test vote (100 to 1) and subsequently the resolution was overwhelmingly adopted. The Soviets later introduced a similar resolution in the UN where it was referred to the Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. This group has been meeting periodically ever since, trying to reconcile the basic difference between the Soviet position (failure to obtain prior consent is a violation of national sovereignty) and the U.S. position (that this is censorship at the source and an abridgement of the universal right to receive and transmit information).

The next international media confrontation in UNESCO came from a Soviet initiative—a draft declaration on the use of the media, that was nothing less than an attempt to gain international sanction for government control of media. The U.S. Government strongly opposed the declaration when it was introduced at the 1974 UNESCO General Conference and revised for the 1976 session at Nairobi. At this meeting, due to the opposition of the United States and its allies and with the help of Western media, a showdown vote was averted by referring it to a committee which recommended that the Director General present a revised draft "based on broad consultations" to the 20th General Conference.

This version, too, was unacceptable to the West, since it still tended to foster governmental control of media and imposed numerous restraints and responsibilities upon them. After three weeks of strenuous negotiation, the United States and its allies succeeded in producing a revised draft that gained broad support and eventually consensus adoption. Gone were all mentions of government control, replaced by affirmations of freedom and diversity in the flow and exchange of information and encouragement of action toward increasing the ability of all peoples to participate in and benefit from the new communications technologies.

Another major initiative of UNESCO is the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, established by Director General M'Bow as a consequence of the Nairobi media debates. This 16-person group was directed to conduct a 2-year study "of the totality of communication problems in the modern world." The Commission, which produced an Interim Report in 1978, will conclude its work this November, and its Final Report will be submitted to the 21st General Conference of UNESCO in October 1980.

The Chairman is the Irish statesman/diplomat, Sean MacBride. The American Commissioner is Elie Abel, journalist and broadcasting professional, who is now a distinguished professor at Stanford University.

A leading spokesman for the Third World is Mustapha Masmoudi, the Tunisian permanent delegate to UNESCO and immediate past chairman of the Coordinating Council for Information of the Non-Aligned Countries. It was he who compiled the first comprehensive paper on the new world information order and it was in this forum that he chose to unveil it.

The document was formulated at the request of the Non-Aligned Countries Information Council which met in Havana in April 1978. The Council requested Masmoudi to synthesize the media concerns of the non-aligned countries in a paper to be submitted to UNESCO and the UN. A group of media specialists from various sectors of the Third World were brought to Tunis to assist Masmoudi in this undertaking. The result is the first comprehensive articulation of this concept, for, though the idea had been evolving in non-aligned country meetings since 1973, the Masmoudi paper gave the concept better definition and sharper focus. The projection of the new world information order idea into the MacBride Commission moved the issue into the forefront of the international agenda and signaled the start of a full-fledged campaign to bring this new information system into being.

This wide-ranging document draws together in one package every grievance the Third World has raised over the past decade or more about the disparities and inequities in world communications and sets forth every remedy the developing countries perceive as in their interest. It recites complaints, accusations, injustices and their causes, and analyzes them from the political, legal, cultural, economic, and technological standpoint.

The major complaints concern—

- the massive imbalance of new flowing from advanced countries to the developing ones;

- control of most of the news coming to the Third World by Western agencies owned and operated from the advanced countries;

- news reporting on the Third World focusing on the sensational or negative aspects;

- the dominance of Western ideas resulting in a kind of cultural imperialism;

- the near total dependence on developed countries' information systems, which does not permit developing countries sufficient opportunity to originate information.

These complaints, along with many others, form the rationale for a series of demands. The main ones call for—

- throwing off the dominance of transnational corporations as vestiges of colonialism and as threats to sovereign and cultural integrity;

- establishing independence and equity in access to global communication resources;

- expansion of assistance programs to speed communication development;

- promotion of the Non-Aligned News Agency Pool;

- imposition of duties, encumbrances, and responsibilities upon the media;

- a mandated right of reply when inaccuracies in the media are alleged;

- legitimizing limitation of access to news sources;

- the right to censor or restrict flow of information across national borders;

- establishment of a supranational tribunal to monitor media behavior.

The full realization of this concept could have profound consequences for the United States—not just for the media industry but also for business, government, and national security. It could lead to loss of slots in the electronic spectrum, thus reducing the amount of information about the world upon which we rely for decision-making in every aspect of a democratic society.

On the other hand, some sort of a new information order, cooperatively developed rather than prescribed solely by the non-aligned countries, could provide the U.S. and other countries with highly developed communications the opportunity to exert leadership that would result in a system that would increase the capacity for all people to communicate more freely and effectively.

It will take patience and forbearance to bring this about. The desire for communications development by some is as strong as the motivation for media repression by others. Both are facts of life we have to reckon with. The issue of international information equity is well launched and is gaining momentum.

Moreover, this movement initiated by the 87 non-aligned nations has now gained official international sanction. At the UNESCO 20th General Conference three resolutions recognized the aspirations of the developing countries to seek "a more just and effective world information order," and subsequently similar recognition was accorded in the UN General Assembly. On the specific resolution calling upon

UNESCO to endorse the New World Information Order, the U.S. (and seven allies) abstained. At the UN a consensus resolution on this issue developed because the non-aligned states agreed to a formulation of the NWIO concept which made it clear that such a concept must be based "on the free circulation and wider and better balanced dissemination of information."

The campaign for the New World Information Order is arising in an increasing number of international fora. For example, at a recent meeting of the UN World-Wide Program for Information on Science and Technology (UNISIST), Mr. Masmoudi introduced a resolution calling for universal access to all of the world's technical and scientific information. At other meetings he has called for the establishment of an international fund to assist developing countries' communications development and for the establishment of an international communications and information center governed by UNESCO.

Another forum in which the NWIO may arise is the World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) to be held this fall to review the entire global radio frequency spectrum.

How should the United States react to the Third World campaign for a new world information order? And what have we been doing about it?

First, we must make others understand that the NWIO as proposed by Masmoudi and other militant spokesmen is not acceptable to the U.S. Second, the creation of a more just and effective world information order must be an evolutionary process requiring the cooperation of both the First and Second Worlds, as well as the Third.

More and more Third World spokesmen recognize that it will require far more than denunciatory rhetoric and moral indignation; in particular, it will require the cooperation and involvement of the countries with advanced technological capacities—especially the United States, which is still regarded as the principal source of technical assistance. Accordingly, the developing countries—no matter what they may say for political effect—realize that if they are ever to achieve a significant improvement in their communication capacities they need all the help and assistance they can manage from the United States and the industrialized countries.

Given this circumstance, it is useful to keep pointing out to the leadership of the NWIO that the strident voicing of extreme positions is "off-putting" to those in the developed world who are in any way predisposed to respond sympathetically to their more reasonable concerns and it erodes the climate of consensus so painfully wrought in Paris.

Indeed, there is truth in some of the complaints, validity in some demands for rectifying certain inequities and injustices, and grounds for recognizing the destabilizing influence on the world of the massive imbalance of information.

It is important to seek out the matters which seem susceptible to agreement, leading to cooperative action. These include, for example, measures relating to international postal rates, telecommunication tariffs, access to satellite services and financial and training assistance.

At the 1974 General Conference of UNESCO, our delegation, in opposing the Draft Declaration on the mass media, asserted that the way to redress the imbalance was not through the imposition of restrictive measures upon the countries with developed communications but through helping developing countries to help themselves in strengthening their own communication capacities. This policy is also consistent with our deeply held views on the values of a free flow of information.

To the extent that certain voices are not being heard, whether because of oppressive restraints which prevent the exercise of free expression or because of the lack of the technical means to contribute to the flow of information, the objectives of free flow cannot be fully accomplished. Accordingly, we are prepared to join in efforts to help develop the ability of all peoples to exchange information.

As evidence of our commitment to this policy our government is engaged in several projects to help overcome the unevenness of communications development within societies. Two projects now underway were described by Ambassador Reinhardt at the Paris conference; the first is designed to offer assistance to Third World centers for professional training in broadcasting and journalism. The second will utilize the facilities of INTELSAT or other communications satellites for major segments of the developing world so as to afford them opportunity to use satellites for the dissemination of educational programming to people in remote areas.

In keeping with our emphasis on practical approaches, the United States introduced two draft resolutions at the Paris meeting, which gained several co-sponsors and eventually consensus adoption. The first requested the MacBride Commission to analyze and propose "concrete and practical measures leading to the establishment of a more just and effective world information order." The second resolution invited the Director General to convoke a conference to develop a proposal for institutional arrangements to systematize collaborative consultation on communication development activities needs, and plans. The U.S. offer to host such a conference has been accepted and early in November the meeting will be held here in Washington with representatives of 35 nations in attendance. The recommendations of this conference will provide the agenda and a framework for an intergovernmental meeting to be convened by UNESCO next spring.

Such a consultative mechanism could fill the gap which has often been noted between the expression of the communication needs and aspirations of developing countries and the implementation of plans to respond to them. Moreover, to put it bluntly, such a mechanism could help introduce something of American management methods into what is now a very hazy area. At present little is known by one donor country of others' efforts: what, where and with what results. A clearinghouse of information and research results would be useful to donor and receiving countries alike and might even afford some measure of progress and help set international priorities for communications assistance.

These projects and resolutions are a part of a positive response by the United States to communications needs of the developing world. At the same time, we emphasize that there cannot be a more efficient world order of communication without improvements in its base—the national and regional systems upon which it rests. Any restriction upon journalists seeking to gain needed access to sources of information, any harassment of professional media personnel, any blocking of the entry or exit of information across national borders, and any suppression of the fundamental rights of individuals to express themselves—any of these tend to limit the flow of information and keep the truth from being disseminated to people of the world, and thus jeopardize the entire global communications process. In short, the United States has some complaints about the present world order of information, too, and has suggestions for its improvement.

That brings me to another U.S. initiative. This December the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO will hold a conference of American media specialists for the precise purpose of developing an American agenda for what a better world communication order should be and what approaches might be undertaken to bring it about. We feel it is high time we devoted less time to defending ourselves from complaints and reacting to the initiatives and prescriptions of others and sat down to think out what we believe should be done to improve the global system of communications. In other words, we believe it is time to stop reacting and begin acting to foster our ideas and our convictions. The key question to be answered will be how American values and American technological prowess can accommodate the communications requirements of our increasingly diverse world.

In part, this job has already been done by Professor Elie Abel in a paper he prepared for the MacBride Commission. Entitled "Communication for an Interdependent Pluralistic World," it is a response to the Masmoudi paper on the New World Information Order. It challenges a number of assumptions, examines areas of possible agreement and ends with a listing of those issues on which he insists the U.S. can never compromise. I won't go further because I am delighted to note that Professor Abel will be testifying himself. I want only to emphasize the importance of the point he makes in listing the topics on which he feels there cannot be a consensus; namely, that the Commission should "separate the more intractable political and philosophical issues from those relatively value free on which agreement is possible and even likely."

This, it seems to me, is also the approach our government should take in dealing with the New World Information Order drive. In order to advance in a positive way common objectives in communications, the international community must concentrate on issues that are susceptible to practical cooperation. It is unrealistic to think there can really be one grand universal design for a new world information order. The efforts for improvement must be a piecemeal approach that promotes the coexistence of diverse systems in diverse ways. The total result of putting together many such pieces is more likely to produce a more just and effective system of communications than any single grandiose global scheme.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that while we are sympathetic to the aspirations of the developing world in seeking improvements in the world's communications and are willing to expand the dialogue and action programs on this matter through appropriate international instruments and structures, we will vigorously oppose ideas in conflict with free speech and an increased flow of information. Some aspects of the NWIO proposals made by the less developed countries are reasonable and constructive; others are alarming and totally unacceptable. This is our problem with the careless use of the slogan in its current undefined form. It inevitably implies linkage with these objectionable ideas and prescriptions. Any concept that the United States can support for a more just and effective order of communications must be developed and attain focus and definition deriving from the exchange of a broad and diverse array of news from all sectors. It is our conviction that without discarding our differences, we must pursue the commonalities which are surely to be found in positive, constructive and practical approaches to these problems.

I have brought all these matters to your attention to provide some notion of the realities and challenges we face in dealing with today's international communication issues. I want it clearly understood that the State Department will continue to defend vigorously the principle of freedom of information internationally, for this is a fundamental component of U.S. foreign policy. But the realities require us to recognize other nations' and peoples' aspirations, also. We are far more likely to see essential characteristics of free expression survive and prevail in today's interdependent world if we adopt a cooperative attitude toward Third World media concerns.

There is much that can be done to improve the status quo. Our long-range national interest will be better served if we seek improvement via diversity and multiplicity rather than through uniformity or conformity—including insistence on our own brand of orthodoxy.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by quoting from a recent speech of Mr. Brzezinski before the National Press Club: "We are now facing a massive awakening and growing self-assertiveness in peoples in Asia, Africa, Latin America (who) realize that they have new economic power and resources. This is producing a prolonged and highly difficult process of change, bearing on economic and political power * * * It is in the vital interest of the U.S. that this process be peaceful, that it be stable, that it be reasonably managed * * * And it will require patience and foresight and a willingness both to steer change deliberately and at the same time accommodate to it. It will require, in effect, much more statesmanship that we have ever before been called upon to demonstrate."

"The challenge we confront now is even greater because we will be dealing with the world which we cannot easily control or as directly influence as we did in the past. And yet (it is) a world which still basically depends on positive American inputs, on creative American involvement; because without us, it is highly unlikely that anyone else can generate the needed framework of strategy and continuity for peaceful change."

Thank you.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Dalley.
Mr. Robinson.

STATEMENT OF GLEN O. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN, DELEGATION TO THE 1979 WORLD ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be here today to discuss the emerging concept of a so-called new world information order, and more particularly, the relationship of the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference, or WARC, as we commonly call it, to that concept.

Since time is limited, I will forgo some preliminary general remarks about the new world information order concept itself and turn directly to the World Administrative Radio Conference.

Though the World Administrative Radio Conference has been prominently identified as a part of the dialog over the new world information order, the fact is that there are many issues that will be raised at this conference which do not have any important bearing

on the new world information order, or are not truly north-south issues. Moreover, even though some of the issues that will arise at the WARC will surely partake of a north-south character and could possibly be considered as part of the dialog over a new world information order, we see rather little to be gained by attempting to deal with these general issues under the yet amorphous, highly abstract, and occasionally confrontational tone of the new world information order slogan, even as it has been modified by the statement agreed to last year; that is, "the new more just and effective world information order."

We do not, realistically, expect to be able to avoid all discussion of some of the more general concerns, and it will not trouble us greatly to engage in such discussion of general concepts up to a point; but it is our position that the main business of the World Radio Conference should proceed without becoming preoccupied by abstract political debate. In all candor, I cannot guarantee that this will happen. I can say that the United States is not alone in seeking at this conference to have a reasoned and closely focused debate about concrete proposals involving specific questions concerning the agenda of the conference, which is concerned with radio frequency allocations.

Let me explain a little bit more what this conference is about.

The World Administrative Radio Conference is a function of the International Telecommunication Union, which is the specialized U.N. agency responsible for international radio allocations and technical standards for telecommunications. The ITU is the oldest international agency in existence. It has a long and widely admired tradition of international cooperation in a field in which major international cooperation and agreement is essential. The 1979 conference will review the use of radio frequencies throughout the world and make modifications as necessary and appropriate. It is the first general conference in some 20 years with the power to consider all uses of radio frequency spectrum and the results of our meeting will probably have an effective lifetime of another 20 years. Thus, we will not only have to catch up with events of the past 20 years but forecast those of the next 20 years as well.

This is indeed a challenging task. The world of electronic communications is greatly different today, of course, than it was in 1959 and we expect it will change as much in the next score years as it has in the past. This means, of course, that the use of the radio spectrum will change as well, and it is the function of the WARC to make changes in radio allocations and related regulations to accommodate this important change in electronic communications.

There is no denying the practical importance of this conference. In the private sector at stake are frequency allocations affecting billions of dollars in domestic and international investments and an enormous variety of services ranging from amateur radio activities to radar navigation. In the public sector, the allocations affect vital defense communications as well as other key activities such as environmental sensing from space, deep space exploration, international broadcasting, and other services too numerous to mention.

Because of this importance, our preparatory efforts for this conference have been more elaborate than those for any previous conference of its kind. They began some 5 years ago as a joint undertaking

by the FCC, the Office of Telecommunications Policy, which was the predecessor to the present NTIA—National Telecommunications and Information Administration—and the Department of State. Since that time, virtually every Federal agency, as well as industry and public users too numerous to mention, have actively participated in shaping U.S. requirements and U.S. proposals for this conference. Most of our proposals were submitted to the ITU at the end of January this year. The remainder of our proposals dealing with the HF (high frequency) spectrum were delayed until April.

The development of proposals is, of course, only one part of the preparatory process. We have been actively developing detailed position papers evaluating alternatives and tradeoffs in light of what we have learned of the views of other ITU members.

We have been very active in exploring what those views are. Last month I led a team to London, Paris and Algiers for bilateral discussions while other U.S. representatives were in Latin America. Before this round of bilaterals we were in Washington with the Soviets, a followup to earlier discussions in Moscow last year. Two weeks before that, I was in the People's Republic of China discussing the conference; a week before that we held discussions with the Australians, Indonesians, and Indians, and others in Asia and in the Pacific. Before that, there were discussions in February and March in Africa and Latin America. That is just the discussions this year. This effort has been going on for about $2\frac{1}{2}$ years now.

I might just mention parenthetically, I have just come back from Ottawa, and I am on my way to Bogota next week to cap off these discussions.

So, we have been active in seeking out the views of others and trying to explain our views to them. We think we have a pretty good fix at this point on what the conference will do.

Let me turn at this point to some of the main conference issues. I will not attempt to outline the specific proposals we are making. They are contained in a set of documents about an inch thick. I will be happy to provide for the record, if you wish, copies of those proposals or a narrative summary.

It might be useful, however, to summarize here some of the very broad objectives which we seek at the conference.

First, we seek to achieve international agreement on necessary and incremental changes in frequency allocations and related regulations in order to enhance U.S. economic, social, and national security interests. The proposals range widely over the entire radio spectrum, affecting virtually every use of the radio spectrum. Broadcasting; amateur radio; radio navigation; telephony; meteorological and environmental sensing; radio astronomy and space research; mobile radio—these are a few of the general services for which proposals are being made.

Second, we seek to maintain those procedures which provide maximum flexibility and adaptability to changing needs. As far as the United States is concerned right now, the present procedures of the ITU are essentially adequate to the task. We have not tabled a lot of additional changes to be made in these procedures, although we are perfectly happy to discuss proposals by other countries for appropriate changes.

Three, we wish to strengthen the role of the ITU as the foremost international organization responsible for implementing radio spec-

trum allocation decisions, while not adversely affecting the sovereign rights of the United States.

Four, we support changes in international allocations and related frequency management procedures which will accommodate the needs of other nations, consistent with our own essential requirements, of course, while at the same time endeavoring to avoid or limit the impact of politically inspired efforts to impede fair and efficient use of the spectrum.

How well will we be able to secure our general objectives? Well, as might be expected, there are several schools of thought. At one pole is a school which envisions a rather smooth WARC, operating along traditional technical lines, one generally free of confrontational politics and confrontational rhetoric—one which is essentially divorced from most of the other aspects that you heard described under the rubric of the new world information order.

At the opposite pole is another school which forsee a conference fraught with political problems similar to those experienced at the Law of the Sea Conference, or in some of the UNCTAD conferences. Adherents of this latter view envision highly politicized, ideological confrontations—essentially along north-south lines. One observer, in what can be described as a spirit of verbal abandon, described the WARC as the coming "Armageddon" of the new world information order debate. I think such apocalyptic forecasts are wildly exaggerated. A careful appraisal of the situation right now, based upon rather extensive preparatory efforts and consultations around the world, leads me to an intermediate judgment about the probable outcomes of the conference. Let me illustrate in specific terms what I think this implies:

First, I expect resistance to proposals which we have made for substantial increases in HF broadcast frequency allocations, which are intended primarily to accommodate international broadcasting. This resistance will come mainly from those developing countries which have continued need for other services, notably the fixed service used for telephony, which they fear would have to be sacrificed. We are attempting to show that the sacrifice would not be significant because of the possibility for sharing the frequencies between these services, but I have to concede there is some widespread skepticism around the world about the feasibility of such sharing. I should also report, however, to keep a balanced perspective on this, that we have many supporters for our proposals around the world, not only among developed countries, but among developing countries as well.

Among some nations there may also be some political hostility to increasing allocations for HF broadcasting because it is used for international broadcasting primarily, and we may see some elements of the debate in UNESCO intrude into this discussion. I will come back to that in a moment.

Second, U.S. proposals to satisfy increased requirements for satellite allocations will be the subject of considerable controversy at the conference. Here I should emphasize that the problem is not uniquely one of conflict between developed and developing country needs; the larger problems, in fact, is simply one of reconciling different demands for the spectrum—demands that are relatively independent of general geopolitical orientation. In fact, with respect to most of the specific

allocations issues, the most obvious conflicts turn out to be among developed countries. At stake here are a variety of different services—broadcasting; fixed telephony-type services; mobile satellite services; a solar power transmission service; environmental sensing; radio navigation; and a variety of other services. In each service the United States has important proposals; some of them have strong support, some appear to have strong opposition.

Third, one of the most vexing problems that will confront us at the conference will be that of trying to insure the fair and equitable access by all nations to the spectrum and to the geostationary orbit. This issue does have a distinctly north-south political orientation. We believe—as do most other developed countries and many developing countries as well—that fair and adequate access, fair and equitable access to the spectrum and to the geostationary orbit can be assured through adherence to the present procedures. However, a number of developing countries—we cannot yet be certain how many—believe otherwise, and they will insist on some form of more tangible guarantee of access. Proposals to provide such a guarantee will include, for example, establishment of allotment plans for the distribution of frequencies and orbital space slots on a country-by-country basis. Such plans have been proposed recently for two services—the HF broadcast service that I mentioned a moment ago, and the fixed satellite service which embraces both domestic and international satellite services, such as Intelsat system, the Weststar system, Comstar, and others.

Such proposals will have to be carefully and critically evaluated. We do endorse the principle of insuring fair and reasonable access by all countries to the radio spectrum, but we have in the past opposed allotment plans except in situations where such planning has been deemed essential to effective worldwide use. In neither of the cases that I just mentioned do we consider the planning to be essential to effective worldwide use. Our concern, however, is frankly a pragmatic one: Allotment plans just do not work out well in practice; they do not provide adequate incentives for adopting of spectrum and orbit-conserving technologies; they tend to generate overstated requirements on the part of the countries concerned and thereby lead to waste of a valuable resource.

What kinds of compromises or trade-offs might be possible to meet developing country concerns will have to await the conference. We are, however, continuing to consider all the different options that might be possible.

I should mention very briefly other less specific areas of potential conflict which are distinctly associated with the “new world information order” debate. We have followed with particular interest the various meetings of groups of the nonaligned movement which have been endeavoring to work out a concerted strategy and proposals for the conference. Although the details of possible common positions among the nonaligned countries are still missing, recent meetings of both the nonaligned broadcasting and telecommunications organizations indicate an apparent consensus among some of the more active countries on some important subjects, such as orbit planning, MF broadcast planning, allocations preferences for developing countries, and other matters.

Although we would have difficulty with some of these proposals that are emerging out of these nonaligned meetings, I am confident we can constructively deal with them at the conference if we can keep the discussion focused on their specific merits, and keep to a minimum the ideological politics and confrontational rhetoric. Unfortunately, several recent nonaligned meetings give evidence that at least some of the countries see WARC as an occasion for generalized political debate of the kind we are trying to avoid. Recent meetings of different groups of nonaligned countries in Cameroon and Algeria in particular are illustrative of the troublesome mixture of specific technical concerns with more general political polemics along the lines of past discussions in UNESCO and elsewhere. We are particularly disturbed to see some signs—which fortunately are still faint—that the debate over “free versus balanced flow” of information might surface at WARC, despite the UNESCO statement of principles agreed to in Paris last year.

We are developing our positions to cope with all these issues as well as other issues not specifically on the agenda as they arise. I think I can accurately and reasonably report that so far we have not been surprised by anything that we have learned in our preparatory efforts. I think, also, that I can report reasonably and accurately that we are in as good a position as I can imagine any country being to respond appropriately to all these concerns as they arise, whether or not they are specifically within the scope of the agenda.

Our strategy for dealing with all of these shifting challenges will be as flexible as possible, consistent with protecting our essential national interests and also maintaining the traditions and integrity of the ITU as a forum for achieving constructive international agreement.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared remarks. I will be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

[Mr. Robinson's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GLEN O. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION TO THE 1979 WORLD ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a pleasure to be with you today to discuss the emerging concept of a so-called New World Information Order, and more particularly, the relationship of the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) to that concept.

Since my responsibility is the 1979 WARC, I will concentrate my remarks on this important Conference. However, inasmuch as the concern of the Committee is with the larger concept of the “New World Information Order”, I would like if I may to offer a few preliminary comments about that broader concept.

The debate over a declaration of principles for mass media at last year's annual meeting of UNESCO involved more than a question of the international role of the media. Beneath the clamor of debate over the role of the mass media are a broad array of issues concerning international communications and information policy. The debate in UNESCO served more to publicize than to define the many problems that underlie the debate. But this is not a negligible accomplishment. At least it helped to bring to the foreground a number of important issues of global communications and information policy that have been lurking in the background of the North-South dialogue and East-West tensions. However, the need to define these issues more clearly, both individually and collectively, remains.

As with so many issues in international affairs—whether of the North-South or East-West variety—there has been a considerable intellectual effort to mold all of these different issues of communications and information policy into a single analytical framework and cap it with a prescriptive slogan. In this case the framework is the perceived gap between the “information rich” and “information

poor" countries. The prescriptive slogan that goes with this framework is the so-called "New World Information Order."

As Ambassador Reinhardt has described, actions at the UNESCO General Assembly and the U.N. Special Political Committee have given new force to the search for principles to govern international communications and information policies. There were at the time some misgivings by the United States and others about accepting this general concept because of its ill-defined scope. However, despite the lack of clear meaning or specific content in the slogan, the United States, quite wisely, I think, recognized that the New World Information Order idea, whatever it means, will be the semantic centerpiece of a debate over international communications and information policy in the years to come. For the United States to stand aloof from the idea because of apprehension about what it might come to mean, would undermine our ability to influence the agenda of the emerging dialogue over these important issues.

Having decided to take a positive role in this dialogue, there remains for the United States and others the vexing question of how to define its scope and content. This is a large issue and one that far transcends my own particular responsibilities as head of the U.S. Delegation to the World Administrative Radio Conference. However, there is one point that I should make about the general concept of the New World Information Order inasmuch as it bears directly on the relationship between this general debate and the more specific issues of the World Administrative Radio Conference.

Despite the quite common assumption that the New World Information Order concept is but an aspect of the North-South dialogue, I think it should be emphasized that the link between the two is only partial. In fact, some of the issues being discussed in the context of the New World Information Order debate are not North-South issues at all. Some of the issues do relate uniquely to North-South relations such as the question of development communications and economic assistance to promote expanded communications for developing countries. The same is true of some other issues such as Third World claims for reserved allocations of radio frequencies or orbital arc segments. However, some of the other points of debate in this context are global concerns that transcend purely regional or socio-economic differences. The free flow of information across international boundaries, for example, is as much a matter of debate between Western allies as it is between the United States and, say, Cameroon. This is an important point for reasons other than mere semantic clarity. We misperceive the nature of the underlying issues if we insist on seeing it solely or primarily in North-South terms—or even in East-West terms.

This point has special relevance to the relationship between the New World Information Order concept and the World Administrative Radio Conference. If the former is perceived solely as an aspect of the North-South dialogue, then it is surely misleading to regard the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference as a forum for debating the New World Information Order. The fact is that although there are many issues that will be raised at the WARC which do have important North-South dimensions, there are just as many that bear no important relationship to concerns between North and South, or between developed countries and developing countries.

Moreover, even though some of the issues that will arise at the WARC surely partake of a "North-South" character, we see little to be gained by attempting to deal with these issues under the yet amorphous, highly abstract, and sometimes confrontational tone of the New World Information Order slogan, however it is defined. We do not expect to be able to avoid all discussion of some of these more general concerns, and it will not trouble us to engage in such discussion up to a point. But it is our position that the main business of the Conference should proceed without becoming preoccupied by abstract political debate. In all candor, I cannot guarantee this will happen. I can say that the United States is not alone in seeking at this Conference to have a reasoned debate about concrete proposals involving specific questions concerning the allocation of radio frequencies.

However, I am running a bit ahead of myself. At this point I should back up a bit and explain a little more about the World Administrative Radio Conference, the issues that it embraces and our preparations for it.

The World Administrative Radio Conference is a function of the International Telecommunication Union, the specialized U.N. agency responsible for international radio allocations and technical standards for telecommunications. The ITU is the oldest international agency in existence. It has a long and

widely admired tradition of international cooperation in a field in which major international cooperation is essential. The 1979 Conference will review the use of radio frequencies throughout the world and make modifications as necessary and appropriate. It is the first general conference in some 20 years with the power to consider all uses of radio frequency spectrum and the results of our meeting will probably have an effective lifetime of another 20 years. Thus we will not only have to catch up with events of the past 20 years but forecast those of the next twenty. This is indeed a challenging task. The world of electronic communications is greatly different today than it was in 1959 and no doubt it will change as much in the next score years as it has in the past. This means, of course, that the use of the radio spectrum will change as well and it is the function of the WARC to make changes in radio allocations and related regulations to accommodate this important change in electronic communications.

There is no denying the practical importance of this Conference. In the private sector at stake are frequency allocations affecting billions of dollars in domestic and international investments and an enormous variety of services from amateur radio activities to radar navigation. In the public sector the allocations affect vital defense communications as well as other key activities such as environmental sensing from space, deep space exploration, international broadcasting, and other services too numerous to mention.

Because of this importance, our preparatory efforts for this Conference have been more elaborate than those for any previous WARC. They began some five years ago as a joint undertaking by the FCC, the OTP—predecessor to the present National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)—and the State Department. Since that time virtually every major federal agency, as well as industry and public users too numerous to mention have actively participated in shaping U.S. requirements and U.S. proposals. Most of our proposals were submitted to the ITU, on schedule, at the end of January of this year. The remainder of our HF proposals were delayed pending internal resolution of a domestic contest over HF frequencies. These were submitted in April.

The development of proposals is, of course, only one part of the preparatory process. We have been actively developing detailed position papers evaluating alternatives and trade-offs in light of what we have learned of the views of other ITU members.

And we have been very active in exploring what those views are. Last month I led a team to London, Paris, and Algiers for bilateral discussions while other U.S. representatives were in Latin America. Before this round of bilaterals we met in Washington with Soviet representatives—a followup to earlier discussions in Moscow last year. Two weeks before that I was in the People's Republic of China discussing WARC; a week before that we held discussions with the Australians, Indonesians, Indians, and others in Asia and the Pacific. Before that were discussions in February and March in Africa and Latin America. This recent schedule—which is all I have recounted—is illustrative of a long term effort. For the past two and one-half years we have been engaged almost continuously in pre-Conference discussions on WARC, in all parts of the world.

Our pre-Conference discussions are now coming to a close. Next week I will take a small team to an important meeting of OAS countries in Bogota, while one of my vice chairmen will visit Israel and Yugoslavia. However, from this point forward we will be focussing most of our energies on intensive evaluation of the proposals submitted by the different countries as well as the information obtained in our discussions and other information sources.

Let me turn at this point to some of the main Conference issues. I shall not attempt to outline the specific proposals we are making. I will be happy to provide for the record a copy of those proposals or a narrative summary if the committee wishes. It might be useful, however, to summarize here the very broad objectives we seek to advance:

One, we seek to achieve international agreement on necessary, incremental changes in frequency allocations and related regulations in order to enhance U.S. economic, social, and national security interests. The proposals range widely over the entire radio spectrum, affecting virtually every use of the radio spectrum. Broadcasting; amateur radio; radionavigation; telephony; meteorological and environmental sensing; radio astronomy and space research; mobile radio—these are a few of the general services for which proposals are made.

Two, we seek to maintain those procedures which provide maximum flexibility and adaptability to changing needs.

Three, we wish to strengthen the role of the ITU as the international organization responsible for implementing WARC decisions, while not adversely affecting the sovereign rights of the United States.

Four, we support changes in international allocations and related frequency management procedures which will accommodate the needs of other nations, consistent with our own essential requirements, while endeavoring to avoid or limit the impact of politically inspired efforts to impede fair and efficient use of the spectrum.

How well will we be able to secure our general objectives or our specific proposals? As might be expected, there are several schools of thought on the subject. One school envisions a reasonably smooth WARC along the traditional, technical pattern of such conferences—one generally free of confrontational politics. At the opposite pole another school foresees a WARC fraught with political problems similar to those experienced at the Law of the Sea Conference or in some of the UNCTAD conferences. Adherents of this latter view envision highly politicized, ideological confrontations—essentially along "North-South" lines. One observer, in what can only be described as a spirit of verbal abandon, described WARC as the coming "Armageddon" of the New World Information Order debate. Such apocalyptic forecasts seem to me widely exaggerated. A careful appraisal of the situation fight now leads to an intermediate judgment about the probable outcomes of the Conference. Let me illustrate in specific terms what I think this implies:

First, I expect resistance to proposals which we have made for substantial increases in HF broadcast frequency allocations—primarily intended to accommodate international broadcasting. The resistance will come mainly from those developing countries which have continued need for other services—notably the fixed service used for telephony—which they fear would have to be sacrificed. We are attempting to show that the sacrifice would not be significant because of the possibility for sharing of frequencies, but I have to concede that there is widespread skepticism about the feasibility of sharing. Among some nations there may also be political hostility to increasing allocations for HF broadcasting inasmuch as it is used primarily for international broadcasting, but I think this is a lesser concern for most countries and probably not the foremost obstacle to allocations changes.

Second, U.S. proposals to satisfy increased requirements for satellite allocations will be the subject of much controversy. Here the problem is not uniquely one of conflict between developed and developing country needs; the larger problem is simply one of reconciling different demands for the spectrum—demands that are relatively independent of general geopolitical orientation. In fact, with respect to most of the specific allocations issues, the most obvious conflicts turn out to be among developed countries. At stake here are a variety of uses—e.g., broadcast, fixed, and mobile satellite services, solar power transmission, environmental sensing, radionavigation—to name some of the prominent uses. In each service the United States has important proposals; some of them have strong support, some appear to have strong opposition.

Third, one of the most vexing problems that will confront us at the Conference will be the problem of trying to ensure the fair and equitable access by all nations to the spectrum and the geostationary orbit. This issue does have a distinctly North-South political orientation. We believe—as do most other developed countries, and many developing countries as well—that this can be assured through adherence to the present flexible procedures. However, a number of developing countries—we cannot yet be certain how many—believe otherwise and will insist on some form of more tangible guarantee of access. Proposals to provide such a guarantee will include establishment of allotment plans for the distribution of frequencies and orbital space slots on a country-by-country basis. Such plans have been proposed recently for two services—the HF broadcast service and the fixed satellite service.

Such proposals will have to be carefully and critically evaluated. While we endorse the principle of ensuring fair and reasonable access by all countries to the radio spectrum, we have in the past opposed allotment plans except in situations where such planning has been deemed essential to effective worldwide use. Our concern is a pragmatic one; allotment plans which distribute frequencies and orbital space to countries or areas in advance of the need do not allow optimal utilization of the spectrum; nor do they provide adequate incentives for adoption of spectrum and orbit-conserving technologies and patterns of use.

What kinds of compromises or trade-offs may be possible to meet developing country concerns will have to await the Conference. We are, however, continuing

to consider, in consultation with many other developed and developing countries, all the different options that may be possible.

I should mention other, less specific areas of potential conflict which are associated with the "New World Information Order" debate discussed earlier. We have followed with particular interest the various meetings of groups of the Non-Aligned Movement which have been endeavoring to work out a concerted strategy and proposals for the WARC. Although the details of possible common positions among the non-aligned are still missing, recent meetings of both non-aligned broadcasting and telecommunications organizations indicate an apparent consensus among some of the countries on some important subjects such as orbit planning, HF broadcast planning, allocations preferences for developing countries and some other matters.

Although we would have difficulty with some of the proposals, I am confident that we can constructively deal with them at the Conference if we can keep the discussion focussed on their specific merits and keep to a minimum the ideological politics and confrontational rhetoric that has characterized some of the North-South debates to date. Unfortunately, several recent non-aligned meetings give evidence that at least some of the countries see WARC as an occasion for just such a debate and also pursuing political issues that are outside the defined agenda of WARC and properly have no place in our deliberations. Recent meetings of different groups of non-aligned countries in Cameroon and Algeria are illustrative of the troublesome mixture of specific technical concerns with more general political polemics along the lines of past discussions in UNESCO and elsewhere on the New World Information Order. We are particularly disturbed to see signs—albeit faint—that the debate over "free versus balanced flow" of information might surface at WARC, despite the UNESCO statement of principles.

We are developing our positions to cope with all these issues as well as with the issues specifically on the agenda. I will not pretend that we are able to predict precisely every contingency, but I can say that we have not yet been confronted with any surprises and I think we are in a posture to respond as appropriate to all matters which arise, whether or not they are specifically within the scope of the agenda. Our strategy for dealing with all of these shifting challenges will be as flexible as possible, consistent with protecting our essential interests and maintaining the traditions and integrity of the ITU as a forum for achieving constructive international agreement.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared remarks. I will be pleased to respond to any questions you or other committee members may have.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Robinson, I appreciate your giving us your thoughts, statements, and time on this most important subject. I do have a few questions that I could like to ask each one of you.

The first question is to Mr. Reinhardt. What is our policy toward the New World Information Order, the U.S. policy?

Mr. REINHARDT. I have tried to explain, Mr. Chairman, in the brief condensation of my prepared statement that we see in the new world information order, the proposed New World Information Order, both an opportunity and certain risks.

One of the problems in answering your question with great specificity is that we are not quite sure what the new world information order is. It is a vague slogan. It is a term that those who advocate it insist on, and it consists of at least two divisions. One, the proponents of it—whatever in turns out to be—argue that there is a great imbalance between the developed and the developing world in communication capability. We have admitted this, we in the West. We in the United States have said that this is a demonstrable fact, and that it is a part of American policy to assist the developing world in its effort to overcome this imbalance.

The second part of the new world information order—again whatever it finally turns out to be—gives us greater problems because we hear from time to time such arguments as that since the developed

world has a greater physical and economic capability to communicate, it communicates wrongly about the developing world; that the stories which come out of the developing world in the press, on the radio, on television are disadvantageous to the developing world; that there is a concentration on those stories which do not show the developing world in a proper light, stories that do not emphasize economic and cultural development. Therefore, the argument seems to go that this capability should be reduced somehow—probably not physically, but reduced by each state making certain that there are restrictions—as yet of an undefined type. To the extent that the new world information order turns out to put emphasis on this kind of restriction of communication freedom, it is our policy to resist.

That, Mr. Chairman, is roughly the development up to this time, and we await the next movement on this issue.

Mr. HALL. Should the United States propose to make a higher priority of freedom of information issues, should we try to elevate that priority in our foreign policy to something more than what it is today?

Mr. REINHARDT. Well, in the proper international forums we have continually done just that. The confrontation, to the extent that there has been one, has been over this issue, and we have insisted that any restrictions on freedom, any abridgment, as we call it, of first amendment values, is absolutely unsatisfactory to us.

Mr. HALL. I am talking about our overall foreign policy, not just in international organizations. You are talking about something else. I am talking about our general foreign policy. Should this be a higher priority? When we talk about human rights we talk about "gross violations of human rights."

Mr. REINHARDT. In my judgment we should. I think that Mr. Dalley, as a representative of the Department of State, may be able to speak with more authority on this subject.

Mr. DALLEY. We are doing that, Mr. Hall, as you probably know. As a result of congressional impetus through the Percy amendment, we have been asked to make the freedom of journalism, the freedom of the press, one of the aspects that we arise with countries during our discussions of human rights concerns. We are doing that. We have made a report to the Congress, as of January of this year, indicating the results of our discussions with other nations. Increasingly, in our bilateral relationships, we will be talking with nations about their policies in the information and communications area.

Mr. HALL. Freedom of information is covered under Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is it not?

Mr. DALLEY. Yes, it is one of the aspects of the universal declaration.

Mr. HALL. And how many countries signed that?

Mr. DALLEY. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is deemed an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations, thus we regard every member of the United Nations as a signatory to the universal declaration. Of course, that is the basic rationale for our contention that protection of human rights is a universal responsibility. As President Carter said in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly of March 1977, "No member of the United Nations can deny human rights as a fundamental precept because as members of the United Nations, all members are in effect signatories to the commitment to protect and advance human rights."

Mr. HALL. Can you also elaborate on the creation of an international fund for communications and information, and how would the United States be expected to contribute?

Mr. REINHARDT. That remains to be seen, sir. This is a proposal that is a subsequent proposal to the one that we made at the UNESCO conference, and which was adopted at the UNESCO conference last November. Our proposal, adopted at UNESCO, provided for the creation of a consultative group, one that will be the subject of a meeting here in November, primarily to determine what kind of inventory of new communication needs and resources will contribute to in an effort to overcome the imbalances and disparities that we have admitted exist.

Certain members of the prospective assembly in November have already introduced the idea of an international fund, presumably one to which all nations would contribute, and from which those nations which have the communication needs would draw. There has been no complete outline of the fund. We have maintained thus far with those who have advocated it that it is not the purpose of the consultative group to establish an international fund. That is about all we know at this point.

Mr. HALL. We will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

[Whereupon, a short recess was taken.]

Mr. HALL. Mr. Dalley, I think we will start a couple of questions with you. What kind of measures, practical measures have been proposed by UNESCO's Director General for assisting developing countries in improving their communication and media services?

Mr. DALLEY. UNESCO has provided training opportunities to developing countries. It has convened regional conferences which have led to the formation of regional news agencies, such as the Asian News Agency and the Caribbean News Agency. It is a function, essentially, of assisting developments that are occurring in these regions, an effort to increase the flow of information through providing greater communications self-sufficiency in order to balance what is perceived as an imbalance in coverage from these areas caused by the alleged monopoly of the Western news media.

Mr. HALL. How does the new world information order relate to the flow of information within a single country?

Mr. DALLEY. Again, the new world information order is a concept that is largely undefined. There are various versions, various papers containing an indefinite, undefined mass of allegations and assertions.

At the risk of over simplification, one would say that the new world information order relates to internal flow in the sense of having governments play a role in determining the appropriate use of information for development purposes or other national purposes. A theme that has become familiar, asserted by some developing countries, is that information is not neutral, information must be used for a purpose, and it must meet national goals; hence, one concept that has been floated in the effort to define the new world information order is the greater control of information to achieve these purposes, to achieve an ending of apartheid, to promote certain concepts of justice or development goals, whatever.

One of our concerns is that this promotion of the government role in the flow of information, or direction of information, is clearly a danger to independent or dissenting voices.

Mr. HALL. How do we coordinate our position on world information order, on issues in various international organizations? How do we coordinate all of that?

Mr. DALLEY. There are several bureaus in the Department of State and agencies in the Federal Government that share responsibility for the issues which arise in international organizations. In our preparation for the 20th UNESCO general conference we coordinated very closely with the International Communication Agency (ICA) and in fact asked the very able head of that agency, John Reinhardt, to head our delegation because of his position as the director of our international communications policy agency and also because of the expertise he gained as head of our delegation to the 1976 UNESCO general conference in Nairobi. John Reinhardt did an excellent job as head of our delegation to both UNESCO conferences.

In preparing for the WARC we have been working closely with Mr. Robinson and his staff on the political issues we anticipate at that conference. We do that also with the bureaus responsible for the Outer Space Committee when these issues arise. What we essentially do in the International Organizations Bureau because of our experience in the political issues which permeate the ways of the U.N. is to work with the people who have specific responsibility for the development of the technical U.S. positions for each international conference to brief them on the issues and to acquaint them with how we anticipate these political issues will be raised.

Mr. HALL. How seriously do we discuss these issues among various high officials in the various departments? Of course it is an important issue. The numbers of issues that come before this subcommittee are so vast and complex, there is so much information, there are so many meetings going on in so many organizations. How seriously do they consider what all of you have said? Is this a priority?

Mr. DALLEY. It becomes a priority when there is a specific threat presented. Our preparation for the 20th general conference of UNESCO is a good example of what happens when we are faced with a specific issue.

The draft declaration on the use of the mass media was a priority issue for us at the UNESCO general conference because we recognized the threat that such a declaration might have to the concepts of journalistic freedom and the free flow of information that we cherish and that we wanted to assert, and do assert in international organizations.

There is a very concerned and active constituency in the United States which seeks to protect and preserve journalistic freedom. Our own media alerts us to threats to this freedom as they continue to monitor developments in other nations and in international organizations. They have a very effective role in making this a priority issue within the State Department and within other agencies.

The State Department regards the preservation of journalistic freedom and promotion of the free flow of information as a very important priority. However, it is even more important for us to respond when it is clear that people in our own media community are concerned and are pressing us to make this issue a priority.

I can assure you that these information issues get attention at the highest level of the State Department.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Robinson, how prominently do you expect the political debate on the new world information order to figure in WARC, and how do you think this issue will affect the work and outcome of the conference?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that at the outset there is going to be quite a bit of general rhetoric about at least some aspects of a new world information order. Whether the concept of the new world information order itself will be a prominent part of that discussion, or whether it will relate specifically to the radio frequencies is still hard to say.

I think such issues as technical assistance, for example, could have some influence in the discussions at the conference. We have been mindful of that connection. It is not on the agenda. We hope not to spend a lot of time at the conference discussing it, but we would rather see it discussed on an informal—essentially bilateral—basis; but we are mindful of the ITU, for example, as a forum which does play a role and can play a very effective role in providing technical assistance.

We see also the possibility of free-flow type issues emerging in connection with some of the technical items on the agenda. I cannot say how much they might influence the conference in general. Again, I think a lot of this is going to be background rhetoric. We have seen specific proposals developed by some of the developing countries which seem to have what I would call an orientation in this direction; that is, their ideological underpinning, if you will, is based upon this notion of redressing the imbalance between the so-called information-rich and information-poor countries. That, in and of itself, is not a matter of great concern. You have to look at the specific proposals to find out whether the specific proposals themselves might have merit. We are perfectly happy to do that, whether they stem from a more general political concern or not.

I guess on balance I would have to revert to my earlier statement about an intermediate judgment. I think these political factors are going to be marginally influential in shaping attitudes; I do not expect them to overwhelm the conference. We have a quite specific agenda. Most of the countries that we have talked to, and most of the others whose proposals we have seen, appear to be prepared to address that agenda in reasonably concrete terms. So, although they may choose to talk a little bit about some of the more abstract political concerns along the lines of new world information order dialog, I think that most countries are coming to the conference prepared to deal concretely and specifically with the agenda.

So, all this is by way of saying I am not panicked by the view of some that there is going to be a confrontation. I think there are going to be some difficult and challenging moments at the conference, we expect them and are prepared for them.

Mr. HALL. You talked about satellite broadcasting, about this probably being one of the more controversial aspects of the conference. How do you expect to deal with the topic of people's access to satellite broadcasting, and what is our position with respect to that?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, I ought to clarify the term "satellite broadcasting" because the issue does not specifically arise in connection with

satellite broadcasting. There is an array of different services that are provided by satellite. Satellite broadcasting as such is not one of the most prominent issues on the conference agenda. Satellite services, more generally, are a very prominent part of the agenda and specifically there is a concern about access to the orbital arc and the frequency spectrum with respect to fixed satellite services, a satellite either along the pattern of our domestic system, such as Weststar, or Comstar or the international system such as Intelsat, Intersputnik, Inmearset, and others.

The concern here is that the orbital arc will become too congested to permit access at a future date by developing countries whose requirements are only now maturing. Our approach to that is, we think the orbital arc and the radio spectrum are adequate to accommodate all who have bona fide legitimate requirements. That is the position we are going to take at the conference.

As I mentioned, one of the specific ways of addressing this issue on the part of the LDC's is to propose that the frequency spectrum allocated to a particular service, such as the fixed satellite service, be "planned." "Plan" is a term of art in ITU parlance. What it means is that you take a particular allocation to service and you divide the frequencies on a country-by-country or regional basis so that everyone has a guaranteed frequency and a segment of the arc from which they are going to provide that service.

Our view of planning is, we do not think it is, in general, a very efficient way of handling the radio spectrum or the geostationary orbit. We have a lot of supporters behind our view. Indeed, I would characterize it as generally a view held by most of the developed countries and a great many of the developing countries as well at least with respect to those services for which it will be proposed at this conference.

But our specific attitude at the conference will depend in large measure on the specific proposals that are brought forward—what kinds of plans are brought forward. Again, we are prepared to deal with them on the merits, but we do not think that the general idea is a very good one. We do not think, by the way, it is essential to insure adequate and equitable access to the spectrum or the orbital arc.

Mr. HALL. You talked about prior consent of countries receiving satellite broadcasting. Can you explain what prior consent is, and is there a position we have with respect to that?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, we do have a definite position. The issue actually arises in several different contexts, but most prominently it has arisen in the context of direct broadcast satellite service for television programming. Our position is that prior consent in any form is unacceptable. We have maintained that position successfully in the U.N. Outer Space Committee where it has been on the agenda for several years—I do not know how many years. This is the U.S. position, of course, we will have at this conference; although our baseline position on this is that we do not think the ITU is the forum in which to talk about it in the first place. It is on the agenda in the U.N. Outer Space Committee, and that is where it ought to stay.

There is also a concern over prior consent in the context of remote satellite sensing; this is a somewhat different issue. Whereas the DBS issue is concerned about the intrusion of unwanted programming into a country, the remote sensing issue is rather the converse; it is a con-

cern about sensing of a country's resources and then the free dissemination of that information to all who have an interest in it.

Here again, in the U.N. Outer Space Committee, we have been debating this for a number of years. Our position is, again, we will not accept a prior consent condition.

Mr. HALL. Thank you very much for your time and for your very important thoughts.

Now we have two other very important witnesses that have testimony and, hopefully, we will get through those in such time as I do not have to go over and vote again.

We have Mr. Abel, professor of communications from Stanford University, who will speak first; and Mr. Jerry Friedheim, executive vice president and general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

STATEMENT OF ELIE ABEL, HARRY AND NORMAN CHANDLER PROFESSOR OF COMMUNICATION, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, AND MEMBER, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS

Career history: Harry and Norman Chandler Professor of Communication, Stanford University, 1979-present; Godfrey Lowell Cabot Professor and Dean, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, 1970-79; Diplomatic Correspondent, NBC News, 1967-69; Chief of London Bureau, NBC News, 1965-67; State Department Correspondent, NBC News, 1961-65; Chief of Washington Bureau, The Detroit News, 1959-61; Chief of the South Asian bureau in New Delhi, India 1958-59; then Chief of the Balkans bureau in Belgrade, 1956-58; National and Foreign Correspondent, The New York Times; based in Detroit and Washington, 1949-59; United Nations correspondent, Overseas News Agency, 1947-49; Rewrite man, Los Angeles Times, 1947; Foreign Correspondent, North American Newspaper Alliance, based in Berlin, Germany, 1946-47; Assistant City Editor, Montreal Gazette, 1945-46; Military service, Royal Canadian Air Force, 1942-45; Reporter, Windsor (Ontario) Daily Star, 1941.

Publications: The Missile Crisis, Lippincott, 1966. Roots of Involvement, The United States in Asia, 1784-1971. (With Marvin Kalb.) Norton, 1971. Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin, 1941-46. (With W. Averell Harriman.) Random House, 1975. Contributed articles and reviews to: The New York Times Magazine and Book Review, The New Republic, The Reporter, The Washington Post, Look, American Heritage.

Honors: Overseas Press Club awards for best interpretation of foreign news, 1969, and for TV documentary, Russia in the Mediterranean, 1970. George Foster Peabody Award for radio news, 1968. Shared Pulitzer Prize, 1957, for coverage of Eastern Europe, including Hungarian revolution. Pulitzer Traveling Fellowship, 1942.

Public service: Moderator, Presidential Candidate Forums, 1976, sponsored by League of Women Voters and broadcast nationally on PBS. Chairman, New York State Committee on Public Access to Records, 1974-78. U.S. member, International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, UNESCO. 1977-present.

Board service: Trustee, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976-present. Vice chairman, Washington Educational Television Association (channel 26), 1972-75. Director, Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association, 1973-79. Public Governor, American Stock Exchange, 1973-78.

Memberships: The Council on Foreign Relations, New York. The Century Association, New York. The Garrick Club, London.

Degrees: Master of Science (Journalism), Columbia University, 1942. Bachelor of Arts, McGill University, 1941. L.D. (honoris causa), University of Western Ontario, 1976. L.D. (honoris causa), McGill University, 1971.

Personal: Born in Montreal, Canada, on October 17, 1920. U.S. citizen. Married Corinne Adelaide Prevost, January 28, 1946. Two children—Mark and Suzanne.

Mr. ABEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We now move from the official level to the private citizen level. I should make it clear that I serve on the International Commission for the study of communication problems—better known as the MacBride Commission, after its chairman, Sean MacBride of Ireland—entirely as a private citizen, and that our work is fast approaching the countdown stage.

I want to take just a moment or two to fill you in on some of these aspects because I think there is a good deal of misunderstanding about where the Commission is at.

There are only two meetings remaining in which we, the Commissioners, can place our imprint on a book-length report that is supposed to be published by UNESCO in 1980 and presented to the General Conference in the fall of that year.

It has been difficult, as members of this committee will be aware, for a body drawn from 16 nations and representing every shade of opinion on the issues at stake, to engage successfully in collective authorship. In these circumstances, we are reduced to the role of editors and it is a staff recruited from the UNESCO Secretariat that prepares the drafts to be considered, debated, and revised by the members of the Commission.

These are the tasks that will confront us at the seventh and eighth meetings in Paris, September 10 through 14, and again at the end of November. The Commission's official life will expire on November 30 unless the Director General of UNESCO should grant us a stay of execution.

By its composition, the Commission crudely reflects the political arithmetic of the United Nations today, a preponderance, in short, of members and viewpoints characteristic of the so-called Third World: four from African countries; three Asians; two Latin Americans; two North Americans; and five Europeans, three from Western Europe and two from Eastern Europe.

On the crucial issues faced by the Commission, those having to do with the flow of information, the weighted numbers would appear to lie with those who favor one degree or another of state control; that is my central concern. But I have discovered that the numbers can be deceptive. The Third World is not a monolith. On more than one occasion so far in the Commission's work, the case for a free press—at least a freer press than exists today in much of the world—has been made with eloquence and force by certain of my colleagues from those former colonial areas, now under independent, authoritarian regimes.

Chairman MacBride has determined to proceed by consensus, which appears to be the UNESCO way of doing business, and as a result we have not until now had a show of hands on any of the important issues that seem to sharply divide the Commission. How those will be resolved remains to be seen. I do not, myself, see much value in papering over the cracks on matters of principle. As I have tried to point out in a paper written for the Commission, copies of which I believe are available to members of this committee,¹ the final report has to deal with the world as it is, with the diversity of existing communication systems, and it is not the task of the Commission to confer its blessing upon any particular model.

¹ See p. 36.

As an American schooled in the tradition of the first amendment, I know what I consider to be the best model. I cannot be persuaded that any alternative system I have studied serves the people half as well as our own. I am bound to acknowledge, however, that citizens of other nations with value systems of their own, have the right to choose an alternative model that more nearly suits their needs.

There is some ground for believing that my colleagues on the Commission, a majority of them, share my belief that to force a vote on this matter would be destructive and just in case such an effort is made, I am prepared to file a resounding dissent. If this were to happen, I am confident that others would join.

Let me now very briefly outline my position on the so-called "New World Information Order." It is, as other witnesses have testified, a concept that has never been defined with any clarity, in spite of the mountain of papers in the Commission's files—and I might say in my study—attempting to justify the idea. It remains even among its proponents in UNESCO, as one of them said, "Not a perfectly definable concept." It will be no secret to this committee that my skepticism has been shared by other members of the Commission. Even our Soviet colleague made clear his profound distaste for the idea by drawing a parallel between the New World Information Order and Adolf Hitler's New Order.

Another colleague, representing a large nonaligned country, called it, "Nothing but a propaganda slogan."

What our shared disinclination amounts to is, we do not want to buy a pig in a poke. But we are, in fact, bound to consider the concept, bound not only by the mandate placed upon us by the Director General of UNESCO, but also, as you heard, by a resolution of the UNESCO general conference and the United Nations General Assembly.

My own skepticism remains intact. I do not consider that the existing set of communication arrangements, incomplete and uneven as they are, constitute an international order of any kind, and the easy talk of a "new order" to replace what now passes for the "old order" loses sight, in my judgment, of certain stubborn facts.

First, it is putting the cart before the horse to speak of a truly worldwide communication system in the absence of concrete and costly steps at the national level to build the necessary infrastructure and to train the people who must operate it. That goal cannot be attained by a dozen more U.N. resolutions or UNESCO declarations. It will take an effort of will on the part of the developing countries, massive investment, and a new set of priorities. I strongly favor generous assistance by the community of developed countries, including our AID, the World Bank, and the UNDP, to help with the kind of material support that is needed for the building of infrastructure and training.

But even if the most generous assistance is forthcoming, the main effort will have to be made by the developing countries themselves. It seems to me abundantly clear that only a country with a strong domestic communications system can expect to make its voice heard and its weight felt around the world. The current prominence—in UNESCO parlance "dominance"—of our U.S. media did not happen overnight. It took decades of growth and development on home

grounds before such organizations as the AP and the UPI, Time, Newsweek, and the Reader's Digest felt strong enough to compete in the world market.

Second, a national communication system cannot aspire to worldwide acceptance of its product unless it is free—and seen to be free—of government domination. It will not be trusted, as Tass, for example, is not widely trusted in the Third World and elsewhere precisely because Tass is essentially a government agency.

Third, the more complete and better balanced worldwide system I would like to see will be a long time in building because it can only be based on the gradual spread of national and regional systems, laced together by modern telecommunications. This world needs, in my judgment, more voices, not fewer; we need to build more capacity, not tear down what exists.

The long-term goal, assuming all these national and regional decisions are made, and the aid is forthcoming, may perhaps some day be called a new information order. But as of the moment it does not seem to me to exist, and it will certainly not be advanced by the persistence of censorship, closed frontiers, and internal monopolies on the flows of information, incoming as well as outgoing. All of these practices, unfortunately, are still rampant in many developing countries. Those countries cannot expect to have it both ways.

A new information order—if, as its champions keep telling me, it is not intended to diminish freedom but to widen it—will have to stand for open frontiers, free access for legitimate foreign correspondents, and expanded communication channels.

I cannot, of course, predict at this moment how exactly the MacBride Commission will come down on some of the crucial issues, but my paper, I think, does indicate a number of areas in which concrete and practical steps can indeed be taken.

I would like, however, to single out one point that is not in my paper. I think the single, most important need of the developing countries today is for more and cheaper paper—mostly newsprint. With newsprint selling even in this country today at close to \$400 a ton—if you are lucky enough to have a long-time contract, and higher than that, I am told, if you have to buy it on the so-called spot market—there is a worldwide shortage. I think an ambitious international R. & D. effort should be mounted to discover new ways of making paper out of materials that might be available in the developing countries. There is one other range of proposals that I would just like to mention before concluding, and this is one that is being pressed by certain members of the commission, including Chairman MacBride, which I have opposed and must go on opposing because it seems to me wrong-headed, arbitrary, and downright destructive of free communications.

MacBride wants journalists to be declared a protected species, like the snail darter. All governments, under his scheme, would extend special protection to journalists in the performance of their legitimate professional duties at home or abroad. The journalists, as part of that package deal, would have to accept and live by a worldwide code of responsible behavior. I put aside the question of who is going to draft the code, although that is a serious question.

But it is clear that in order to qualify for this promised protection, journalists would have to be certified and licensed by some public body. Let me say that I used to be a journalist myself, as they say, and a foreign correspondent, at that. But I have taken the position in the commission that I want no part of special treatment for journalists. It seems to me wrong to differentiate in law between journalists and ordinary citizens. No working journalist I know of has ever asked for special treatment of this kind, not even, I might say, after the wrenching recent experience we all went through, sitting at home in any easy chair and watching an American television reporter murdered in the streets of Managua in living color.

It is a regrettable fact that governments which show no regard for the human rights of their own citizens can scarcely be expected to be overcome by humane concern for the safety of foreign correspondents. Moreover, no journalist I know of wants to see a planetary code of behavior imposed, nor any licensing scheme. As Gerald Long, the managing director of Reuters said the other day, "I am afraid that in the matter of protection of journalists, I see under the hem of the cassock the cloven hoof of regimentation." I wish I had thought to put it so neatly.

Thank you.

[Mr. Abel's prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF ELIE ABEL, HARRY AND NORMAN CHANDLER PROFESSOR OF COMMUNICATION, STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The work of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, better known as the MacBride Commission (after its chairman, Sean MacBride of Ireland), is fast approaching the countdown stage. Only two meetings remain in which the Commissioners can place their imprint on a book-length report, to be published by UNESCO in 1980 and presented to the General Conference in the fall of that year.

It has been difficult, as the members of this Foreign Affairs Committee will be aware, for a body drawn from 16 nations and representing every shade of opinion on the issues at stake, to engage successfully in collective authorship; all the more so when the membership is scattered round the globe, from Moscow to Kinshasa and from Tokyo to Paris, having met no more than six times over a period of 19 months. In these circumstances it is a staff recruited from the UNESCO secretariat that prepares the drafts to be considered, debated and revised by the members of the Commission.

These are the tasks that will confront us at the seventh and eighth meetings, to be held in Paris on September 10 through 14 and again toward the end of November. The Commission's official life will expire on November 30, unless the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Amadou M'Bow, should grant us a stay of execution.

By its composition, The Commission crudely reflects the political arithmetic of the United Nations today: a preponderance, in short, of members and viewpoints characteristic of the so-called Third World. There are four from African countries, three Asians, two Latin Americans, two North Americans, and five Europeans—three from Western Europe, one each from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

On the crucial issues to be faced by the Commission, those having to do with the flow of information in this pluralistic though increasingly interdependent world, the weight of numbers would appear to lie with those who favor one degree or another of state control. But numbers can be deceptive. The Third World is not a monolith. On more than one occasion in the Commission's work so far, the case for a free press (at least a freer press than exists today in many parts of the world) has been made with eloquence and force by certain of my colleagues from former colonial areas now under independent but authoritarian regimes.

Chairman MacBride, determined to proceed by consensus, has till now resisted calling for a show of hands on a number of issues that sharply divide the Commission. How these will be resolved remains to be seen. I do not myself see much value in papering over the cracks on matters of principle. As I have tried to point out in a paper written for the Commission, the final report must deal with the world as it is, with a diversity of existing communication systems.

These range from "systems in which the state owns and controls all channels of communication to those in which the state is debarred by the Constitution from interfering in the flow of information, with an infinite variety of alternative models filling the spectrum between the two extremes. It is not the task of this Commission to confer its blessing upon any particular model."¹

As an American, schooled in the tradition of the First Amendment, I cannot be persuaded that any alternative system I have studied serves the people half as well as our own. I am bound to acknowledge, however, that citizens of other nations, with value systems of their own, may prefer one or another alternative model.

There is some ground for believing that my Commission colleagues, or a majority of them, share my belief that to force a vote on this matter would be destructive. I am prepared, however, to file a resounding dissent if this should happen, and I am confident that others would join.

Let me now, very briefly, outline my position on the so-called New World Information Order. It is a concept that has never been defined with any clarity, in spite of the mountain of papers in the Commission's files dedicated to justifying the idea. It remains, in the words of one proponent among my UNESCO colleagues, "not a perfectly definable concept." It will be no secret to this Committee that my skepticism has been shared by other members of the Commission. Our Soviet colleague, for example, made clear his own profound distaste for the idea by drawing a parallel between the New World Information Order and Adolf Hitler's New Order. Another colleague, representing a large nonaligned country, called it "nothing but a propaganda slogan."

Our shared disinclination to buy a pig in a poke is not, of course, universally shared. The Commission, in fact, is bound to consider the concept, bound not only by the mandate placed upon it by the Director General of UNESCO, but also by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly and the UNESCO General Conference itself. (The Director General, I should note, did not make known the terms of that mandate until long after the individual Commission members had accepted appointment.)

My own skepticism remains intact. I do not consider that the existing set of communication arrangements, incomplete and uneven as they are, constitute an order of any kind. The easy talk of a new order to replace what now passes for a world-wide system of communication loses sight, in my judgment, of certain stubborn facts:

It is putting the cart before the horse to speak of a truly world-wide communication system in the absence of concrete and costly steps at the national level to build the necessary infrastructure and to train the people who must operate it. That goal cannot be attained by a dozen more UN resolutions or UNESCO declarations. It will take massive investments and a new set of priorities on the part of individual developing countries. I strongly favor generous assistance by the community of developed countries, including our AID, the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program. Of course, I support the initiative taken by John Reinhardt at the UNESCO General Conference and it is my hope that the Executive Branch, in spite of current pre-occupations, will see the wisdom of following through on that initiative, because it is the right thing to do. Even if generous assistance is forthcoming, however, the main effort will have to be made by the developing countries themselves. Only a country with a strong domestic communication system can expect to make its voice heard, and its weight felt, round the world. The current prominence (in UNESCO parlance, dominance) of our United States media did not happen overnight. It took decades of growth and development on home ground before such organizations as the AP and the UPI, Time, Newsweek and the Readers Digest felt strong enough to compete in the world market.

A national communication system cannot aspire to world-wide acceptance of its product unless it is free—and seen to be free—of government domination. It

¹"Communication for an Interdependent, Pluralistic World," by Elle Abel. UNESCO Commission document, p. (1).

will not be trusted, as Tass, for example, is not widely trusted in the Third World or elsewhere.

The more complete, better balanced world-wide system of communication I would like to see will be a long time in the building because it can only be based on the gradual spread of national and regional systems, laced together by modern telecommunications. We need more, not fewer, voices; we need to build new capacity, not tear down what exists. The long-term goal, call it a New Information Order if you like, will not be advanced by censorship, closed frontiers and internal monopolies on the flow of information, incoming as well as outgoing. All of these practices are, unfortunately, still rampant in many developing countries. They cannot expect to have it both ways, in my judgment. A New Information Order, if as its champions insist it is not intended to diminish freedom but to widen it, must stand for open frontiers, free access for legitimate foreign correspondents and expanded communication channels.

It would be presumptuous for me to forecast at this time how the MacBride Commission will come down on these and other issues in our final report. A great deal of work remains to be done. But rather than go on talking in cloudy generalities we must seek to agree on what the 1978 UNESCO General Conference described as "concrete and practical measures leading to the establishment of a more just and effective world information order."

Speaking for myself, a number of recommendations seem to me susceptible of agreement: Reduced international postal rates for newspapers, periodicals and books, for example; preferential telecommunication tariffs, which would make it cheaper for poor countries to communicate with their neighbors and the rest of the world; easier access for such countries to international satellite services; generous aids, as already mentioned, for training and for communication equipment. Each of these steps is outlined in my paper.

Perhaps the single most important need of the developing countries is for more and cheaper paper. With newsprint selling at hundreds of dollars a ton, and a world-wide supply shortage, and ambitious international research effort should be mounted to discover new ways of making paper out of materials available in the developing countries. There is, in short, no lack of sympathy for the plight of those countries within the Commission.

There is, however, another range of proposals and demands being pressed by certain members of the Commission, including Chairman MacBride, that I have opposed and must go on opposing because they seem to me wrongheaded, arbitrary and downright destructive of free communication among men and nations.

Mr. MacBride, for example, wants journalists to be declared a protected species, like the snail darter. All governments, under this scheme, would extend special protection to journalists in the performance of their legitimate professional duties at home or abroad. The journalists, as part of the package, would have to accept and live by a world-wide code of responsible behavior. Of course, in order to qualify for the promised protection, journalists would have to be certified and licensed by some public body.

I used to be a journalist myself, as they say, and a foreign correspondent at that. But I have told Mr. MacBride and the Commission that I want no part of special treatment for journalists. It seems to me wrong to differentiate in law between journalists and the rest of the population. No working journalist I know has asked for special treatment of this kind, not even after the wrenching recent experience of sitting at home in an easy chair and watching an American television reporter murdered in the streets of Managua, in living color. It is a regrettable fact that governments which show no regard for the human rights of their own citizens can hardly be expected to be overcome by humane concern for the safety of foreign correspondents. Moreover, no journalist I know of wants to see a planetary code of behavior imposed, nor any licensing scheme. As Gerald Long, the Managing Director of Reuters, said the other day: "I am afraid that in the matter of protection of journalists, I see under the hem of the cassock the cloven hoof of regimentation." I wish I had thought to put it so neatly.

Let me now thank your committee for its patience. I have not attempted to be comprehensive. That will leave time, I trust, for whatever questions the committee members may have.

COMMUNICATION FOR AN INTERDEPENDENT, PLURALISTIC WORLD¹ BY ELIE ABEL,
MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATION
PROBLEMS AND HARRY AND NORMAN CHANDLER PROFESSOR OF COMMUNICATION,
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

ADDRESSING THE COMMISSION'S TASK

The task before us, as redefined by the 1978 General Conference of Unesco is to analyze and propose in our final report "concrete and practical measures leading to the establishment of a more just and effective world information order."

If, in the limited time that remain, the Commission is to elaborate measures that are both concrete and practical, it must in my judgement eschew political sloganeering and undertake an honest search for steps that can lead to action in the world as it is, pluralistic yet increasingly interdependent. Our world contains a bewildering variety of working models for the ownership and control of communication systems. These range in their diversity from systems in which the state owns and controls all channels of communication to those in which the state is debarred by the Constitution from interfering in the flow of information, with an infinite variety of alternative models filling the spectrum between the two extremes. It is not the task of this Commission to confer its blessing upon any particular model.

The search on which we are embarked will, moreover, be doomed to futility, even ridicule, unless we agree on specific measures that have the effect of widening, rather than narrowing, the flows of news from nation to nation. The General Conference, in adopting the Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and Understanding, has called for "a free flow and a wider and better balanced dissemination of information" throughout the world. Article II of that declaration underlines several pertinent points:

The exercise of freedom of opinion, expression and information is "a vital factor in the strengthening of peace and understanding."

Public access to reliable information depends upon the availability of a diversity of sources, so that each individual can "check the accuracy of facts" and "appraise events objectively."

Journalists, accordingly, must be allowed to report freely and be assured of the "fullest possible" access to sources of information.

Whether they are working in their own countries or abroad, journalists should be assured of protection in carrying out their legitimate professional responsibilities.

THE PROMISE, AND THE LIMITATIONS, OF TECHNOLOGY

Changes in the way this world communicates are necessary and indeed inescapable. They are dictated, in fact, by the forward march of technology and by the transformation of interstate relations since the end of World War II. There are today three times as many independent nations as there were when the United Nations was founded. The newly sovereign member states are properly making their voices heard, and their weight felt, in world politics, and economics, as well as communications.

The role of the developing countries in world affairs is bound to grow and find expression in a variety of contexts—through bilateral and regional cooperation, through international organizations and the nonaligned movement. Certain resource-rich developing countries have already assumed roles of major importance on the world stage. The series of challenges confronting the modern world—how to maintain peace, promote economic growth with equity, and preserve the common environment—will be more daunting than ever. Any serious attempt to master these challenges to all mankind will require abundant multi-lateral flows of information reflecting in their rich diversity all cultural and political perspectives.

¹This document is one of a series of documents, prepared for the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, established in application of resolution 100 and the guidance notes of the medium-term plan adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 19th session. As the commission's mandate is of wide concern, this document, which is a preliminary text for discussion, is also being made available to those interested in the subject. Opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of UNESCO.

To say that the technological revolution now underway in the field of international communication carried with it the seeds of change, regardless of ideology, is a truism. The marvellous new machines that man has invented are politically and morally neutral. They disseminate truth—and lies—with equal facility. It is human intelligence, not the machine, that determines the message to be transmitted. In the space of three decades, we have seen the advent of television, computers and satellites. To a degree these inventions have transformed the ways in which mankind works, perceives the world, is entertained and instructed. The new technologies also have transformed the global flows of news, cultural and technical information, in quantity and quality.

While it is the fact that these technologies were first developed and applied in the advanced industrial countries, the benefits that flow from them are now beginning to be shared more widely. Far from constituting an element of increased imbalance between north and south, the new technologies can help in dramatic ways to redress the acknowledged present-day imbalance that is our central concern.

Even more rapid progress can be foreseen over the next two decades. By the end of the century, the existing boundaries between telecommunications, computing, broadcast and print media can be expected to blur as integrated print information systems of unprecedented capacity are developed and installed. All nations can benefit from these remarkable new opportunities, and employ them for social ends of their own choosing, by turning their attention to the promise of a more abundant future and putting behind them certain sterile arguments of the past.

Technology by itself, however, cannot be allowed to set the agenda for mankind in the 21st century. Once the possibilities and choices promised by technology have been understood, the Commission must come to grips with its mandate: to analyze and propose "concrete and practical measures" leading to action, measures that would inaugurate changes in the existing system of world communications toward the goal of a more just and efficient arrangement, with special benefits flowing to those countries whose infrastructures are as yet in an early stage of development.

THE MYTH OF PASSIVITY

The most ardent champions of a new information order have so far failed to provide us with a clear definition. One proponent concedes that it is not yet "a perfectly definable concept." Another has written:

This new order * * * is no ready-made recipe, which would enable an unjust situation to be transformed overnight into one less unjust. Because it is the product of a long history, the present situation cannot be put right quickly. The aim must be, rather, to initiate a process at the national, regional and international levels. Effective, concrete measures are called for, rather than academic discussion.²

There persists, nonetheless in certain quarters a belief that the free circulation of information and ideas is, to say the least, a mixed blessing for mankind, one that must be brought under control through the proclamation of a new world order. Much is made of the notion that the output of the major international news agencies is of no interest or value to developing countries, because it is said to be superficial, irrelevant, ethnocentric and somehow biased in favor of the countries in which these agencies are based. Consider this statement, for example:

Even important news may be deliberately neglected by the major media in favor of other information of interest only to public opinion in the country to which the media in question belong. Such news is transmitted to the client countries and is indeed practically imposed on them, despite the fact that readers and listeners in these countries have no interest in them.³

One might conclude from the statement just cited that:

(A) Foreign news agencies have direct access to the eyes and ears of readers and listeners in developing countries;

(B) Their output is so lacking in interest or relevance that no developing country would subscribe to them.

Neither statement happens to be accurate.

² The New World Information Order, document presented to the Commission by Mustapha Masmoudi, Ambassador of Tunisia to UNESCO, p. 10, par. 36.

³ Ibid, p. 5, par. 15.

In fact, most developing countries do not allow their newspapers or broadcasting stations to subscribe directly to foreign agency services. The subscriber in most cases is the government, or government-controlled agency. In short, the picture of passive millions in the developing countries awash in a tidal wave of alien information is somewhat fanciful. The following table is an attempt to show the real pattern.

SALES TO NONALIGNED COUNTRIES BY AP, UPI, AND REUTER

	Countries	AP		UPI		Reuter	
		Direct	Government	Direct	Government	Direct	Government
Arab region.....	18	5	4	5	8	7	10
Africa.....	41	2	3	1	5	5	27
Asia.....	14	2	4	1	3	3	6
Americas.....	9	8	7	7	5	5	2
Europe.....	3	2	1	1	1	2	1
Total.....	85	19	12	15	12	22	46

¹ The Third World and the Fourth Estate, by Edward T. Pinch, a study done while Pinch was a member of the State Department Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy, 1977.

Of 85 nonaligned countries in the sample, AP makes direct sales to 23 percent, UPI to 18 percent and Reuter to 27 percent. The other side of the coin is that Reuter (the largest direct supplier of the three) enter 73 percent of these countries only through government, or government-controlled channels. The respective figures for the other agencies are—AP, 77 percent and UPI, 82 percent. Thus the nonaligned countries and their populations are by no means "passive recipients" of unwanted foreign information. Their governments are, and have long been, in firm control.

These facts are difficult to reconcile with the wholly negative view of the Western news agencies cited above. Surely some information of value, at least to governments, moves on these circuits. Such information appears, however, to be reserved for official use only. Governments, presumably, have a need to know what is happening in the world, even when they take special steps to "protect" the in-populations by filtering this information through national agencies of one sort or another.

Ascertainable facts of this kind must not be ignored if the Commission wishes to be taken seriously, and to arrive at concrete, practical results. Where additional research is called for, we must not shrink from the effort of providing it. Recommendations based on nothing more solid than slogans can only invite derision among professional students and practitioners of the communication arts. It is not for the Commission to decide whether in the fullness of time there will be a new, more widely distributed, world system of communications. Technology alone will see to that. Our task is to consider how those inevitable changes will be shaped: By whom? According to what principles? To what ends? If practical results are the goal, then the international community will have to focus on specific measures that are susceptible of cooperation and to tread warily in areas that tend to generate hostility or confrontation.

THE NATURE OF NEWS

News values differ from country to country, even within particular countries. There is no single, internationally accepted standard of news judgment. The interests and preoccupations of one nation may seem trivial, even foolish, by the standards of another. Articles describing the same event will be placed in very different positions, and treated at greater or lesser length, in different publications within the same city. The news standards of *Le Monde*, for example are not those of *France Soir*. What commands top-of-the-front-page attention from the *New York Times* may be relegated to page 18 of *The New York News* the same day, or it may be ignored. Protocol news, which records the comings and goings of government officials of sufficiently exalted rank, can be of real interest to a wide public when the purpose of the mission is understood and the reporter on the scene has some knowledge of what was discussed. It can be a deadly bore without the knowledge and will, as a result, be ignored in many newspapers. Generalizations

about news as a universal value are for these reasons always hazardous. Certain definitions, nevertheless, have survived the ceaseless shifting of fashion over the decades since mass circulation newspapers made their appearance in the late 19th century. A great editor of that period, Charles A. Dana of the *New York Sun*, once defined news as "anything that interests a large part of the community and has never been brought to its attention before." To Willard Bleyer, a more contemporary figure in American journalism, news is "anything timely that interests a large number of persons, and the best news is that which has the greatest interest for the greatest number." Bleyer, in short, has added the criterion of timeliness or topicality.

Present-day scholars keep devising fresh definitions, none of them comprehensive and each bearing the imprint of its place and time. The author of a widely used American text for journalism students offers this definition: "News is the timely report of events, facts and opinions that interest a significant number of people."⁴ A second author offers two general guidelines for the definition of news: "News is information about a break from the normal flow of events, an interruption in the expected. News is information people need to make rational decisions about their lives."⁵ Adding all these suggested definitions together we arrive at a list of several qualities that make news:

News must be timely. Andre Gide has consigned to the province of journalism "everything that will be less interesting tomorrow."

It must interest large numbers of people.

It ought to be fresh, in the sense of telling the reader or the listener something that has not come to his attention earlier.

It ought to contain information that is useful to the public in arriving at personal decisions.

It represents a departure from the normal, everyday pattern of life. The soft, gentle rains that wash Ireland almost daily are not deemed newsworthy by Irish editors. In drier climates, on the other hand, a rainstorm becomes news—good news if it breaks a period of drought, bad news if it causes flooding or other devastation.

Other factors enter into the decision of what makes news. Prominence is one such element. The activities of a statesman, a celebrated actor, scientist or sports hero, receive more attention in the media than those of a person whose name would not be recognized by the general public. Proximity is another element. Media in virtually all countries devote more space or time to reporting events close at hand than to happenings in far-off places. Finally there is the element of conflict. In spite of the general preference for local happenings, the press of the entire world has reported day by day the overthrow of the Shah of Iran and the continuing turmoil in that country.

It should be clear from the foregoing that while news is information, information is not necessarily news—unless it meets the test of timeliness, wide interest, usefulness, freshness and so forth. Any number of talented journalists have demonstrated that it is possible to meet these tests, thus ensuring publication, and still do justice to development news from the Third World. This calls on the part of the reporter for an effort to rise above the demands of "dailiness", as James Reston has called it. There is a need in the Western countries, no less than in the East or the South, for reports that fall into the "soft news" category, news of bold attempts to defeat hunger and disease in the form of long-term projects that may take years before fulfillment.

But "hard news" will continue to demand the attention of foreign correspondents and their audiences. A coup, a strike, a border war, the overthrow of any regime, must be reported, even at the risk of being labelled negative news by some. News of this kind will necessarily remain part of the international flow, but only a part. Whether the news is hard or soft, however, it requires access to countries and to sources of information within them. The accuracy and balance that members of the Commission have demanded of foreign correspondents can be attained only when those correspondents are free to travel, to see and hear, to investigate conditions for themselves.

THE POLITICAL DIMENSION

It is well to remember that although technological advances hold real promise for the future, we are not here dealing with technical issues. These are, instead,

⁴ *The Mass Media*, by William L. Rivers, New York, Harper & Row, 2d ed., 1975.

⁵ *News Reporting and Writing*, by Melvin Mencher, Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown and Co., 1977.

political issues of extraordinary sensitivity. Few decisions taken in the name of any people more accurately reflect their underlying political philosophy than those having to do with ownership and control of their information networks. Particular countries have chosen one model or another, because that model is in harmony with the economic and social system distinctive to that country. So long as the present diversity of system and belief persists, there can be no single, approved UNESCO standard in these matters. A decent respect for the convictions of other societies is called for.

Indeed, the effective functioning of the international system under construction demands a degree of understanding round the world that can only be the product of more, and more accurate, information flowing freely between nations and regions. Mutual respect and understanding among peoples cannot be based upon ignorance. The truly free multi-directional flow of information we seek is a condition long desired, increasingly approximated, but still far from realization.

There is no real disagreement within the Commission on certain shortcomings of the present incomplete system of world-wide communications. The necessary resources, whether of infrastructure or trained manpower, are unevenly distributed. The reasons behind this uneven development are rooted in the uneven history of industrialization. Some countries—in the words of Dr. Nagai—were early starters on the road of development; others started late. Talk of conspiracies to “dominate” information and culture flows can yield no practical outcome, save increased polarization. The current situation in the communications field is inescapably linked with the uneven pace of economic development generally. The remedy must, therefore be found in deliberate national and international measures to advance the welfare of those countries still locked in the grip of traditional poverty. The present concentration in particular nations and institutions of the resources needed to communicate effectively across national boundaries—and within them—is clearly undesirable. It results in the disproportionate voicing of certain perspectives and the substantial ignoring of others. It is clear that this situation does not suit the needs of an increasingly interdependent, pluralistic world system of states.

The remedy does not lie, however, in measures to restrict and control the voices now being heard. The developing nations will not strengthen their own capacity to communicate by attempts to block, or tear down, the capacities of others. Nor can the answer be found in the adoption of a single standard for the control of communication systems throughout the world. The world-wide need is for more voices, not fewer, in order that citizens of all nations can make themselves heard even as they listen to voices and messages from afar. The constructive response can only be a massive international effort to increase the capacity for communication at every level—the individual, the community, the nation and among nations.

Few would disagree with the proposition that a major share of available resources should be invested in the developing countries. Agreement within the Commission upon concrete measures for attacking this problem will necessarily demand open, honest discussion. Those spokesmen who condemn the alleged monopoly of information flowing from the industrial countries all too often represent governments which impose internal monopolies on all incoming and outgoing information. Stubborn adherence to this double standard of virtue can only sharpen existing differences.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Traditional ideas with regard to human rights, including the right to inform and to be informed, together with the rights of free expression and of privacy, are undergoing significant reformulation in our time. The move toward expansion of these rights also brings into play new concepts affecting the responsibilities of individuals, institutions and nations. The inherent contradictions between certain of these conflicting rights are being re-evaluated in several countries, including my own. In the United States, for example, the courts are grappling with the contradiction between the reporter's right to protect the confidentiality of news sources and the government's right to information that is relevant to criminal investigation or prosecution. The individual citizen's right of privacy—expressed decades ago by Mr. Justice Brandeis as the right “to be let alone”—also has come into conflict with the government's responsibility to inform the citizen of its own operations. Concentration of media ownership

in certain communities, the product of laissez faire attitudes in years past, conflicts increasingly with the responsibility of public authorities to foster a diversity of viewpoint and expression within those communities. Similar debates are taking place in other societies, based upon reinterpretations of their separate legal and moral value systems. These are highly complex issues. In attempting to resolve them, each society is bound to follow its own traditions.

Any attempt to decree a single planetary standard for resolving these issues must necessarily fail. The world community can, at best, undertake to seek out, and build upon, whatever elements of consensus may exist in this area, recognizing at all times the need to respect the diverse traditions that govern communication systems in each country.

AREAS OF POSSIBLE CONCRETE DECISION

Mr. Masmoudi and Mr. Osolnik between them have raised a number of matters that seem to me susceptible of agreement, leading to action. These include measures relating to international postal rates, telecommunication tariffs, universal access to satellite services, technology transfer and financial and training assistance. It may be useful to comment upon these suggestions, one by one:

Air postal rates.—Reductions in the rates affecting newspapers, periodicals and books could do much to increase the flows of information and cultural materials between developing countries, and between developing and industrial countries. Reduced shipping costs, moreover, could have the effect of stimulating increased production of such materials in the developing countries. At present, the Universal Postal Union allows its members to apply a 50 percent optional reduction for all printed matter. Material relief for the developing countries will probably require more drastic reductions, including specific preferential rates for small-run publications. Progress in this direction will not, however, be easily accomplished.

The Universal Postal Union is, of course, heavily influenced by the Ministries of Posts and Telegraphs of the member states, the largest number of these from developing countries. Most PTTs lose money on their postal operations and can, therefore, be expected to resist any drastic revision of international agreements that would have the effect of cutting their revenues. To reduce, or remove, this impediment to the free flow of information from the developing countries, a concerted effort will be needed on the part of all governments, above all the governments of the developing countries themselves.

They will have to persuade their PTTs that the maintenance of present rate structures, for reasons of revenue alone, conflicts directly with the promise of desirable impacts for the developing countries in telling the world of their aims and accomplishments. The UPU is a respected technical organization, which has been largely free of excessive political or ideological influence. If proposals for reform of the rate structure can be framed and put forward by a sufficient number of governments acting together, progress should be possible. So far as the government of the United States is concerned, I pledge my best efforts as a private citizen to see that this attainable and constructive reform is viewed with sympathy by its postal authorities.

Telecommunication tariffs.—This is another area for concrete action. The present tariff structure is the outcome of a web of complicated agreements at the national and international level. It will require the active involvement of many institutions to bring about the reforms we seek. Probably the most important forum for discussion is Intelsat, the international consortium created especially to provide international telecommunication services by means of satellite transmission. With a membership of some 100 states and its doors still open to others, Intelsat answers to many constituents. It is an appropriate forum for discussion of proposals to equalize communication rates world-wide, to offer discounts for transmission of news and to create preferential rates for certain types of transmissions from developing countries.

As in the matter of postal rates, however, the crucial persuading role may have to be played by the developing countries with their own PTTs. These ministries, quite apart from exerting considerable influence upon the positions taken by their governments within Intelsat, also levy charges on international communications, and these frequently surpass the charges billed by Intelsat for the international segment.

Here again, the PTTs may be inclined to protect their revenues from a highly profitable service—the provision of two-way links between the earth station and

the ultimate sender or receiver within the country—with even more determination than they protect an unprofitable service, the posts. Much of the task of persuasion must inevitably fall upon spokesmen for the developing countries, interceding effectively with their own governments. Although Intelsat cannot be expected to resolve all aspects of the problem by itself, it can give these issues high visibility. If the Intelsat experience proves fruitful, the way should be open for applying rate reductions to traffic carried by cable. Here as well it is the PTT administrations that control the channels and if they can reach agreement in one forum they should be prepared to do so in the other.

This history of Intelsat, brief though it is, has been marked by considerable technical and economic accomplishment, rather than political debate. For this reason, fruitful discussion within the organization will have to be conducted in the most objective terms possible. One caveat warrants special emphasis: To describe the treatment of small-scale users of telecommunication services as an "injustice" overlooks economic fact. It costs less, in real terms, to provide any such service in bulk than to start and stop the service repeatedly for small transmissions. It is this wholly economic factor, rather than malevolent intent, that explains why bulk users tend to pay less, per transmission. It will be difficult enough in my judgment to persuade the technical/financial personnel in the PTTs and in Intelsat to override their normal inclinations, even in a powerful case can be made in favor of revising their tariff structures for reasons of social benefit. Vague references to injustice will make the task of persuasion even more difficult. The argument must be more compelling—nothing less than the absolute necessity of building a world-wide communication system in which the developing countries can make their presence felt as full partners, capable of transmitting as well as receiving, in common with the industrial nations.

Access to satellite services.—This broader issue is entirely appropriate for consideration through Intelsat. In recent years, satellite communication capacity has been expanding rapidly and costs have been declining. This trend is likely to continue. Intelsat has already begun to offer its members domestic as well as international telecommunication services. Several developing countries have used this service to great advantage. A number of highly technical questions with direct implications for the matter of access, remain to be dealt with. For example, decisions must be taken with regard to the minimum technical standards for earth stations using present and projected Intelsat satellites. An agreement on standards will directly affect the costs of expanding satellite communications beyond the capital cities of the developing countries. For countries now engaged in building or planning national news agencies, telephone networks and rural development programs, the determination will be of crucial importance. On this and other issues of no less importance to the free flow of information between nations, and within them, Intelsat seems the right forum for serious discussion, leading of the kinds of action this Commission would favor.

Technology transfer.—This is one more area for concrete action. Certain errors of the past have arisen from a lack of clarity regarding the needs of receiving countries and the supply of technology that proved inappropriate to those needs. The United States Government, fully cognizant of the disappointments caused by certain of these transactions in years past, is now engaged in a major effort to upgrade in qualitative terms the official support given to technical cooperation between American enterprises and the developing countries. I have reason to believe that advice and suggestions from foreign governments and international organizations on ways of improving procedures for the transfer of communications technology would be carefully considered. The United Nations Conference on Science and Technology, to be held this summer, can be of powerful assistance in this area. The specific needs of developing countries in choosing the technologies best suited to their needs and conditions (with specific reference to information and communication) warrant prominent consideration at that conference.

Financial and training assistance.—Support for a major initiative in this area has been building over the last two years in the United States and other Western countries. As a direct result of the discussions in Paris last autumn, during the General Conference of UNESCO an intergovernmental planning conference is to be held in Washington later this year. Those of my countrymen who have been actively involved in this effort hope it may be the first step toward the creation of a Communications Development Consultative Group, with the sponsorship of UNESCO and balance participation, by developed and developing countries alike.

Certain of the major international funding agencies are now actively reconsidering their past disinclination to support communication projects in Third

World countries on the ground that such projects tended to favor the urban elites in recipient countries rather than the poorest of the rural poor. As a result of the rethinking now in process, it seems likely that more substantial funds will be allocated by the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) in the United States, together with the other institutions mentioned, in response to statements of interest and need on the part of developing countries. Within A.I.D. there is considerable interest, for example, in communication programs that explore the educational and development applications of satellite technology. The success of India's SITE project has pointed the way to new forms of north-south cooperation—the United States, in this case, supplying the satellite facilities with Indian educators in full control of the software.

Delegates to the 20th session of the General Conference last autumn heard the chief United States delegate outline a follow-up plan, which A.I.D. would be prepared to fund. This would be an effort, worked out in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the developing countries, to promote basic literacy, health care and other aspects of rural development through the use of satellite systems reaching into remote areas.

Ambassador Reinhardt also presented a plan for manpower training. We have learned through long experience that professional education and training for journalists and others involved in the communication arts are most effective when carried out within the regions in which the students feel at home with instructors native to the region in control of the curriculum. Under this proposal, the developing countries would be invited to identify regional training centers, with financial and technical support from the developed countries or international agencies. The United States has offered to send a senior American faculty member to each such center for a year, if requested, to serve as an adviser. Private news organizations in the United States also are prepared to underwrite visits of senior correspondents and editors, on rotating assignments, to help in skills training. Equipment needs, once identified, would be met through donations to the regional centers. The visiting instructors will be there to learn, as well as teach. Their direct exposure to the developments needs and perspective of developing regions will stay with them when they return to their permanent assignments as teachers and gatekeepers in American journalism.

ISSUES OF POLITICAL SENSITIVITY

The debate within UNESCO the scholarly community and the Commission itself has already exposed a number of questions which do not, in my judgement, lend themselves to solution by consensus. These are philosophical-political issues of a kind that generate strong passions and occasional dogmatic assertions. Among these are the rights of access to countries and to sources of information within those countries, censorship, licensing of journalists, codes of ethics, the right of rectification and demands for "equitable access" to the radio spectrum.

Right of access.—From the libertarian perspective, this right is fundamental. It calls for measures that would guarantee the freedom of journalists to move about the world without hindrance, to interview sources (both official and non-official) and to transmit their reports as a matter of right without interference by governments or other authorities. The Stockholm seminar last April specified a right of access not only to government sources but to the "entire spectrum of opinion" within any country.

The concept of access for duly accredited journalists clearly implies a world-wide opening of channels. Certain spokesmen for the developing countries, however, see the matter quite differently. In discussing the right of access, they appear to be more concerned with constricting, rather than opening, these channels of communication. Mr. Masmoudi, for example, lists three measures he would like to see adopted that plainly suggest restriction of access:

Regulation of the right to information by preventing abusive uses of the right of access to information.

Definition of appropriate criteria to govern truly objective news selection.

Regulation of the collection, processing and transmission of news and data across national frontiers.

As a citizen of a country that has enshrined in its constitution certain rugged safeguards for the press, designed to insure its independence from government, I must ask Mr. Masmoudi: Who would define "abusive uses" of the right of access? Who would determine the "appropriate criteria" for "truly objective" news selection? Who would regulate the flow of news across national frontiers? Does not each of his proposed measures invite official interference with the flow of information? Is he not, in effect, sanctioning censorship?

Let there be no mistake about the response to these suggestions in my country, and in many others (including Third World countries with a strong attachment to free institutions). We regard governments, and the men who lead them, as poor judges of journalistic objectivity. We must reject the notion, clearly implied in Mr. Masmoudi's listing, that the right of access, which is still in the process of definition, must from the outset be qualified, regulated, some would say nullified, by unidentified agencies. Any sovereign nation has the right and the power to shape its domestic laws and regulations as it sees fit. Such a nation would, however, be ill advised to expect passive acceptance of international standards based upon government control by countries that value a free and independent press.

Licensing of journalists.—This practice is not as yet widespread but it is gaining sufficient ground in Latin America to be troubling. In much of the world, even in countries where mass media enterprises are subject to licensing, they remain free to employ as journalists those persons they consider qualified for the task. The media institution itself is commonly considered the most appropriate source of knowledge regarding the particular demands of the job to be filled and the capabilities of the employee in question. For an outside body officially constituted or sanctioned, to intervene in this process would be to negate the independence of the press, subjecting it to influence or control by persons whose motives may have nothing to do with the pursuit of disinterested reporting, or of truth.

Proposals for the licensing of journalists, moreover, must inevitably collide with the individual citizen's right to communicate? If that right is to be elaborated and confirmed in international law, access to the media cannot logically be restricted solely to those persons holding professional licenses. The individual who has been denied access to the columns of a newspaper for lack of a professional license has been effectively stripped of a basic right under Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. It reads:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions * * * and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

The right of rectification.—In many countries, including the United States, it is unthinkable that the media should be compelled by the government to publish a retraction or correction of an earlier report. The Government of the United States has, to my knowledge, never requested such powers. Along with its private citizens, who may feel offended or injured by a particular report, the government relies on the professionalism of the media to publish corrections or retractions voluntarily when they are justified. A right under international law to compel corrections or retractions at the request of foreign governments, or their citizens, has in my judgement absolutely no prospect of acceptance in the United States, or many other countries. Foreign governments are not, of course, debarred from requesting correction of false or distorted reports, but the decision to publish rests with the responsible editors of the publication in question. It would be naive to assume that the United States Government would countenance the extension to foreign entities of a right it does not claim for itself.

The major means of redress for persons who feel they have been maligned in the press or broadcast media is, of course, the traditional laws governing libel. In the United States at least, libel actions do not as a rule lead to published retractions. In successful cases the court awards financial compensation for damages caused by the publication.

While libel laws offer the only legal remedy in such cases, new avenues of accountability to the public have been developed voluntarily by newspapers and broadcasting stations in the United States, and other countries. These include the establishment of Press Councils, which thoroughly investigate public complaints of false, distorted or misleading reports and publish their findings; also the institution of the Ombudsmen employed by many newspapers to investigate reader complaints while also exposing the shortcomings of their own newspapers in the treatment of specific news developments.

This idea adapted from Swedish practice, was inaugurated in the United States by the Louisville, Kentucky, Courier-Journal and soon thereafter adopted by The Washington Post and other leading newspapers. There has been a parallel development in the recent proliferation of Op-Ed pages, so called because they tend to be published opposite the editorial, or leader, page in hundreds of newspapers across the country. These pages provide space for articles submitted by

outside contributors, that is, non-journalists (some prominent, others obscure) who freely express their views and observations on matters of public interest. There is, finally, the Letters to the Editor section in virtually all American newspapers which invite and publish contributions from readers.

The purpose of citing these examples is not to persuade other countries that the American system is a perfect model for the world. It is only to show that there is more than one way of dealing with the problem of false information, the more compelling in that it rests on voluntary compliance, rather than compulsion. Any attempt to draft a right of universal application that would compel retraction or correction of offending articles risks direct contravention of a decent and durable tradition that is honored not only in the United States but in other countries as well. Such a measure, if proposed as an international norm, would certainly be unacceptable in the United States and elsewhere.

Codes of ethics.—There can be no objection, only encouragement, on the part of the Commission to the voluntary elaboration of professional codes by journalists and journalistic organizations, so long as these codes apply within particular countries. Such codes exist and are observed, more or less, in a great many countries. In my own, the National Association of Broadcasters has its code of conduct; the American Society of Newspaper Editors has its own code. In addition to these industry-wide codes, many media enterprises, concerned with the maintenance of high professional standards, have their own codes. What is proposed by Mr. Masmoudi and others, however, appears to be a universal code for journalists of all nations.

To attempt the drafting of such a code seems to me a fruitless task.

Given the radically different conceptions of the journalist's role in society that have become apparent in our own deliberations, it seems abundantly clear that any formula we could devise would be essentially meaningless. In the United States, for example, the press and three of the four television networks are privately owned. They remain independent of government, frequently serving as a check on abuses of government power. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the press is seen as a direct instrument of the State. It is difficult for me to imagine how representatives of societies with such disparate political and social systems can be expected to agree upon a single code of conduct for all journalists, everywhere, unless the Commission were to limit its aspirations to a guarantee of physical security for journalists working outside their own countries.

Spokesmen for certain nonaligned countries have argued for a code of planetary scope in order that journalists might be held accountable to the entire world community. There have also been calls for a code to protect journalists from improper demands placed upon them by their employers. It strikes me as remarkable and somehow revealing, that nowhere in these documents is there mention of a code to protect journalists—and journalistic enterprises—from the dead hand of government control.

Access to the frequency spectrum.—This matter has been assigned to another forum, the World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) to be convened later this year in Geneva. It is clear to me that the Commission has neither the time nor the special experience to anticipate the work of WARC. Only one or two observations can be advanced with any degree of confidence:

First, that the spectrum is, beyond question, a global resource; second, that those developing countries making little use of the spectrum in their present state of development are entirely justified in seeking to assure their access to the spectrum at a later stage, when they are equipped to use it. The type of a priori plan that has been advanced for allocating the spectrum in precisely equal shares will, however, strike many as wasteful. There may well be a need to revise the traditional ITU procedure of assigning frequencies on a "first come, first served" basis. But a priori plans that would allocate scarce frequencies to countries that are not ready to use them does not appear to be a rational solution.

The list of sensitive issues discussed above is not intended to be comprehensive. My purpose in raising these issues is to suggest that the Commission would be well advised to separate the more intractable political and philosophical issues from those relatively value-free, on which consensus is possible and even likely.

LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVES

A universal act of awareness has been called for by Ambassador Masmoudi. The most thoughtful of journalists and students of communication processes are fully aware of the historic dependencies, disparities and imbalances that handicap the developing nations. They acknowledge that the present patterns of in-

formation flow, running heavily in one direction, must be altered for the benefit of all nations, developed and developing alike.

The news flow argument, however noisy and prolonged, will have served its purpose if it leads to the establishment of new national and regional structures above all in the developing regions of the world, that can serve as building blocks of the genuinely multidirectional world system that technology has put within our grasp. Wisely applied in a spirit of north-south cooperation, the new technologies can create an abundance of communication channels that is without precedent in human history. Greater and more diversified message flows and broader citizen participation are technically possible today. With each passing year, the productivity of communication technology rises and its costs continue to drop.

In economic terms, the information technology possesses certain unique virtues. It is a resource created by human ingenuity that, unlike oil or coal or other non-renewable materials, can never be exhausted. As it becomes ever more productive, hence cheaper, it can be universally available.

Seen in this hopeful perspective, the new multidirectional world system can become a primary agent of reform and reconstruction also affecting political and economic relationships among nations. Indeed the problem confronting generations to come may well be how to share the world's increasing abundance of communication resources, a more agreeable task than the familiar squabbles and power struggles over control of energy and other raw materials, which diminish year by year. It is by focusing on the prospects the future holds, rather than the legacies of the colonial past, that this Commission can accomplish its assigned task.

Mr. HALL. Thank you Professor Abel.

Mr. Friedheim.

STATEMENT OF JERRY W. FRIEDHEIM, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Jerry W. Friedheim, a former Missouri newspaperman, has served as Executive Vice President and General Manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association since June 1975. He is the chief administrator for the association which represents more than 1,300 newspapers throughout the United States, Canada and the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Friedheim also serves as Executive Vice President and chief administrator of the ANPA Foundation.

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. Thank you, Mr. Hall. I think I should set the record straight at the beginning. Mr. Abel said he "used to be" a journalist. We certainly regard him as an academic of distinction in this country, but certainly his peers in journalism and those who have learned from him regard him as a continuing journalist, and I hope that the subcommittee would do so also.

We are glad to have this opportunity to join with these other witnesses and to acquaint you with some of the views of some free-world newspaper executives on international developments which may affect or do affect both the press and in our view the public.

I would like to highlight my written statement and simply submit it for the record, Mr. Chairman.

I want to tell you a little bit about the activities of the free-world media in regard to what we have heard called this New World Information Order, to express some of our very serious concerns about it, and to outline some areas in which we think constructive and cooperative efforts can and should be channeled.

I can speak officially only for the American Newspaper Publishers Association, but ANPA's views on this issue are, I believe, representa-

tive of and consistent of those of other free world media organization.

ANPA is a member of three large international media organizations; the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers, called FIEJ; the International Press Telecommunication Council; and the World Press Freedom Committee. We are, as you can see, interested in international press matters, just as we are in domestic ones.

We have listened with interest to the proponents for change in international communication practices, and we have been attentive to the developments which have taken place since this term "new world information order" was first used. We feel the term and the concept is at best very vague. It seems to refer to a host of complaints and a variety of proposals.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who work in the business which exercise the citizens' free press liberties, believe that without a free press there can be no free society. Here in the United States we are proud of our first amendment rights, and we guard those jealously. But we know we have no monopoly on mankind's yearning for freedom. None of us wants to shun the cooperative efforts of men and women elsewhere in the world who wish to support, defend, and expand free and uncontrolled communications between and among peoples. We would suggest to the subcommittee that the matters brought to mind by the term "new world information order" are viewed across the world from at the very least three basic viewpoints, and that it is a case of "where you stand depends on where you sit."

From the standpoint of the developing countries, the desire appears to be for communication of more favorable information about themselves to others, and they sometimes think government control of communications is a step toward their goals. From the standpoint of the Soviet bloc, there appears to be a desire to expand throughout the world the Soviet principle of government control of communications. The Soviet Union's UNESCO words and deeds make this clear, even though they, too, now have some reservations about this vague concept.

From the standpoint of the free-world press there is a willingness to cooperate with journalists in developing countries and to help them obtain expertise and training, and technology, and to use it professionally; but there is a strong opposition to efforts toward government control. It is also obvious to us that the efforts of some nations to change international communications practices are inextricably part and parcel of similar efforts to change international economic practices, all to the detriment of the free world.

The Soviet Union originally proposed the "Draft Declaration on Use of Mass Media" which came before UNESCO, and the rhetoric of the proposal was that the media should be used by governments. The free-world representatives pointed out that a truly free press could not be used even for laudible goals, and stressed that government use of the media meant government decisionmaking on content; and that, of course, was censorship.

Fortunately, not all of the developing countries have agreed with the Soviet view, as our State Department representative pointed out. That proposal was tabled, and the MacBride Commission, on which Professor Abel sits, was organized. But last year the proponents of the original declaration were back again in the UNESCO arena, unwilling to

wait for the MacBride Commission's report. A resolution was adopted which endorsed the principle of a new, and a fair, and a balanced world information communications orders.

Unfortunately, much of what is now discussed under the heading of the "new world information order" consists of versions of the Soviet-originated "Draft Declaration on the Use of the Mass Media."

Some proponents of change envision new international law by which governments would redress alleged "imbalances" cited by developing countries. They suggest that this might involve an international code of ethics, written primarily by governments and enforced by government police power.

There are those who support an international "right of correction" which would provide governments with increased mechanisms for controlling press content.

Others would arrange "protection" for journalists, as Professor Abel has pointed out, not just from physical harm, but also from other "pressures" on the journalists, with the governments doing the "protecting." Such protection almost always involves some sort of governmental licensing process, such as has recently been suffered by the journalists in Panama.

So, Mr. Chairman, most of the moves for change is in the direction of governments controlling communications, governments controlling the media, governments licensing journalists, governments editing the news, and governments giving the views. The thrust, simply, is not about freedom as the free world understands freedom.

We are, of course, fortunate that Professor Abel has helped to enlighten other colleagues around the world by his work on the MacBride Commission. You have before you his paper, which I commend to the committee's attention as the most thoughtful study that has been done on this subject today. The free world and free press are certainly fortunate to have him representing our views.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that ANPA is somewhat apprehensive that discussion of all of these political issues might well arise at the World Administrative Radio Conference this fall, as previous witnesses have indicated. The delegation chairman, Mr. Robinson, who testified earlier, is of course quite aware of this potential and he does not expect all these dire things to occur. ANPA hopes that he is correct. But with the effectiveness of the free world's press at stake, we believe that the U.S. delegation must be prepared for all the contingencies, and we are frankly disappointed that the President specifically chose not to include a newspaper publisher or editor among this delegation. We hope that the Congress and this committee will strongly encourage the White House and the Department of State to take all appropriate action now necessary to insure that our representatives at WARC are properly equipped and supported by the full range of U.S. diplomatic support, to deal with the challenges of the free press if they should indeed occur at WARC.

Even though we are critical, Mr. Chairman, of some proposals for increased government controls on international communications, the free-world journalists do recognize that there are some positive proposals for change which deserve even more attention from us. One is the presentation of more and better reported news from the developing nations. The two major American wire services, the Associated Press

and United Press International, are most conscious of the importance of transmitting meaningful international information to audiences and readers worldwide. They are at work constantly to improve their coverage, to write for more specific interest groups, and to use reporters and editors who understand more of the background of the societies about which they are writing. The major American broadcast networks share these concerns and these efforts.

It has been suggested that another international news service should be established specifically to transfer information between developing countries, and a nonaligned news pool has in fact been formed. There were some who expected the media of the developed world to oppose that sort of action, but the opposite has been true. The free press recognizes that growth of new and existing international and regional news services enhances the capability of free people to receive and to impart information.

Another element the free press supports is technology transfer. The press in the developed world recognizes that transfer of technology to developing countries will contribute to a world in which more communication is possible.

There has been active private sector participation, particularly from North America, Japan, and Western Europe, in efforts to help journalists in developing countries upgrade both their equipment and their skills. Both FIEJ and the World Press Freedom Committee are active in this arena, and I have included for the committee some details of this activity in my written statement.

I was interested, Mr. Hall, to hear Professor Abel raise the subject that he believes the single most important one for journalists in developing countries, and that is the need for cheaper newsprint and other types of paper. Our ANPA Research Institute has been conducting some rather interesting studies which indicate that we may one day be able to make newsprint from a woodpulp alternative known as kenaf. Kenaf is a plant that grows very rapidly in a number of the developing countries. On an experimental basis, we have grown some in the United States successfully. We have produced some experimental newsprint from it, and we actually printed part of a press run of one of our member newspapers on newsprint made from kenaf. It would grow more quickly, would be cheaper to use, and if our research proves in future years that kenaf can produce newsprint successfully and economically, we may, sooner than we expect, be in a position to further help journalists in developing countries by showing them how to manufacture their own newsprint from their own locally grown kenaf plants.

Another communication area which is ripe for cooperative and constructive effort is that of reducing the costs of international communications. In some parts of Africa, for instance, it costs more to telephone a neighboring country than it does to call Paris or London. An international organization, willing to push for cooperative efforts between governments and possibly willing to provide capital for communications equipment investment, could make a significant and a lasting contribution to improve worldwide communications simply by making physical communication among nations more economical.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me capsule for you some suggestions that I think might be constructive for the committee to consider.

First, the United States must continue to follow a firm diplomatic policy which is alert to even the most subtle efforts to undermine press freedom, or to disadvantage free societies.

I think you have heard today two articulate spokesmen—"the" articulate spokesmen from the diplomatic corps and the administration and I can tell you that the free press in the United States is delighted that these gentlemen are as interested and effective as they are in this field. But the firm efforts that now exist have not always existed in this arena, as you indicated by one of your questions, and we hope that this committee and others will continue to share with the executive branch your desire that this emphasis would continue.

As a second point, Mr. Chairman, the United States, I believe, should consider regularly the question of whether it is appropriate for an international agency, of which the United States is a member, to actively pursue—with the help of funds contributed by this country—a course which seems to point toward controls on communications. One small example crossed my desk as I was preparing this testimony and raised this question again in my mind.

I learned that the United Nations development program is planning a seminar in Costa Rica this fall for a proposed United Nations International "University for Peace." The seminar would be on the topic, "The Role of the Mass Media in Provoking War and in Promoting and Preserving Peace." There is the magic rhetoric again from someone who wants not a free press, but a manipulatable press—a press playing a "role" directed by the governors, rather than freely serving the governed.

I wonder how much this exercise by the U.N. in Costa Rica is going to cost, and I wonder what the U.S. mission to the U.N. has done about it. The subcommittee might also wonder.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be constructive to seriously consider whether there are ways in which our Government can cooperate with international, private-sector efforts to bring better tools and increased professionalism to journalists in developing countries who want them—without our Government exercising control over those programs or devoting taxpayer funds to them. For example, our Government might help arrange transportation of communications equipment which our private sector is making available for transfer to developing countries. Surely, some constructive U.S. diplomatic effort could be made in the area of reducing the costs of international communications in and between the developing countries.

Finally, our Government simply must assure that U.S. delegations to all international meetings are fully and properly represented so that they can effectively address all of the issues likely to be presented in those forums. Even the forums in the international arena on the most remote topics now are subject to discussion of these rhetorical subjects from some of the countries of the world which do not necessarily wish us well.

All of these things, Mr. Chairman, we feel are not just important to the free press newspapers of the United States, but they are important to the United States.

Thank you, sir.

[Mr. Friedheim's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JERRY W. FRIEDHEIM, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AFFECTING THE FREE PRESS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to acquaint this subcommittee with some of the views of free-world newspaper executives on international developments which affect or may affect both the press and the public.

The government panel which previously has testified here has outlined for you the origins of the so-called "new world information order" and has reported to you on the U.S. government's posture in relation to it.

I want to tell you something about the activities of the free-world media in regard to this concept; to highlight some of our very serious concerns about it; and to outline some areas in which we think cooperative and constructive efforts can and should be channeled.

I can speak officially only for the American Newspaper Publishers Association of which I am executive vice president and general manager, but ANPA's views on this issue are representative of and consistent with those of other free-world media organizations.

ANPA is an international, trade association of more than 1,340 member newspapers in the United States, Canada, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Brazil, the Netherlands Antilles; and of such European newspapers as the International Herald-Tribune. ANPA membership includes more than 90 percent of total U.S. daily and Sunday newspaper circulation and more than 85 percent of daily and Sunday newspaper circulation in Canada. ANPA also represents a number of nondaily newspapers.

ANPA, itself, is a member of three, international-media organizations—the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers (FIEJ), the International Press Telecommunications Council (IPTC) and the World Press Freedom Committee (WPFC).

FIEJ is a federation of 28 newspaper associations in 26 countries. The World Press Freedom Committee is composed of 34 media organizations in five continents. I serve on the Executive Council of FIEJ and on the Executive Committee of the World Press Freedom Committee.

An executive of an ANPA member newspaper has been a delegate at the last two UNESCO general conferences—Clayton Kirkpatrick of the Chicago Tribune in Nairobi; William Attwood of Newsday in Paris.

The chairman of ANPA's International Relations Subcommittee, Joseph Rawley of the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, was a member of the U.S. Advisory Committee on the World Administrative Radio Conference, and ANPA is watching preparations for this fall's conference in Geneva with great interest and some worry.

So you can see, Mr. Chairman, ANPA is interested in international press matters just as it is in domestic ones. We have listened with interest to the proponents for change in international communications practices; and we have been attentive to the developments which have taken place since this term "new world information order" was first used. We view this term and its concept as at best vague. It appears to refer to a host of complaints and a variety of proposals.

We are pleased to discuss these complaints and proposals with you and with others, including those in developing countries; but we cannot discuss the so-called "new world information order" as a specific and detailed proposal because it is not that—and almost certainly should not become that.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who work in a business which exercises the citizenry's free-press liberties believe that without a free press there can be no free societies.

Here in the United States, we are proud of our First Amendment liberties; and we guard them jealously. And we know we have no monopoly on mankind's yearning to enjoy freedom. None of us wants to shun the cooperative efforts of men and women elsewhere in the world who wish to support, defend and expand free and uncontrolled communications between and among peoples.

We would suggest to the Committee that the matters brought to mind by the term "new world information order" are viewed across the world from at least three basic viewpoints. And, it's a case of "how you stand depends upon where you sit."

From the standpoint of the developing countries, the desire appears to be for communication of more favorable information about themselves to others. And they sometimes think government control of communications is a step toward their goals.

From the standpoint of the Soviet bloc, there appears to be a desire to expand throughout the world the Soviet principle of government control of communications. The Soviet Union's UNESCO words and deeds make this clear.

From the standpoint of the free-world press, there is a willingness to cooperate with journalists in developing countries and to help them obtain expertise and technology and use it professionally; but there is strong opposition to the efforts of government control. It also is obvious to us, Mr. Chairman, that the efforts of some nations to change international communications practices are part and parcel of similar efforts to change international economic practices—all to the detriment of the free world.

The Soviet Union with support from a number of developing countries, originally proposed the "Draft Declaration on Use of Mass Media" which first came before UNESCO in 1976. The rhetoric of the proposal was that the media should be used by governments for "strengthening peace and international understanding and in combating war propaganda, racism and apartheid."

The free world pointed out that a truly free press could not be "used" even for laudable goals; and stressed that government "use" of media meant that government spokesmen would be making decisions on media content—and that constitutes censorship.

Fortunately, all developing countries did not agree with the Soviet view on government control of the press and the proposal was tabled; and UNESCO created the MacBride commission to study world communications problems.

But in 1978 the proponents of the declaration were back, unwilling to wait for the commission's report in 1980. Last year an amended declaration, with many objectionable elements deleted, was adopted by consensus. But a separate resolution was adopted which endorsed "the principle of the establishment of a new, fair and balanced world information and communications order."

However, much of what continues to be discussed under the heading of "new world information order" consists of versions of the Soviet-originated "Draft Declaration on Use of Mass Media."

The underlying theory of the international proponents of government control of communications is entirely opposite to our theories of libertarian government and to the theories of others worldwide who seek real freedom for individual citizens.

Some proponents of change envision new international law by which governments would redress alleged "imbalances" cited by developing countries. They suggest this might involve an international code-of-ethics written primarily by governments and enforced by government police power.

There are those who support an international "right-of-correction" which would provide governments with increased mechanisms for controlling press content.

Others would include "protection" of journalists not just from physical harm but also from the "pressures" of their employers—with government doing the "protecting." And such "protection" might well be preceded by a governmental licensing process, such as has recently been suffered by journalists in Panama.

So, Mr. Chairman, most of the move for change is in the direction of governments controlling communications; governments controlling the media; governments licensing journalists; governments editing the news; governments giving the views. The thrust, simply, is not about freedom as the free world understands and enjoys freedom.

I want to take a moment to thank the U.S. member on the MacBride commission, Professor Elie Abel, for his contributions to these deliberations. His paper, "Communication for an Interdependent, Pluralistic World," which I understand you have before you, is an excellent reply to the proponents of government control. We in the United States, the free press and the free world, are fortunate to have him representing our views on the commission.

One of my greatest fears, Mr. Chairman, is that some of these proposals which would place governments in control of communications would inevitably lead to a world of "information islands" in which people in one place are able to learn little if anything of what might be happening in the rest of the world's "information islands." In such a world, international problems would be compounded; societies would understand almost nothing of developments in other societies. World peace would be fragile, indeed.

ANPA is apprehensive, Mr. Chairman, that discussion of these political issues might well arise at the World Administrative Radio Conference this fall. Traditionally, this forum has been limited to consideration of technical proposals for

the allocation of spectrum frequencies, but there have been indications that proponents of increased government control of communications regard WARC as an important arena for the pursuit of their goals. ANPA believes the U.S. delegation must be well prepared to confront these potential discussions.

ANPA is concerned that the procedural structure of WARC may itself, come under attack; that there may be an overt attempt to divert the technical deliberations in order to focus on volatile—and irrelevant—issues such as space sovereignty for satellites, prior governmental approval for news transmissions across borders and other "political issues." The chairman of our delegation, Mr. Robinson, is quite aware of this potential; and he does not expect these things to occur. ANPA hopes he is correct. But, with the effectiveness of the world's free press at stake, ANPA believes that the U.S. must be prepared for this contingency. And we are not yet convinced that the U.S. delegation is adequately prepared to face such a challenge. The delegation does not even contain a knowledgeable publisher or editor despite our recommendation of just such a person.

Another way in which government control of the press may be pursued at WARC is through a carefully orchestrated series of technical proposals that could be put before the various working groups—proposals which, when taken as a whole, might represent an attempt to further certain political viewpoints. ANPA believes it is imperative that a senior member of the U.S. delegation be assigned primary responsibility for the review of the reports of the working groups so that such a plan may be recognized quickly and confronted fully.

ANPA shares the expressed concern of Senators Goldwater and Schmitt that our delegation is not as prepared as it needs to be.

ANPA is disappointed that the President specifically chose not to include a newspaper publisher or editor among the delegates. There is no one on the delegation who can speak on behalf of the special and essential needs of our free press. ANPA hopes the Congress will strongly encourage the White House and the State Department to take all appropriate action now necessary to ensure that our representatives at WARC are properly equipped and supported to deal with challenges to the free press, should they occur.

Even though we are critical, Mr. Chairman, of proposals for increased government controls on international communications, the free-world's journalists recognize that there are some positive proposals for change which deserve even more attention from us. In fact, we believe the arguments for greater government control will be significantly undermined as some proposals which deserve attention are acted upon with vigor.

These are areas to which we think the MacBride commission could give its constructive attention. We have urged Mr. MacBride to do just that. These are areas in which free press representatives have long been working.

One is presentation of more and better-reported news from developing nations. Most readers of free-world newspapers would not put news from developing countries at the top of their personal lists of the information they need the most. Yet, free-world newspaper editors and publishers realize more than ever before that events elsewhere in the world often have significant impact upon our nations and our lives.

The two major news services, the Associated Press and United Press International, are most conscious of the importance of transmitting meaningful international information to audiences and readers worldwide. They are at work constantly to improve their coverage, to write for more specific interest groups, and to use reporters and editors who understand more of the background of the societies about which they are writing.

It was suggested that another international news service should be established specifically to transfer information between developing countries; and a non-aligned news pool has been formed. Some expected the media of the developed world would oppose this action. The opposite has been true; the free press recognizes that establishment and growth of new and existing international and regional news services enhances the ability of free people to receive and impart information.

Another element the free press supports is technology transfer. The press in the developed world recognizes that transfer of technology to developing countries will contribute to a world in which more communication is possible.

There has been active private sector participation, particularly from North America, Japan and Western Europe, in efforts to help journalists in developing countries upgrade both their equipment and their skills.

There are a number of press organizations actively at work in this area. I probably could not list all the programs, but I will cite two in which ANPA plays a role.

One is the development program of the World Press Freedom Committee, which began about two years ago. Since then, the World Press Freedom Committee has made 25 grants for seminars and other training programs and for efforts to upgrade print and broadcast equipment of media in developing countries. These grants have supported efforts in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. They total more than \$200,000 and have consumed about two-thirds of the contributions which have thus far been donated by private media organizations—the World Press Freedom Committee's sole financial support.

In addition, the World Press Freedom Committee has located expert technicians and sent them to newspapers in developing countries which have requested advice on how to solve specific technical and equipment problems.

ANPA cooperates with the World Press Freedom Committee in locating equipment from North American newspapers which are upgrading their equipment and are interested in passing on good, used equipment to journalists in developing countries.

The other effort I wish to cite is the work of the Press Development Cooperation Committee of FIEJ, the organization of 28 newspaper associations in 26 free world countries which I mentioned earlier.

The FIEJ Press Development Cooperation Committee has recently been able to provide mobile printing units in two developing countries: Indonesia and Kenya. These units involve a small printing facility housed in a motorized van. They permit a small newspaper to be printed and distributed regularly in a number of rural communities along a scheduled route over which the van operates.

The FIEJ committee plans a seminar next year in Nairobi on the "function and organization of newspaper media for rural development." This seminar will be held in cooperation with UNESCO; some of its funds will come from the World Press Freedom Committee; and it will be for journalists from throughout Africa.

I also was interested to hear Professor Abel say that he believes that the single most important need of journalists in developing countries is for more and cheaper newsprint.

Our ANPA Research Institute has been conducting some interesting studies which indicate that we may one day be able to make newsprint from a woodpulp alternative known as kenaf. Kenaf is a plant which grows very rapidly in a number of the developing countries. On an experimental basis, ANPA has grown kenaf in the United States successfully, and we think farmers in the South and Southwest might be able to grow two crops a year. We have produced some experimental newsprint and actually printed part of a normal press run at one of our member newspapers on newsprint made from kenaf.

If our research proves in future years that kenaf can produce newsprint successfully and economically, we may one day be in a position to further help journalists in developing countries by showing them how to manufacture their own newsprint from locally-grown kenaf.

Another communications area ripe for cooperative and constructive effort is that of reducing the costs of international communications.

The IPTC long has advocated reduced press rates for international communications. This Council is composed of organizations which represent press interests in Europe, North and South America, Japan and South Africa. The Council has been active with UNESCO's Working Group on International Telecommunication Tariff Structures.

A number of governments, including both developing and developed countries, currently seem to think that major profit opportunities lie in international press transmission over government-run communication systems. Yet, the greater benefit to society would come from cheaper and more plentiful international communications.

In many parts of Africa, it costs more to telephone a neighboring country than it does to call Paris or London.

An international organization willing to push for cooperative efforts between governments, and possibly willing to provide capital for communications equipment investment, could make a significant and lasting contribution to improved, worldwide communications simply by making physical communications among nations more economical. Such an effort also could include increased efforts to reduce international postal rates. This would make it easier for the printed words of all people to flow inexpensively among nations.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me capsulize for you some suggestions I believe it would be constructive for you to consider.

First, the United States must follow a firm diplomatic policy which is alert to even the most subtle efforts to undermine press freedom.

Second, the United States should consider the question of whether it is appropriate for an international organization of which it is a member to actively pursue—with the help of funds contributed by this country—a course which seems to point toward controls on communications. One small example crossed my desk while I was preparing this testimony. I learned that the United Nations Development Program is planning a seminar in Costa Rica this fall for a proposed United Nations International "University for Peace." The seminar would be on the topic, "The Role of the Mass Media in Provoking War and in Promoting and Preserving Peace." There's the magic rhetoric again from someone who wants not a free press but a manipulated press. A press playing a "role" directed by the governors rather than freely serving the governed.

I wonder how much this sorry exercise by the U.N. in Costa Rica is going to cost. I wonder what the U.S. Mission to the U.N. has done about it.

The Committee might also wonder.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be constructive to seriously consider whether there are ways in which our government can cooperate with international, private-sector efforts to bring better tools and increased professionalism to journalists in developing countries who seek them—without our government exercising control over those programs or devoting taxpayer funds to them. For example, the U.S. government might help arrange to transport communications equipment, donated by the private sector, to journalists in developing countries on a space-available basis. Surely some constructive U.S. diplomatic efforts could be made in the area of reducing the costs of international communications.

And, certainly, the government can assure that U.S. delegations to international meetings are fully and properly representative so that they may effectively address the issues likely to be presented in those forums—and one good place to start would be for the President to correct the current oversight and name a publisher or editor to the WARC delegations.

Mr. Chairman, communications problems have existed since peoples of the world began seeking truth. While truth is the just goal for all journalists, it is admittedly elusive. Free journalists must satisfy themselves with printing what they honestly believe to be truth, and with reporting the views of all sides in the hope that truth can be perceived by the reader. It is an imperfect process, and there always will be those who would replace free editors with someone more likely to make editorial decisions favorable to their own viewpoints.

Because people of the world will not always agree as to what is true, the best alternative is to have a multiplicity of information sources available to them. It is far better for people to have access to information gathered and presented by a cadre of free and competing reporters and editors, than for the people to be left with only one source which a government or an international body has decided provides "truth".

And that's not just important to the free-press newspapers of the United States, Mr. Chairman. It's important to the United States.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Friedheim.

Professor Abel, what, in your opinion, will be UNESCO's reaction to the Commission's report, and what kind of reaction do you expect from the United States?

Mr. ABEL. That is a difficult question to answer. As of now I would be very hard pressed to suggest to you what the final shape of that report will be, for the reasons I have indicated in my statement. UNESCO is, as we all know, a two-headed organization basically; policy is set by the General Conference in biennial sessions and executed by the Secretariat. Since the Commission members were drawn from countries that represent major trends within UNESCO and the U.N. there should be no particular surprise, except that if the rule of consensus which UNESCO favors is indeed followed in the Commission, it is quite conceivable that some of the more political, more demagogic demands of particular spokesmen for the Third World will be watered down, or indeed dropped by the wayside.

I think we saw that process at work in the last session of the General Conference, at which the draft declaration in effect was rendered toothless by the efforts of our own Government and those of other governments in the West, with support from the nonaligned group. That was considered a tactical defeat by some of the more extreme proponents of the new world information order idea. The minute our commission met last January, they were there, trying to put back in all the things that were dropped out in November. So, it is not an easy question to answer.

I, myself, tend to be a little pessimistic about the answer. It is a battle that will have to be fought in every conceivable arena, I think, for years to come.

Mr. HALL. You talked about licensing reporters. Do you expect UNESCO to accept this proposal?

Mr. ABEL. Well, the interesting thing about that is that I think I was the first member of the commission to raise, more than a year ago, the problem of licensing reporters, which was already fairly well advanced in Latin America. When I put it before the commission as one of the evils that certainly ought to be on our list, several members of the commission, including the Soviet delegates, said they had never heard of any such thing.

Well, now, thanks to Mr. MacBride and his somewhat controversial proposal, which comes as close to licensing as any I know, it is very much on the front burner. I doubt, frankly, that there is a consensus in favor of licensing within the commission.

I should tell you, however, that it is an issue on which you are never going to get unanimity. I remember one of my African colleagues saying to me that in his country—which shall remain nameless for the moment—journalists like to be registered because it is a status symbol to have your name on the official roll of licensed and authorized journalists; this means that you are more important than other people. I think he somewhat misunderstood my objections to the idea of licensing. But, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. HALL. When the commission will make its final report, what kinds of recommendations do you think will come from it?

Mr. ABEL. I hope that we are going to get recommendations of the kind I tried to outline in this paper. There are, it seems to me, a number of issues on which we, the countries with highly developed industrial economies, ought to be sympathetic to the genuine needs of the poor countries. There is the matter Mr. Friedheim mentioned—which is also in this paper—of somehow making it easier for countries in remote parts of the world to use the marvels of modern communications systems, including satellites and other advanced forms of telecommunication at, I would say, preferential rates: Let the poor pay less. As of now, they pay more in most cases. I am sure that is not what the common carriers intended, but that is the effect. The developing countries tend to use these services for very short-run transmissions which means turning on the power and turning off the power repeatedly. They are handicapped in that sense.

If they are to be made full members of a worldwide communications system, maybe we ought to encourage them a little bit. Indeed, I heard the other day of an effort by some communication lawyers in Washington to pick up on that idea and see whether the FCC might not look with favor upon such a system.

There is an interesting parallel. The British for years, beginning before the war and on through it, had something called an "Empire Penny Rate," which was of course in those days used essentially for newspapers. But it did greatly facilitate the transmission of news and other information within the Commonwealth for a penny a word, from any point to any other point. Now, this was in the days when that traffic went by cable alone.

I think it would be an interesting "act of awareness," which one of my colleagues keeps asking for, if the advanced Western and, for that matter, Eastern countries that have satellites and other sorts of transmission equipment available, would give serious thought to providing special services for the poorest countries, in that way insuring that they are tied into the world network. That, I would strongly favor.

I also strongly favor support for training programs. I have suggested already that indeed many of our private organizations are doing that now. The AP and UPI have both been training a number of Africans in the last year in connection with plans by their own countries to set up national news agencies. They send those people to New York for the "hands-on" experience of working in a major international news agency.

I think the newsprint proposal is an important one. But the crucial point for me is that if the Commission wishes to be taken seriously it must at the same time, take very strong positions against certain abuses of freedom of expression, which are not limited to the developing countries but unfortunately rather prevalent in certain of those countries.

I, for one, feel that a report placing new restrictions on information flow is one that I simply cannot and will not support. That is what I had in mind when I suggested the possibility of a fairly resounding dissent. If pushed to the wall, that is what we will do.

MR. HALL. Mr. Friedheim, what role did the American media play in formulating the U.S. position on the "Mass Media Declaration" for the 1978 UNESCO conference?

MR. FRIEDHEIM. Well, as Mr. Dalley said, there was considerable interchange between the private sector of the U.S. journalism community and our diplomats as that subject and numerous peripheral subjects were discussed. For instance, the officers of the American Newspaper Publishing Association—one of them also happened to be the president of the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers—met with the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Reinhardt, and others. Representatives of the Associated Press and United Press International were there, and a number of others. There has been good, close, and continuing interchange of views. From our side, we could not be more delighted with the receptivity of the administration to the views of the free press. It has not always been that way on some issues. This is one that is quite important to us and important, we think, to society and the country. We are sure it will continue.

MR. HALL. So, the reaction of the Western media was favorable?

MR. FRIEDHEIM. It should be pointed out that the same sort of situation which I described here in the United States did in fact occur in virtually every other "free press" country in the world, particularly our European colleagues and Japan, the Scandinavian countries, all of them approached their governments and their diplomats in the same manner and had the same sort of effective exchange and interchange.

Coming back in the other direction, the suggestions that the private sector provide some training support and some equipment support, and some understanding of the feelings of the diplomats and the journalists in the Third World has met with the establishment of a number of the programs I detailed in my statement, which I did not bother to read to you. But particularly the World Press Freedom Committee is deeply involved in trying to satisfy the kinds of awareness concerns that Professor Abel mentioned.

Mr. HALL. When you see distortions in reporting events in the Third World, do you think that these distortions come mainly from restrictions imposed by governments on reporters, or other reasons, such as cultural barriers?

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. There certainly have been cultural barrier problems, but I think that is much, much less now in perhaps the last decade when the Western media have particularly sought to assign reporters and editors to those countries who understood them, knew their history, and could speak the language.

There were those, such as Professor Abel, who were able to do it in previous years, but it certainly has improved in the most recent years.

Distortions quite often occur, what the developing countries might regard as distortions, or what an American reader might regard as an unclear statement, quite often occur because of restrictions which governments place on foreign correspondents operating in their countries.

One of the dangers of proceeding in the direction of those who want increased government control on communications, the transfer of information, is that the countries will become what I call "information islands" in which each is sort of closed in to itself and the information on activities in that country does not freely flow to the outside world. Therefore, those of us on the outside, looking in, are not able to understand what is happening in that country or why; or who the leaders of the country are, or why. In that direction lies only dire trouble in the international arena because we can only have misunderstanding or lack of understanding, or untimely understanding in those circumstances.

Mr. HALL. What about our foreign correspondents, the network for Western papers, do they speak the language of the countries?

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. Not in every case, of course. In many cases they speak an international language which allows them to operate in several countries. More and more often they do speak the language, or do utilize assistants or aides within a country in which they are operating. The European correspondents are also involved in this. I think Professor Abel could comment on that, he has seen it operate from some of the foreign countries.

Mr. ABEL. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I think having seen it from several sides, I would have to say that at present, the young generation of foreign correspondents that are now out in the field are probably much better prepared than my generation was in terms of knowing languages and being prepared to penetrate cultural barriers.

To give you a small example in a recent class in the Columbia School of Journalism, we had five young people in one class who arrived at the school already fluent in Chinese. This was inconceivable in my days. It was hard enough to get them to learn French or German.

So, I think in that sense there is a pool of available, well-trained young people. I think we ought to get, in the long term, more sensitive reporting from some of these countries as a result of this generation. But this is not to say that every correspondent can be expected to know the language of every country. I myself, at various points—20-odd years ago—had a roving assignment, which meant covering 6 or 8 countries, each with its own language. It is simply impossible to learn 6 or 8 languages, and then to spend only 2 years in that assignment and then go on to another one.

You have this problem, to a degree, also with the Foreign Service in the sense that these short-term assignments make it somewhat counterproductive to spend a vast amount of time learning an out-of-the-way language that you never again have any use for.

I would have to add to that, somehow language training has been losing ground in American schools for quite some time. That, I do deplore. I think we have to make an effort to put it back in.

Mr. HALL. I was in the Orient for 2 years, and I saw many journalists that came to the country. Then I used to read newspapers that I would get from home about various articles. It was amazing how little they knew about the people, about the country, the culture, the religion. Their interpreters were sometimes assigned by the government and of course their interpretation was slanted.

What is the normal stay for a foreign correspondent, let us say, in kind of an exotic nation where they do not speak French, or Spanish, or Italian—say China?

Mr. ABEL. Well, China we have not had enough experience with, we just got the first correspondents in.

Mr. HALL. Say, Vietnam.

Mr. ABEL. Two years, 3 years, that is all. It is not long enough, in my view, particularly in the case of the larger countries. I spent 10 years on the New York Times and during that period we had a managing editor who believed in rapid rotation. He also was a man who believed that journalists operated by a triumph of instinct. They did not have to know the language. You could drop them on the cold face of the Moon and somehow they would come back with the story. I do not think most of us believe that anymore. But this was in the 1950's, early 1950's. It was then widely held. Indeed, there were correspondents—I think of my dear old friend Homer Bigart—who spoke no known language apart from Pennsylvania English, and who did a splendid job in any number of countries. But Homer was a magnificent exception.

Mr. HALL. I can remember one case where a very esteemed writer—a Pulitzer Prize winner—came to Thailand and wrote a story, this was 12 or 14 years ago, on the situation on the Cambodia-Thai border. He spent 3 days—3 days. What he wrote was so distorted and so terrible, and of course with his name on the article it was believed to be fact, to be true.

Mr. ABEL. Yes, it had the ring of truth.

Mr. HALL. It really did.

Mr. ABEL. I am sure neither Jerry nor I would argue that every correspondent does a flawless job in every situation; but I think we are making progress in this area. Particularly the agencies, which are in many ways the most important because, after all, most newspapers in

this country do not have their own foreign correspondents; they rely on the wire services.

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. It is precisely for these reasons that we need a multiplicity of persons and a multiplicity of access. The reason an Associated Press, for instance, is interested in there being a Thai press service, or a Southeast Asian press service is to increase the ties because the truth will not come out of any one single reporter. The best hope that the public will receive some measure of what might be fact is that there is a multiplicity of reporters. For that reason we want to discourage the sorts of activities that we see in some of these international forums which tend to restrict and go in the direction of controls, and close the countries into themselves.

Mr. HALL. Your job is very difficult, to try to impose a new order in communications, it is a very difficult job.

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. It is a rough one.

Mr. HALL. I thank both of you, and of course the three witnesses before you, for your thoughts and directions, and some of your ideas that you have given this committee, and certainly for your time, I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ABEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDHEIM. Thank you, sir.

[Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX 1

CHRONOLOGICAL HIGHLIGHTS OF "WORLD INFORMATION ORDER" ISSUES IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: 1946-79

1946.—U.N. adopted "Declaration on Freedom of Information," stating in part: " * * * all states should proclaim policies under which the free flow of information within countries and across frontiers will be protected * * *"

1948.—Geneva Freedom of Information Conference debated free flow of information issues. Soviets argued that true freedom of information could not exist as long as Western media were controlled by a small group of capitalists.

U.N. became principal forum for political debate on freedom of information issues: UNESCO assumed technical role in striving to improve developing countries' media capabilities and reduce tariffs and postal rates on international shipment of books, newspapers and audiovisual equipment.

1965.—With increasing North-South tensions and advent of space communications, UNESCO became more involved in political debate on world information order.

UNESCO published report on space communication conference, stressing that media should use space communication for "benefit of all peoples."

1970.—UNESCO General Conference authorized UNESCO Director-General to assist member states in formulating their mass communication policies.

1972.—UNESCO General Conference adopted (U.S. voted against) Soviet-sponsored resolution calling for declaration of "guiding principles on the use of satellite broadcasting for the free flow of information and the spread of education and cultural exchange," including provision for prior consent of receiving nations.

UNESCO also adopted Soviet-sponsored resolution calling upon Director-General to prepare declaration on "fundamental principles governing the use of mass media with a view to strengthening peace and understanding and combatting war propaganda, racialism and apartheid" (mass media declaration).

1974.—UNESCO General Conference could not reach agreement on Swedish-prepared draft of mass media declaration.

1976.—UNESCO General Conference (Nairobi) tabled another draft mass media declaration prepared by group of intergovernmental experts, but did accept Tunisian resolution (supported by U.S.) endorsing idea of assistance to developing world to increase its communications capabilities as means of correcting existing world information imbalance.

1976.—UNESCO also established 16-member International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, chaired by Sean MacBride, to submit final report by mid-1979. Four key topics will be addressed in report:

Defining "free and balanced flow of information";

Defining "new world information order" and its relationship with "new world economic order;"

How the right to communicate can be achieved throughout the entire communications field; and

How the objectivity and independence of the media can be assured and protected.

1978.—UNESCO General Conference (Paris) adopted by consensus revised draft "Declaration on Fundamental Principles Governing the Contribution (note: "use" changed to "contribution" in revised draft) of the Mass Media to Strengthening and to Combatting War Propaganda, Racialism, and Apartheid."

According to U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO Conference, John Reinhardt, three main points of resolution are: it endorses principle of free flow of information; it does not endorse government control of the media; and it ensures journalists and reporters the "best conditions for exercising their profession."

1979.—From September 24 through December 1, International Telecommunication Union (ITU—a UN Specialized Agency) will hold first World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) since 1959.

WARC will review and, where necessary, revise international regulations governing frequency allocation and coordination procedures for entire radio spectrum, setting regulatory framework for telecommunications until 1999.

Equal access to and required prior consent before receiving satellite broadcasts will be two topics of debate at WARC.

APPENDIX 2

TEXT OF DRAFT DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE MASS MEDIA TO STRENGTHENING PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING, THE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND TO COUNTERING RACIALISM, APARTHEID, AND INCITEMENT TO WAR, UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE, TWENTIETH SESSION, PARIS, 1978

INTRODUCTION

1. Since it was issued on 6 September, the Draft Declaration in document 20 C/20 has aroused keen interest and generated much discussion, which the importance of the subject fully justifies.

2. Not only were statements concerning the text of the Draft Declaration made by most of the heads of delegation in the General Policy Debate; its content was also extensively discussed during the numerous discussions which the Director-General held with the heads of delegation of Member States and with the observers attending the General Conference.

3. In the light of these statements and consultations and of the discussions which he has held in particular with the different regional groups, the Director-General has felt able to submit to the General Conference a new text which is in his view likely to command the broad agreement which the General Conference deemed desirable at its nineteenth session.

4. As its title indicates, this new text is a compromise text. The result of lengthy and patient negotiations it takes into account the ideas underlying the proposed amendments, and its wording is designed to dispel the misgivings generated by certain misunderstandings.

5. The Director-General submits this revised text in the firm hope that it will be possible for it to be adopted by consensus by the General Conference.

DRAFT DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE MASS MEDIA TO STRENGTHENING PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING, THE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND TO COUNTERING RACIALISM, APARTHEID AND INCITEMENT TO WAR

PREAMBLE

The General Conference,

1. Recalling that by its Constitution the purpose of UNESCO is to "contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms" (Art. I, 1), and that to realize this purpose the Organization will strive "to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image" (Art. I, 2),

2. Further recalling that under the Constitution the Member States of UNESCO, "believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means of communication between their peoples and to employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives" (sixth preambular paragraph),

3. Recalling the purposes and principles of the United Nations, as specified in the Charter,

4. Recalling the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 and particularly Article 19 which provides that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive

and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers"; and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1966, Article 19 of which proclaims the same principles and Article 20 of which condemns incitement to war, the advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred and any form of discrimination, hostility or violence,

5. Recalling Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965, and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1973, whereby the States acceding to these Conventions undertook to adopt immediate and positive measures designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, racial discrimination, and agreed to prevent any encouragement of the crime of apartheid and similar segregationist policies or their manifestations.

6. Recalling the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965.

7. Recalling the declarations and resolutions adopted by the various organs of the United Nations concerning the establishment of a New International Economic Order and the role UNESCO is called upon to play in this respect,

8. Recalling the Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1966,

9. Recalling Resolution 59(I) of the General Assembly of the United Nations, adopted in 1946 and declaring

Freedom of information is a fundamental human right and is the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated;

Freedom of information requires as an indispensable element the willingness and capacity to employ its privileges without abuse. It requires as a basic discipline the moral obligation to seek the facts without prejudice and to spread knowledge without malicious intent;

10. Recalling Resolution 110(II) of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted in 1947 condemning all forms of propaganda which are designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression,

11. Recalling Resolution 127(II), also adopted by the General Assembly in 1947, which invites Member States to take measures, within the limits of constitutional procedures, to combat the diffusion of false or distorted reports likely to injure friendly relations between States, as well as the other resolutions of the General Assembly concerning the mass media and their contribution to strengthening peace, thus contributing to the growth of trust and friendly relations among States,

12. Recalling Resolution 9.12 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1968 reiterating UNESCO's objective to help to eradicate colonialism and racialism, and resolution 12.1 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1976 which proclaims that colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism in all its forms and manifestations are incompatible with the fundamental aims of UNESCO,

13. Recalling resolution 4.301 adopted in 1970 by the General Conference of UNESCO on the contribution of the information media to furthering international understanding and co-operation in the interests of peace and human welfare, and to countering propaganda on behalf of war, racialism, apartheid and hatred among nations, and aware of the fundamental contribution that mass media can make to the realization of these objectives,

14. Recalling the Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twentieth session.

15. Conscious of the complexity of the problems of information in modern society, of the diversity of solutions which have been offered to them, as evidenced in particular by consideration given to them within UNESCO as well as of the legitimate desire of all parties concerned that their aspirations, points of view and cultural identity be taken into due consideration,

16. Conscious of the aspirations of the developing countries for the establishment of a new, more just and more effective world information and communication order,

17. Proclaims on this ——— day of ——— 1978 this Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racialism, Apartheid and Incitement to War.

Article I

The strengthening of peace and international understanding, the promotion of human rights and the countering of racialism, apartheid and incitement to war demand a free flow and a wider and better balanced dissemination of information. To this end, the mass media have a leading contribution to make. This contribution will be the more effective to the extent that the information reflects the different aspects of the subject dealt with.

Article II

1. The exercise of freedom of opinion, expression and information, recognized as an integral part of human rights and fundamental freedoms, is a vital factor in the strengthening of peace and international understanding.

2. Access by the public to information should be guaranteed by the diversity of the sources and means of information available to it, thus enabling each individual to check the accuracy of facts and to appraise events objectively.

To this end, journalists must have freedom to report and the fullest possible facilities of access to information. Similarly, it is important that the mass media be responsive to concerns of peoples and individuals, thus promoting the participation of the public in the elaboration of information.

3. With a view to the strengthening of peace and international understanding, to promoting human rights and to countering racialism, apartheid and incitement to war, the mass media throughout the world, by reason of their role, contribute effectively to promoting human rights, in particular by giving expression to oppressed peoples who struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, foreign occupation and all forms of racial discrimination and oppression and who are unable to make their voices heard within their own territories.

4. If the mass media are to be in a position to promote the principles of this Declaration in their activities, it is essential that journalists and other agents of the mass media, in their own country or abroad, be assured of protection guaranteeing them the best conditions for the exercise of their profession.

Article III

1. The mass media have an important contribution to make to the strengthening of peace and international understanding and in countering racialism, apartheid and incitement to war.

2. In countering aggressive war, racialism, apartheid and other violations of human rights which are inter alia spawned by prejudice and ignorance, the mass media, by disseminating information on the aims, aspirations, cultures and needs of all people, contribute to eliminate ignorance and misunderstanding between peoples, to make nationals of a country sensitive to the needs and desires of others, to ensure the respect of the rights and dignity of all nations, all peoples and all individuals without distinction of race, sex, language, religion or nationality and to draw attention to the great evils which afflict humanity, such as poverty, malnutrition and diseases, thereby promoting the formulation by States of policies best able to promote the reduction of international tension and the peaceful and the equitable settlement of international disputes.

Article IV

The mass media have an essential part to play in the education of young people in a spirit of peace, justice, freedom, mutual respect and understanding, in order to promote human rights, equality of rights as between all human beings and all nations, and economic and social progress. Equally they have an important role to play in making known the views and aspirations of the younger generation.

Article V

In order to respect freedom of opinion, expression and information and in order that information may reflect all points of view, it is important that the points of view presented by those who consider that the information published or disseminated about them has seriously prejudiced their effort to strengthen peace and international understanding, to promote human rights or to counter racialism, apartheid and incitement to war be disseminated.

Article VI

For the establishment of a new equilibrium and greater reciprocity in the flow of information, which will be conducive to the institution of a just and lasting peace and to the economic and political independence of the developing countries, it is necessary to correct the inequalities in the flow of information to

and from developing countries, and between those countries. To this end, it is essential that their mass media should have conditions and resources enabling them to gain strength and expand, and to co-operate both among themselves and with the mass media in developed countries.

Article VII

By disseminating more widely all of the information concerning the objectives and principles universally accepted which are the bases of the resolutions adopted by the different organs of the United Nations, the mass media contribute effectively to the strengthening of peace and international understanding, to the promotion of human rights, as well as to the establishment of a more just and equitable international economic order.

Article VIII

Professional organizations, and people who participate in the professional training of journalists and other agents of the mass media and who assist them in performing their functions in a responsible manner should attach special importance to the principles of this Declaration when drawing up and ensuring application of their codes of ethics.

Article IX

In the spirit of this Declaration, it is for the international community to contribute to the creation of the conditions for a free flow and wider and more balanced dissemination of information, and the conditions for the protection, in the exercise of their functions, of journalists and other agents of the mass media. UNESCO is well placed to make a valuable contribution in this respect.

Article X

1. With due respect for constitutional provisions designed to guarantee freedom of information and for the applicable international instruments and agreements, it is indispensable to create and maintain throughout the world the conditions which make it possible for the organizations and persons professionally involved in the dissemination of information to achieve the objectives of this Declaration.

2. It is important that a free flow and wider and better balanced dissemination of information be encouraged.

3. To this end, it is necessary that States should facilitate the procurement, by the mass media in the developing countries, of adequate conditions and resources enabling them to gain strength and expand, and that they should support co-operation by the latter both among themselves and with the mass media in developed countries.

4. Similarly, on a basis of equality of rights, mutual advantage, and respect for the diversity of cultures which go to make up the common heritage of mankind, it is essential that bilateral and multilateral exchanges of information among all States, and in particular between those which have different economic and social systems be encouraged and developed.

Article XI

For this Declaration to be fully effective it is necessary, with due respect for the legislative and administrative provisions and the other obligations of Member States, to guarantee the existence of favourable conditions for the operation of the mass media, in conformity with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and with the corresponding principles proclaimed in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1966.

APPENDIX 3

STATEMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF UNESCO, LEON DAVICO, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION, AT THE COM- MITTEE TO REVIEW UNITED NATIONS PUBLIC INFORMATION POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 30, 1979

MR. CHAIRMAN, EXCELLENCIES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Let me thank you first of all for giving me the opportunity to tell you how we at UNESCO are doing our information work in attempting to constantly keep pace with the changing realities of the world we live in.

I am not going to tell you how many brochures, press releases and telexes to Agencies we have produced and released in the course of the last year. An information service without these things is a faulty one and I like to think that we are not in that category. However, I do think that you will be interested to know that our efforts have been directed in the past years toward decentralization and the use of more languages on the one hand, and also toward a diversification of our activities in order to reach new audiences. Although this cannot be said for some of our Member States, we at least have adopted the French motto: "We have no gasoline but we have ideas"! Ideas on how to strengthen both basic concepts of UNESCO of the Governments and UNESCO of the peoples * * *

Decentralization first: It is actually useless to produce centrally if at the receiving end or rather ends (as there are as many of them as there are Member States) there is not someone who is going to see to it that the material, whether written or audiovisual is adapted to the needs of the country in question and is distributed as it should be. So, to start with, we have created at Headquarters a regional information service responsible for deciding where what goes. Let me say between brackets that the creation of this service or for that matter of any other service or post did not entail the release of any new funds but just a redeployment of forces. UNESCO's OPI growth in the last four years in terms of finances and posts equalled zero. So, whatever was done was made within the limits of our budget and where we really did not have enough we saw to it that some extra-budgetary funds, not big but useful, were added, such as the proceeds of the sale of a record, for example.

The Headquarters regional service has now several, if I may use this word, direct connections personified by the regional information officers stationed in Caracas, New York, Dakar, Bangkok, and Cairo whose business it is to facilitate the two-way communication between Headquarters and what is usually called the field. The number of these regional officers will soon be at least doubled when UNESCO's communications advisers, stationed in various points on the globe become part-time regional information officers who, in turn, will become part-time communication advisers.

But this is not all. Regardless of the human qualities of the individual it would be ridiculous to think that one person, be he a little Einstein, could see to it that a whole region such as Latin America or Asia, including such huge countries or sub-continent like China, India or Japan, is properly fed and covered. To achieve this we are on the best way of creating a whole solid network of national correspondents with Unesco's governmental national commissions. Some of these commissions have, of course, been extremely active in the past, but our aim is to see them all function as a sort of a prolonged OPI arm.

The UNESCO Courier which continues to be our window to the world has also changed in the sense that it now has a supplement with news from Unesco and that it is now being published in no less than twenty languages. The latest two additions are the Korean and the Swahili editions. Others will follow. Other UNESCO OPI publications such as the Features or our Radio and TV Programmes are also going through a sort of a renaissance as far as languages are con-

cerned and we are signing more and more language contracts with our national commissions.

Generally speaking we are trying to get better mileage for some of our productions by associating countries, national television companies or foundations and by getting them to share the costs and in case of films to do the films themselves as the professional skill is on their side. Right now we have a dozen television co-productions in the making with televisions from three continents.

Still on the chapter on decentralization I wish to mention a series of seminars with important groups of journalists organized all over the world: in Borobudur, Manila, Tunis, Libreville, Quito, the Galapagos Islands, Palermo, Florence, Caracas and soon in Aachen, Cracow, Sukhothai, Bangkok, Kathmandu, Yaounde, and hopefully Peking and Tokyo. We do, naturally, invite groups of journalists to Paris but we are doing what we can, enthusiastically helped by the Governments concerned, to bring UNESCO to the world press rather than begging Paris based correspondents who have other fields of interest to come and do us, please, the favour of writing a few lines about how to predict an earthquake, how to help save some of the most beautiful monuments of the world, how to fight against illiteracy or for a more equitable free flow of information.

This is the cue to what you have said in your opening address, Mr. Chairman, when you spoke of the attacks on the UN and the system of the "automatic majority" and generally speaking on some of the aspects of the new international economic order. Should we counterattack, you asked the question. Yes and no. We should, of course, accept the dialogue with the critics. If they are bona fide. We should also, when they are not, when they are obviously biased or motivated by interests not compatible with either objectivity or goodwill, answer the attacks but not let ourselves become part of a futile polemic battle where the other side repeats the same things regardless of what the facts of life are. No use discussing things with a writer saying that not much can be expected from Unesco as long as "the well known communist * * * and former Irish terrorist Sean MacBride remains its Director-General."

This reminds me of the fellow who asked his friend whether it was true that he just won 200 thousand dollars in Montecarlo and got the following reply: Yes, but not quite because (a) it was not in Montecarlo but in Las Vegas (b) it was not just but two years ago (c) it was not 200 thousand but 400 thousand dollars and (d) I have not won them but lost them.

On the contrary, a dialogue must be established and has in fact been established with all those who sincerely express fears for the freedom of the press or for the fate of press men. The Florence meeting of some 100 top journalists from all parts of the globe, organized by UNESCO's OPI, opened this dialogue which is now in full swing thanks to the work and consultations of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems headed this time really by Mr. Sean MacBride, well known Nobel and Lenin Peace Prizes winner, Commission created at the initiative of Mr. M'Bow, UNESCO's Director-General.

I would like to stress one thing, though. When answering some of the critics or exposing some of the ideas on this subject, we do not try to be colourless and tasteless. We have behind us the new international economic order, the Declaration on the Mass Media adopted by enthusiastic consensus by our last General Conference and a clear line of struggle for international understanding. "Wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed", wrote the American poet Archibald MacLeish into UNESCO's Constitution more than 33 years. This task is still valid and it cannot be achieved without an active role of OPI. That this fight will be long and not always a cup of tea, is clear. Too many prejudices, real and artificial fears and many other things have accumulated in the past centuries and decades and it will require time and courage to overcome all the obstacles.

From decentralization I have, Mr. Chairman, slipped without a real transition to our information activities and their diversification which probably proves that the two forms and subjects are if not inseparable at least made of the same material. We have begun campaigns for new subscribers to the UNESCO Courier, with more or less success, we continue organizing round tables of personalities on UNESCO themes of general interest with corresponding publicity, the first theme being the role of culture in the new international economic order, the second "suicide or survival, the challenge of the Year 2000", the third "What kind of world are we leaving our children", while the fourth this year will simply deal with the rather important question of war or peace. UNESCO cultural events and weeks are being organized in Members states who, in turn, organize their national

days at Headquarters. After Japan, Spain, Venezuela and Poland, Canada has just had its fortnight in Paris with tens of thousands of people visiting its exhibit and its Conferences, films and concerts. Cultural animation at UNESCO Headquarters during the General Conference and during the year has brought hundreds of thousands to our Paris concrete and glass building. Prestige concerts such as the one which just took place in Monaco are also on our menu. This brings us to the International Year of the Child which, I think is an example of good inter-agency cooperation and UN coordination.

Everybody knew in advance what was to be done and the sum of the endeavours of the various organizations of the UN system is an impressive list of events drawing the attention of a large public to the problem, that of children.

Thanks to UNESCO-UNICEF-UNHCR cooperation, over 600 thousand children from 89 countries have sent in their drawings showing us how they think they will live in the Year 2000. Thanks to UNESCO-UNICEF-ITU cooperation, a TV film featuring messages by 7 Heads of State and dances and songs of groups of children, was produced and shown on TV screens in over fifty countries. The Monaco concert of especially gifted children has already been bought by more than 20 national TV channels.

Another good example of UN cooperation and coordination is the world supplement on the new international economic order. Proposed by UNESCO, supported by a certain number of specialized Agencies and other family members, funded privately thanks to the personal efforts of Mr. Akatani, Mr. Akashi's predecessor, this supplement published at the same time by important newspapers in 16 countries among which the Paris *Le Monde*, the Indian Express, the Asahi Shimbun, *Le Soleil* from Dakar, Mexico's *El Excelsior*, the Belgrade *Politika*, the Warsaw *Zycie Warszawy* etc. * * *, will see the light of the day in less than a month thanks to good coordination work of DESI. And, by the way, is this supplement in which the UN system and each one of the participating newspapers will have their say and in the subtitle of which it is clearly marked that we are in favour of the new international economic order, not a good and practical tool of making the views of everybody known.

A successful attempt to sensitize the public of a country and of a big city was made last year when UNESCO was present at the Montreal "Man and his world" exhibit. Encouraged by the results, we are opening our pavilion again on June 24th and so is, for the first time, also UNICEF. The "UNESCO's 24-hours" organized by the Mayor of Montreal in honour of Mr. M'Bow, with 150,000 people swarming to the expo ground to pay tribute to our Organization was a marvellous proof of attachment of a population to the ideals we all serve.

Cooperation among information offices of the family is what we have seen it, not only possible but highly desirable. JUNIC is probably the place to discuss this cooperation and depending on the nature and the theme and subject of the cooperation, the UN or UNESCO or UNICEF or WHO or FAO or the Bank etc., could and should co-ordinate. At the same time it would be very dangerous to become exclusive and to start believing that one single coordinator or one single body could take upon itself the task of informing the world about the various Agencies' spheres of interest. Everything should be done to avoid duplication, triplication and even bigger "plications", but at the same time organizations should be given the possibilities to tell the world and the sections of that world more particularly interested in their job, what is going on.

Who is doing this work at UNESCO? In our OPI, too, we are doing what we can in order to give as fair as objective and as true a picture of what is going on. Our 48 professionals have passports of 32 countries and by the end of the year I think that we shall be able to add another four or five nationalities, without increasing the total number.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the essence of what I really wanted to say to illustrate UNESCO's information work. Needless to add that we and I remain at your disposal and that of the Committee in any form, in any place and at any time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.







