



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 5: The situation in Hungary ( <i>continued</i> ).....	59
Agenda item 3: Appointment of a Credentials Committee.....	81
Report of the Credentials Committee.....	81

**President: Mr. Rudecindo ORTEGA (Chile).**

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**The situation in Hungary (*continued*)**

1. Mr. MATSCH (Austria): As the Members of the General Assembly will remember, the Austrian delegation voted in favour of the resolution [1004 (ES-II)] adopted by the General Assembly on 4 November. The Austrian delegation reaffirms its adherence to the principles contained in that resolution. In view of the fact that the new draft resolution [A/3316] submitted by Cuba, Ireland, Italy, Pakistan and Peru does not contain in its operative part any substantially new suggestions and proposals, the Austrian delegation prefers to reserve its position at this time and therefore will abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

2. In accordance with instructions received from my Government, I have the honour to submit to the General Assembly the following draft resolution [A/3324]:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Considering the extreme suffering to which the Hungarian people is subjected by the fighting which is still continuing,*

*"Urgently wishing effectively to eliminate this suffering,*

*"Convinced that humanitarian duties can be fulfilled most effectively through the international co-operation stipulated in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations,*

*"1. Resolves to undertake on a large scale immediate aid for the affected territories by furnishing medical supplies, foodstuffs and clothes;*

*"2. Calls upon all Member States to participate to the greatest extent possible in this relief action;*

*"3. Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to undertake immediately the necessary measures;*

*"4. Urgently appeals to all countries concerned to give full assistance to the Secretary-General in the implementation of this task."*

3. According to recent reports received in Vienna, the suffering of the Hungarian population has reached unprecedented proportions. For more than a week now the civilian population of Hungary has been cut off com-

pletely from the normal supply of food, drugs and medical equipment. Women and children, the old and the sick, have been subjected to extreme hardships and the danger of starvation. Widespread disease and epidemics are imminent. In certain parts of Hungary, polio is spreading widely and becoming a deadly danger to the civilian population.

4. In view of that situation of extreme urgency, immediate relief measures on a large scale are indispensable if a catastrophe is to be prevented. The Austrian Government believes that the world cannot close its eyes to the suffering of the Hungarian population, and it is confident that all countries will feel duty bound to contribute their share. The Austrian delegation has therefore submitted the draft resolution which I have just read out, calling for immediate appropriate relief action by the United Nations. The humanitarian aspects of such relief measures will, I am sure, transcend all political considerations.

5. The Austrian delegation earnestly hopes that the Soviet delegation will, in addition to the help already pledged, find it possible to co-operate with such relief action to be undertaken by the United Nations by giving free access to the affected areas in Hungary. In view of the great urgency of the situation, the Austrian delegation appeals to the President to put the draft resolution to a vote as soon as it has been circulated.

6. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): Throughout ten years of activity in the United Nations the Peruvian delegation has always adhered to the principle of absolute—I might almost say religious—respect for all the nations represented here. It has also applied the same principle to individuals. When it has had to weigh the actions of Governments it has done so on the basis of principles, dispassionately, and when it has expressed disapproval it has done so in sorrow rather than in anger.

7. For that reason I was distressed by the speech of the Soviet Union representative. I realize that he is in a difficult position; he is defending an indefensible cause and in the circumstances he has understandably had to resort to a proceeding which is forbidden here, to personal allusions, and what is more, to unwarranted personal allusions. He had no right to accuse anyone, least of all the members of the Latin American group, who have acted with perfect and admirable unity in defending the principles of the Charter without partisanship on every occasion.

8. The Peruvian delegation has always acted with scrupulous correctness, and when I addressed the Soviet Union delegation during the debate, I was appealing to it; I was expounding the facts, and I did not utter a single word which was not in accordance with ethical principles and the respect due to others. Hence I was shocked by the attitude of the Soviet Union delegation, although I understand it. The Soviet delegation can perform a service towards the Assembly—because after all there is a certain solidarity among all the delegations

—and even more, a service towards its Government, by informing it of the views of the Assembly and of the temper of this meeting. There may be different shades of opinion among the various delegations but I think there is a unanimous desire, except of course among the parties directly concerned, involved or accused, to urge the Soviet Union without a day's further delay to put an end to the tragedy that is taking place.

9. We have heard the Soviet Union representative state from this rostrum that the action being carried out is a police action; but we have just heard and read with grief and consternation the latest reports to the effect that Budapest is in flames and that there has been wholesale destruction everywhere. What can I add to the authoritative statement made by the representative of Austria, who has told us in words which must have touched the hearts of all delegations, words which tomorrow will echo in the hearts of all mankind, that Europe has never seen such a situation, that a catastrophe lies ahead which will leave nothing but tears, death, disease and famine?

10. We all know something of history; we know that a mere police action, taken by a Government in response to a revolution, remains confined to the belligerents. In speaking of a disaster of the magnitude of this one, how can anyone speak of government action or of order? This catastrophe has occurred because on one side there are the forces of a foreign country and on the other the Hungarian people. I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union—where does he expect the hearts and the feelings of the peoples of Latin America and of all mankind will be in the struggle between the two combatants, on the one hand brute force and imperialism led, so it seems, by the ghost of Stalin, and on the other the people of Hungary?

11. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): On 23 October 1956 there was a peaceful demonstration in Budapest. On 24 October Soviet tanks were in action against the Hungarian people. On 28 October the United States, France and the United Kingdom brought the situation to the Security Council. At this meeting<sup>1</sup> the representative of the Soviet Union described the situation as a reactionary and counter-revolutionary movement against the legal Government of Hungary, stimulated by the United States and other Western Powers. When the Security Council met on 28 October it was already clear that what in fact was involved was a rising of the Hungarian people against Soviet domination, and a heroic nation-wide bid to achieve freedom and independence.

12. As early as 25 October Soviet tanks had been mowing down hundreds of innocent Hungarian people, men, women and children, in the squares and streets of Budapest. During the ensuing week the violent repression continued and the Russian troops continued to attack the forces of the Hungarian Army.

13. At the same time there were reports to the effect that the Russian forces were withdrawing from Budapest and that negotiations had begun between the Soviet Government and the Government of Premier Nagy for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the whole of Hungary.

14. There were then no further meetings in the United Nations on this situation until Friday and Saturday, 2 and 3 November.<sup>2</sup> During the two meetings on those

two days, some of us strongly expressed the view that the United Nations should pay the utmost attention to a situation, in which it was being put out that a settlement would be reached by negotiation, but when the city of Budapest was being ringed with Soviet steel. We now know that in fact a fraud was being perpetrated on the Hungarian people; for very late on the night of Saturday, 3 November, the news reached the United Nations that the Soviet Government was forcibly taking over control in Budapest and subduing the country by force.

15. During these agonizing days, when the Hungarian people were being tricked and betrayed, Soviet voices were being stridently raised in the General Assembly in misrepresentation of the attempt of the United Kingdom and France to save the peace in the Middle East.

16. It is only too clear why. I have even heard it suggested that it was the disruption of the peace in the Middle East that prompted the Soviet action in Hungary. It is sufficient to point out that the tragic chain of events in Hungary had already started some time before the Middle Eastern crisis developed. Indeed, on the day that Israel was mobilizing for its attack on Egypt, the Security Council was already discussing the Hungarian situation.

17. Once the Soviet offer of negotiations on the withdrawal of troops from Hungarian soil had been shown to be no more than a cover for their preparations for a new intensive and still more ruthless attack on Hungary, this Assembly passed a resolution [1004 (ES-II)] calling on the Soviet Union to withdraw all of its forces without delay from Hungarian territory, and to permit observers designated by the Secretary-General to enter Hungary. That was on 4 November—five days ago. As I understand it, the Soviet Government has made no response of any kind to this request from the General Assembly. In the meantime, Russian troops are occupying Budapest, and the Assembly will have heard, as I have heard, the reports of looting, pillaging and indiscriminate shooting of civilians. We have reports of the mowing down of women in bread queues and shooting down at sight of any Hungarian venturing to tread the pavements of his own city. The civilian casualties run into many thousands. The numbers will never be known.

18. The United Nations has affirmed the right of the Hungarian people to a government "responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being". The United Nations has called upon the Soviet Union to desist from all armed attack on the peoples of Hungary and any form of intervention, particularly armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary. The Assembly has also called upon the Soviet Union to cease the introduction of additional armed forces into Hungary and to withdraw all of its forces without delay from Hungarian territory.

19. The Soviet Union has ignored all these requests of the United Nations and, on the contrary, is reinforcing its occupation of Hungary and blotting out the freedom of the Hungarian people.

20. This then is the real situation of the tragedy of Hungary—a sovereign country which we believed, when we voted for its admission last year to the United Nations, was moving at last towards the full exercise of its sovereign rights.

21. This tragic situation cannot be viewed in isolation. If we look dispassionately at the two questions—the Middle East and Hungary—which we have been obliged for the last ten days to consider separately, we see that

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eleventh Year*, 746th meeting.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 752nd and 753rd meetings.

there emerges from them both one clear, simple and disturbing pattern; the pattern of Soviet imperialism.

22. In Hungary the situation which has come into being within the past few weeks stems from Hungary's incorporation into the Soviet empire after the Second World War.

23. In the Middle East the problems of the last weeks stem from the ambitions of the Soviet Union to extend its influence in the direction of that area also. These ambitions on the part of Russia go back a long way, back to the days of the Czarist régime. But the Communist Government of the Soviet Union has recently taken up this traditional policy of expansion at the expense of Near Eastern countries. For the past few years, both inside and outside the United Nations, by methods open and covert, these efforts have been actively developed. All this created an increasingly inflammatory situation. We all know, only too well, how at last this situation exploded into the Israel attack on Egypt.

24. For the last ten days the United Nations has devoted all its efforts to helping to maintain peace and order in the Middle East. My Government is in every possible way making its contribution to that end in accordance with the plans adopted by the United Nations.

25. I may here interpolate that, in agreeing to the appeal for a cease-fire which went out from this Assembly, we were in no way influenced by the blatant threats of Soviet intervention. Indeed, it is a curious lapse on the part of the Soviet psychological warfare machine to suppose that bullying and intimidation can work on the British people.

26. For the Soviet Union it has been easy during this latest crisis, which it greatly helped to create, to express its sense of outrage at what was happening in the Middle East, to pose before the Assembly and before the world as an apostle of peace. All this time the Hungarian people have been suffering their terrible martyrdom. Those who may look toward Communist Russia as a protector should not forget, but should mark and learn, the lesson of Hungary.

27. During the last two years the free world had been encouraged by slight indications that the Russians were coming to see the need to adopt an attitude toward these matters of empire more in harmony with the liberal ideas of the twentieth century. If the Hungarian tragedy must arouse acute doubts as to the willingness of the Soviet Union to loosen its grip on its European empire, we must equally watch with the utmost circumspection the camouflaged ambitions of Russia aiming at expansion in the Middle East.

28. The United Nations must not relax in its attempts to secure to the people of Hungary the right to express themselves in freedom and to determine their own affairs as a sovereign State. So clear is the right that it seems hardly conceivable that it will be denied to them by repression and violence. It must be the profound hope of every representative in this Assembly that the Soviet Union will heed the dictates of the conscience of the world.

29. From all I have said, it follows that I shall vote for the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316].

30. As I have said, the United Nations must continue its efforts to remedy this tragic situation by every means in its power. But in addition to finding a satisfactory final remedy, we must also strive to alleviate the immediate sufferings of the Hungarian people. In their

renewed attack on the Hungarian people, the Soviet forces are employing not only the conventional methods of war, but also the weapon of starvation. I understand that no supplies of food have been brought into Budapest since the Russian forces reoccupied it on 4 November, and furthermore that anyone venturing out of his house to look for food is liable to be shot at sight by Russian soldiers. In these circumstances, the provision of food and medical supplies to Budapest and other areas of Hungary is a matter of the most extreme urgency.

31. We must consider also the needs of the thousands of refugees who have been obliged to leave Hungary to escape the Soviet attack. My Government has already shown that it regards this question as a matter of the greatest urgency. We have already made available to the International Red Cross a total of £50,000 for the provision of medicine and food and we are now examining as a matter of urgency arrangements whereby 2,500 refugees from Hungary may be received into the United Kingdom.

32. I should like, therefore, on behalf of my Government to welcome warmly the United States draft resolution [A/3319]. It is my hope that its recommendations can be carried out with the greatest possible speed.

33. We have just heard from the representative of Austria proposals from his Government also directed to the humanitarian side of the problem. We all know how much the people of Austria have already done to help the people of Hungary. We shall study the Austrian draft resolution [A/3324] very carefully in relation to the United States draft resolution.

34. Mr. JOJA (Romania) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the Romanian People's Republic has expressed its strong opposition to this resolution A/RES/393 because it unquestionably constitutes intervention in a problem which concerns the Hungarian People's Republic and with regard to which the Hungarian Government alone is competent to take such decisions as the situation may require. The Hungarian Government has taken the measures it deemed necessary to defend the fundamental freedoms of the Hungarian people and the constitutional institutions of the popular democratic régime chosen by the people.

35. In view of the new draft resolution [A/3316] submitted to the Assembly, I feel bound once again to draw attention to certain aspects of this matter which are becoming increasingly plain. Firstly, it should be emphasized that the rapid succession of texts, each less well founded than its predecessor, shows that the General Assembly of the United Nations is now the scene of persistent efforts to involve the Organization more and more deeply in a problem which is outside its competence and thereby to weaken its authority, to exacerbate and exasperate the international situation and to maintain a state of unrest prejudicial to peace. It is obvious that the sponsors of the draft resolution disregard the principle in law that a people has the right to organize its own system of national representation and elections without any outside interference in violation of that principle.

36. It is equally obvious that the five-Power draft resolution, regarding the question of the Soviet troops in Hungary which helped the Government to restore order and eliminate the threat to that country's democratic institutions, is in fact directed against the Warsaw Treaty. In other words, it is directed against the right of Hungary and the other countries parties to that Treaty to follow a foreign policy that furthers the



interest of peace and their national security and independence.

37. As is well known Romania is a party to the Warsaw Treaty, whose underlying principle is the defence of the collective security of the European States against the threat of aggression. The Warsaw Treaty was born of the need to defend the peace and security of the peoples of Eastern Europe and, thereby, the security of all the European peoples. It is based on the United Nations Charter, is consistent with the Charter, and is a pillar of world peace.

38. It is unthinkable that the United Nations should have any right to consider the question of the modification, termination, or even interpretation of a treaty which was freely accepted and is in keeping with the interests of Hungary and the other signatory States. It is obvious that the draft resolution seeks implicitly to attain that objective. Such a position is wholly unwarranted, particularly as some of the States whose delegations sponsored the draft resolution are themselves parties to certain military alliances, such as the Paris Agreements providing for the re-armament of Western Germany, whose aggressive purposes led to the conclusion of the defensive Warsaw Treaty.

39. It is clear that intentions such as those expressed in the draft resolution are far-reaching and have nothing to do with the Hungarian people and their interests. The Romanian Government considers that the proper way to solve the Hungarian problem is through the application of the programme of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government, which provides for broad measures to restore Hungary's economy and to further its progress on the basis of a freely elected people's democratic régime. My delegation is persuaded that nothing can prevent the Hungarian people from developing socialism.

40. The situation in Hungary has already improved substantially from every point of view. The Romanian delegation wishes again to state its opinion that it is a grave error and an unacceptable violation of the Charter to attempt to associate the United Nations with the fascist elements who tried to overthrow the democratic régime established by the Hungarian people and to undermine Hungary's security. For these reasons the Romanian delegation will vote against the draft resolution [A/3316] before the Assembly.

41. As regards the other draft resolution [A/3319], submitted by the United States delegation, the delegation of the Romanian People's Republic considers that it is normal that a State whose people have lived through the tragic events which have taken place in Hungary should be helped by other States. Like other Governments, the Romanian Government is providing aid. But the acceptance of such aid is nevertheless an internal affair of Hungary. For that reason the question can be legitimately settled only by an agreement between the States prepared to give assistance and the Hungarian Government. My delegation will therefore vote against the draft resolution.

42. I should like, further, to refer to the speech of the United States representative, in which he made an effort to rouse sympathy for the fascist elements who rose in armed revolt against the democratic rights of the Hungarian people and committed many crimes. Neither the United States draft resolution nor the United States representative's statement make any reference to the acts of terrorism committed by the fascist bands. How can the United States representative's words be reconciled with the photograph published in today's

*New York Times* showing men being shot in the back in cold blood? In Budapest hundreds of thousands of men have been murdered, burned alive and hanged. Neither our contemporaries nor history will ignore these crimes against the Hungarian people, despite the propaganda efforts that can be seen in the draft resolutions submitted by certain representatives of the Western States.

43. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I am glad, as the representative of a free country, to follow in this debate the representative of Romania. I often wonder, as I reflect on the utterances of those in his position, whether in their hearts they fear that the flames which now scorch Budapest could consume Bucharest if its citizens dared to try to be free.

44. There is no need for me to reiterate my country's attitude towards the intervention of Soviet troops in Hungary. Our detestation of the cold-blooded brutalities committed against the Hungarian people was made abundantly clear in my statement at the beginning of this debate [564th meeting]. Most unfortunately, the Soviet Union has done nothing since the beginning of this debate to allay the anxieties and fears of those who watch its stark determination to trample on liberty in Hungary and kill and maim all those men, women and children who dare still to fight for freedom, or even, as I heard Sir Pierson Dixon say, dare to move in their own streets.

45. My delegation will support the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316]. We trust that it will be adopted by an even larger majority than the resolution [1004 (ES-II)] adopted on 4 November 1956. My delegation has understanding of those delegations who were unable to obtain instructions in time to support the earlier resolution. The five-Power draft resolution provides a second opportunity for all Members of the United Nations to make it known where they stand.

46. I find this conception which I am about to set out terrifying and I think that all free peoples will find it terrifying. The conception is this: If you oppose the nationalization of land and industry, certainly if you oppose it vigorously, then you are a fascist, you are a feudalist and you are a capitalist, and as such, in Communist eyes, you deserve to be shot. I ask some of my friends in Asia to reflect on this conception. If this continues to be the philosophy of the Soviet Union—and we see now its terrifying manifestations in Hungary—then the world faces a grim future indeed.

47. My delegation fully supports the draft resolution presented by the United States [A/3319]. My Government has already acted to meet the appeal contained in section II of this draft resolution.

48. In a statement issued today, my Prime Minister said that the New Zealand Government was keeping in close touch with the international measures to assist the refugees from Soviet repression in Hungary. He recalled that the Government had already granted £10,000 to the relief work being undertaken by the International Red Cross and he expressed confidence that the New Zealand public would respond generously to the appeal which had already been launched.

49. The Government, Mr. Holland went on, had given consideration this morning to appeals for assistance from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the two bodies on which the main burden of maintenance and resettlement measures would fall. A decision had been made to receive up to 500 of the Hun-

garian refugees for settlement in New Zealand. This offer was being conveyed to the organizations concerned. The need for further financial assistance would also receive consideration as soon as the situation was clarified.

50. May I add my earnest hope that the Soviet Union and the present authorities in Hungary will promptly comply with Section I of the United States draft resolution. The least that can be expected—the least—is that the crimes already committed against the Hungarian people will not be compounded by a refusal to admit emergency supplies of food and medicine. Any delay will merely add the miseries of disease and starvation to the ravages already so ruthlessly inflicted on Hungary by the forces of the Soviet Union.

51. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): The position of the Czechoslovak delegation on the item under discussion is, in principle, known from the intervention which we made here yesterday [569th meeting].

52. In view of what is going on in this Assembly and what can be justly called an obstinate attempt by a number of speakers, distorting facts which have so far proved themselves, we should stress once again that we are strongly opposed to any interference in the internal affairs of Hungary by the United Nations. The new Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government in Hungary has communicated to this Assembly, through the Secretary-General, its categorical objections to any discussion of the so-called Hungarian question either by the Security Council or by the General Assembly. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter is unequivocal in the sense that the United Nations has no right or power whatsoever to interfere in the internal affairs of States. We have voted against the inclusion of the item on the so-called situation in Hungary in the agenda and against the United States draft resolution [A/3286], the main purpose of which was to realize interference where other means and methods have failed.

53. It is regrettable that the majority of the General Assembly has proceeded in a different fashion, despite the protests of the Hungarian Government. It was, however, not surprising after having heard here all the accounts and claims that a situation existed in Hungary which is the opposite of the truth.

54. The intention to divert public opinion from merciless suppression of the peoples of Algeria, Malaya, Cyprus and other areas of Asia and Africa, from the aggression committed against Egypt, is too obvious to be misunderstood, while we are confronted with another attempt to continue interference in the internal affairs of Hungary.

55. A draft resolution has been presented by five Powers obviously acting, so to speak, as foremost crusaders for freedom. The purpose of this action is, however, the same as other preceding ones. There can be no doubt of the reasons why this draft resolution has been proposed over the objections of the legitimate Government of Hungary and after it has made known that order and security have been restored in Hungary. Those who are pressing this matter are not interested in the rights of the Hungarian people. They distort facts, while claiming that freedom has been suppressed in Hungary.

56. They would like to make us believe that what happened in Hungary was a steadily increasing democratic uprising, which became more and more democratic by the hour, and that it was suddenly suppressed. This is a gross falsification of facts for the purpose of restor-

ing the capitalist régime and the Hungarian fascist revival.

57. The outcome of the events in Hungary has shown beyond any doubt that it is not Hungarian freedom, but reactionary and fascist elements which have tried to turn the clock back to Horthyism, that has been suppressed and chased out of the country by the Hungarian people. There is other evidence that the supporters of the old Horthy régime came in great numbers from across the border to join the organized and well-armed underground inside the country, which enjoyed financial and material support of reactionaries overseas, in a treacherous attack against the democratic régime in Hungary.

58. There exists evidence that, during the last days of the Government of Imre Nagy, seventy aircraft of the Red Cross, coming from Austria, landed in Hungary, carrying on board Horthy's officers, whose task it was to command the rebels. These officers were trained in Western Germany for their special mission. Besides that, a great number of cases of medicaments were transported to Hungary, containing, in fact, armaments for the rebels. Thus, what started as a popular upheaval was transformed by the fascist forces of reactionaries into a situation of greatest danger to the democratic régime in Hungary which had developed out of a long struggle of the Hungarian people.

59. The new Government of Hungary, in an appeal to the Hungarian people, set forth a programme pledging national independence and sovereignty of Hungary, defence and democratic socialism, and negotiations for withdrawal of Soviet troops. Such is the true phase of recent events in Hungary.

60. These are the few but most important facts which cannot be denied or disregarded. Those who persist in distortion of facts obviously have the intention of foisting another United Nations decision on the world which would constitute gross interference in Hungary's domestic affairs for the purpose of disturbing the progress and consolidation of peaceful development. If this is their contribution to the settlement of the so-called Hungarian question as presented by them, we shall not hesitate to denounce and to oppose it.

61. At the same time, we cannot support the second United States draft resolution [A/3319], which pretends to offer aid, while aiming, in fact, at carrying out another task, that of spreading slander, instigating hatred, and perpetrating further interference in the internal affairs of Hungary.

62. Finally, I should like to remind the representative of France, who displayed such particular and continuous concern about our freedom and independence, that the Czechoslovak people have not yet forgotten that France did not honour the treaty which it had with pre-war Czechoslovakia, and that it played an outstanding role in the Munich betrayal.

63. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish simply to reaffirm all that we have already said in clarifying our position regarding Hungary's rights and our solidarity with that country in the face of aggression; there is no need to repeat today what was said yesterday [568th meeting].

64. Our attitude remains the same; perhaps we feel even more strongly than before, if that were possible. It remains the same, and is confirmed at the very moment of this continued intervention against Hungary and this pulverization of a country's rights. The rights of a people fighting, as are the people of Hungary, once again, for its sovereignty and freedom. This continued inter-

vention is following its implacable course and so far the aggression has not been halted either by the resolution [1004 (ES-II)] adopted by this Assembly or by the clamour of the general conscience aroused by the outrage.

65. According to information reaching us, events are following the pattern set in the last few days. The forces of aggression continue to crush the life and destiny of an admirable people. Our words at this point are only intended to reaffirm our solidarity with the Hungarian people; we recognize our duty, as an American democracy, to uphold the principles of the Charter and the decisions of the General Assembly by standing side by side with the Hungarian people which is presently struggling for its rights and those of all mankind.

66. This morning we heard the United States representative present proposals we are now considering. The draft resolution [A/3319] which he proposed contains two fundamental concepts. The first of these is to be found in section I. It requests the Soviet Union to cease immediately actions against the Hungarian population which are in violation of the accepted standards and principles of international law, justice and morality. After this American statement affirming the principles which we uphold under the Charter, which the peoples of America have always upheld and which are upheld by the people and the Government of the true functional democracy which I have the honour to represent, the United States draft resolution calls on our feeling of solidarity and requests the Hungarian authorities to facilitate the receipt and distribution of food and medical supplies to the Hungarian people and to co-operate fully with the United Nations and its specialized agencies as well as with other international organizations in this respect. The draft resolution also calls upon the Government of the Soviet Union not to impede this particular task in any way.

67. We will support not only section I of this draft resolution but also section II which seeks to deal with the grievous consequences of war, violence, aggression and arbitrary action. It calls upon the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to assist the victims of this new upheaval who have lost their homes and happiness as a result of a foreign aggression which has deprived them of their rights and imperilled their very existence.

68. We have heard several of the delegations which have spoken on this new problem of refugees avail themselves of the opportunity to stress the sanctity of the right of asylum. This is a right which we regard as an inviolable prerogative of human beings who fight for their freedom, for equal civil and political rights, for the freedom of thought, speech and ideals, and for the rights to defend those ideals. We who believe in the right of asylum not only as an absolute right recognized in our international treaties but also as an accepted incident of social intercourse between American States, can do no less than vote in favour of this draft resolution which envisages the problem of refugees. This had already been stated by other delegations, and my Government will no doubt give this problem the urgent attention which the gravity of the situation demands.

69. As regards the other draft resolution [A/3316] under consideration, circulated this morning and sponsored by five Powers, I should like to say that my delegation will support its operative part. This draft resolution again requests the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces from Hungary and states that the General Assembly considers that free elections should be held in that country, under United Nations auspices, under the

conditions specified in the draft resolution. This draft resolution also reaffirms the Assembly's earlier request to the Secretary-General to carry out an investigation of the situation created by foreign intervention in Hungary.

70. The explanatory part, or preamble, of this draft resolution may contain features which could be regarded as somewhat redundant, because they are already covered in the operative part to which I have referred. Nevertheless, whatever reservations we may have regarding the wording of this preamble or some of its clauses, which set the keynote for the operative part, the three essential points to which I have referred can certainly count on the supporting vote of my delegation.

71. As we approach the end of this emergency special session of the General Assembly, convened to examine the situation in Hungary, in accordance with the resolution already adopted and in the spirit of unswerving solidarity that inspires them, we wish to salute the fighters in Hungary, in the knowledge that the glare of the flames that illuminate their battle will for ever light the path of mankind in its struggle for justice and freedom.

72. Mr. MACKAY (Canada): Within the past two days, this Assembly has been heartened by the replies received from the Governments recently engaged in military operations in the Middle East. A cease-fire and withdrawal have been agreed to by all concerned. They have also agreed to the entry of a United Nations force pending a general settlement.

73. What a contrast to the situation in Hungary. Not all the facts of the situation in Hungary are available, but there are more than enough to prove the continued unwarranted and brutal interference, by force of arms, of one great country in the internal affairs of a small neighbour.

74. I would ask once again the questions asked of the Soviet Union delegation by our Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, earlier in this debate. For obvious reasons, I address these questions to the Soviet Union delegation rather than to the delegation which purports to represent Hungary. Will the Soviet Union give similar undertakings for a cease-fire and withdrawal—I repeat: and withdrawal—with respect to Hungary? Secondly, will the Soviet Union Government and the Hungarian Government admit a United Nations mission of observers to report back to the Assembly, as approved in the Assembly resolution of 4 November [1004 (ES-II)]?

75. Further, United Nations machinery appropriate to the situation in Hungary is no less urgently required than is United Nations machinery in the Middle East. Where, except from the United Nations, can an impartial and disinterested authority be obtained to hold the ring and thus enable the Hungarian people to form the kind of free national Government they desire, without fear of reprisal? Is the Soviet Union Government prepared to accept any such solution for Hungary?

76. Here is its chance—perhaps its last chance—to prove its good faith. I regret that I can find no evidence in the statement of the representative of the USSR in this morning's debate that his Government has any intention of permitting the Hungarian people any freedom of choice or that it has any intention of withdrawing its forces from Hungarian territory. This, from the Government that has made such loud protestations these last few days about intervention by other Governments in the Middle East.



77. With respect to the five-Power draft resolution my delegation can do no other than vote in favour of it.

78. We shall also support the draft resolution [A/3319] introduced by the delegation of the United States. This draft resolution is solely concerned with the humanitarian aspects of the situation in Hungary. Surely, this purpose and this draft resolution can be supported by all delegations genuinely interested in human welfare and the relief of suffering. In this connexion, I have been authorized to state that Canada is ready to give priority to applications for immigration from Hungarian refugees, to contribute an additional \$100,000 to the High Commissioner for Refugees, specifically earmarked for the aid of Hungarian refugees; and to contribute a further \$100,000 to the Canadian Red Cross for Hungarian relief.

79. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): While explaining my vote yesterday [568th meeting] on the first United States draft resolution [A/3286] adopted a few days ago, I had the opportunity to clarify the approach of the Polish delegation to the heart of the problem being discussed in this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

80. We are deeply concerned about the tragic events in Hungary, but we consider that, at the moment when the new Hungarian Government has stated its programme which we support, one should not interfere with its tasks and its efforts to regulate, through negotiations with the USSR, the problems connected with the presence of Soviet troops in, and their withdrawal from, Hungary.

81. In these circumstances, I can only deplore the introduction of a new five-Power draft resolution [A/3316]. I should like to point out its irresponsible and propagandistic character. It is obviously meant to be used for propaganda purposes only, and not as a serious attempt to help in the solution of the case before us. The problem is too serious, the events are too tragic, for this kind of political game. I earnestly address myself to the authors of this draft resolution and ask them not to exploit the situation and to withdraw the draft resolution.

82. The United States draft resolution [A/3319], on the other hand, is, in the opinion of my delegation, of a very mixed character. While on the surface expressing certain humanitarian intentions and proposals, at the same time it unfortunately repeats the same political reasoning and conclusions which we considered inappropriate and unjust in the first United States draft resolution and which do not correspond to reality. For instance, in the preamble and in paragraph 2 of section I there is a presumption and implication that Soviet authorities are interfering with the relief action provided for in our first draft resolution. But where is this relief action taking place? What effort has been made by the United Nations to implement paragraphs 7 and 8 of that first draft resolution? Have we heard anything about an effort on the part of the United Nations or its specialized agencies to implement those paragraphs of the draft resolution? So far, the whole interest has been concentrated on the political side of the matter, and I should like to express our regret that that has been the case.

83. In my country, substantial aid has been organized for the Hungarian population. Within a few days, 8 million zlotys—about \$2 million—has been collected, and we are sending transports of food and medicine to Hungary without any difficulty. I submit that paragraph 2 of section I of the new United States draft

resolution, instead of calling for non-interference, should call for relief, for food and medicine and action on the part of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. As it stands now, we cannot support section I of the resolution.

84. We find ourselves in a similar position in regard to section II of the draft resolution. We would be the last ones to interfere with help for refugees. Poland has already declared its readiness to take care of Hungarian children orphaned in the recent events. But we must remember that among the refugees there are not only women, children and other innocent victims of the recent events, but also people responsible for terrible crimes, examples of which could be seen in the pages of yesterday's New York newspapers. The political purpose of section II of the draft resolution is also clear from its preamble. Therefore, my delegation cannot support it.

85. But now a new draft resolution has been submitted by the representative of Austria [A/3324]. I have still not received a typewritten copy of the draft resolution but, according to my understanding of the text of the proposal, it has a really humanitarian character and is drafted with the purpose of bringing substantial and immediate help to the Hungarian people. In view of this, my delegation, anxious to contribute to the effort to bring help to Hungary, is prepared to put aside its legal doubts and to give to this draft resolution, as it would give to any other proposal of this character, its careful and favourable consideration.

86. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly has before it a United States draft resolution [A/3319] providing for aid to the Hungarian people which, owing to its noble, humanitarian purposes, cannot fail to gain the unanimous approval of this Assembly.

87. Also before us is a draft resolution [A/3316] submitted by five Powers calling upon the Government of the Soviet Union to withdraw its armed forces from Hungary without any further delay. The draft resolution further expresses the desire that free elections should be held in Hungary to enable the people of Hungary to determine for themselves the form of government they wish to establish in their country. It also reaffirms the request to the Secretary-General to investigate the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary and to report to the General Assembly on compliance with the decisions of the United Nations.

88. With regard to the draft resolutions I have just mentioned, the Argentine Republic takes the view that the Soviet Union, by invading Hungarian territory with its troops and by failing to withdraw its armed forces from Hungarian territory despite repeated requests, has violated the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations.

89. The attitude of the Soviet Union is, in fact, in conflict with the following commitments entered into by that country as a signatory of the United Nations Charter:

Firstly,

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace . . ."

Secondly,

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and

self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;”

Thirdly,

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

90. Considering that by its violation of these basic provisions the Soviet Union has acted against the spirit of the United Nations, the Argentine Republic proposes that, if the Soviet Union fails to comply with the recommendations contained in the draft resolution [A/3316] to which I have just referred and which will surely be adopted, the Members of the General Assembly should sever diplomatic relations with the USSR. Moreover, in view of the vicious onslaught against the Hungarian nation, unique in its repercussions on history and in the dismay to which it has given rise throughout the world, we request the General Assembly to recommend non-recognition of the new Hungarian Government and rejection of the Hungarian delegation's credentials on the ground that it does not represent any lawfully constituted authority.

91. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): I shall be brief, and what I shall say will be in the nature of an explanation of my delegation's vote on the General Assembly's [1004 (ES-II)] previous resolution of 4 November, and also an explanation of its votes on the two draft resolutions [A/3316, A/3319] that are under discussion now.

92. At the very outset I should like to make it clear on behalf of my Government that we are against all kinds of imperialism, and that we stand by the principle of self-determination for all nations. We deplore aggression wherever it may occur in the world, be it in the Middle East or in Eastern Europe. Nepal, in spite of its being a small country, has in its history prized independence more than anything else. My country has always been a firm and conscientious believer in the cause of freedom of the smaller nations.

93. Naturally, our heart goes out in sympathy to the people of Hungary which is struggling against heavy odds for freedom and democracy. The blood-curdling events that have occurred in Hungary as a result of the armed attack of the Soviet Union have shocked the moral conscience of mankind.

94. The Hungarian people must be free to live under the form of government it chooses, and the USSR must be compelled to withdraw its troops from Hungary. I think that this may be possible only through unrelenting world public opinion. We condemn the armed intervention of Soviet Russia in the affairs of Hungary just as we condemned the military aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt.

95. We abstained from voting on the draft resolution of 4 November [A/3286] sponsored by the United States specially for the reason that some of its paragraphs were such as to require instructions from our Government, although there were others in which we concurred fully and completely—for example, the sovereign equality clause, the human rights, and so on. Communications with Nepal being extremely difficult we decided to abstain, but we should like it to go on record that we do not approve of the Soviet Union's armed intervention in Hungary. Our belief in non-aggression and non-intervention as the principles of international conduct was very eloquently endorsed at the Bandung Conference of April 1955.

96. With regard to the draft resolutions now before us, we thoroughly approve the humanitarian purposes underlined in that submitted by the United States [A/3319], although we feel that some of its paragraphs could be so reordered as to make their humanitarian content appear more pronounced by removing the political colour. I learn that some of the African-Asian nations have suggested [A/3325] amendments, and I hope that these amendments will meet this suggestion of mine. The general idea of extending humanitarian assistance to the people of Hungary, who obviously are in very great need of such assistance, is highly commendable. We shall therefore be able to vote in favour of the United States draft resolution, with the amendments which I understand have been submitted by some of the African and Asian Powers.

97. We shall abstain from the vote on the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316], because certain paragraphs of that draft resolution are rather strongly worded and would have to be referred to our Government.

98. Mr. DE GRIPENBERG (Finland): Under the agenda item entitled “The Situation in Hungary”, the Assembly has before it three draft resolutions: one submitted by five Powers [A/3316], another by the United States of America [A/3319]; and the third [A/3324], presented by Austria.

99. The Finnish delegation will abstain from the vote on the five-Power draft resolution only because we do not find it possible to associate ourselves with the formulation of some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution presented by Austria. In this connexion, we should like to emphasize Finland's fervent hope that Hungary and the Soviet Union will be able to agree on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and on the safeguarding of the fundamental human rights of the Hungarian people, in a way corresponding to the traditions of freedom which have existed in that country for many centuries.

100. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): Yesterday [569th meeting], I set forth my Government's basic attitude towards this question of Hungary which is now being dealt with by the General Assembly in emergency special session. Delegations are prone to state the high and noble principle on which the policies of their Governments are based. This is a good thing, and my delegation has followed this practice, also.

101. I believe that, so far as declared principles are concerned, there is not much disagreement among delegations to the General Assembly. Indeed, the very fact of being a Member of this Organization entitles each of us here to claim that, in our policies, we uphold the noble principles expressed in the Charter.

102. My delegation has clearly stated the principles involved in this question of Hungary. What is important now is the fact that we must solve the problem, that we must seek a solution to a grave and serious situation which presents itself to us, but even more to the people and country of Hungary. I should like to repeat what I said here yesterday:

“Whatever we do, at this crucial time in the history of the Hungarian people, we should do in the real interests of the Hungarian people as a whole, for the country as a whole, and thereby assist the Hungarian Government to carry out such objectives, taking into account, however, the need for a country, especially a small one, to maintain friendly relations with its neighbours.” [569th meeting, para. 80.]



103. We must seek a peaceful solution in the interests of the Hungarian people. We must contribute to the cessation of fighting and destruction in that country. We must do that in the real interests of the country and its people, but also, I believe, in the interests of peace in that entire area of the world. My delegation will view every draft resolution in that light, basing its final position on the usefulness or the effectiveness of the draft resolution in paving the way for a rapid and peaceful solution of the problem.

104. Sentiments of sympathy, of anger and of condemnation of one another have been expressed. Everyone is, of course, free to state his views and to express his feelings. We respect all those sentiments and feelings, many of which, indeed, we share. If, however, we ask the Assembly to take a decision, the prime consideration should be whether, after the adoption of the first resolution [1004 (ES-II)] on 4 November, the adoption of another draft resolution would really contribute further to the solution of the situation, even though it might satisfy our sentiments and feelings.

105. Moreover, we are dealing here with a Member State, a sovereign State with a government of its own—whether we like it or not—which, according to the Charter, has its own rights and obligations. Nothing, in fact, can be solved now without the co-operation of the Hungarian Government. Only yesterday, the Secretary-General communicated to that Government an *aide-mémoire* [A/3315], which was also circulated to delegations here, bringing to the attention of the Hungarian Government the provisions of the Assembly resolution of 4 November and seeking that Government's co-operation in implementing the provisions. Thus, we are in fact at this moment awaiting the Hungarian Government's answer to and comments on the *aide-mémoire*. Now, a five-Power resolution [A/3316] has been submitted which seeks to make further demands of that Government and contains further expressions of condemnation. I do not know whether such a draft resolution will be helpful at a time when we are seeking, through the Secretary-General, the co-operation of the Hungarian Government in many matters. I do not want to challenge or to question the principles involved in this draft resolution. In fact, my delegation supports the idea of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary; this is a matter to be negotiated by the Hungarian Government with the Soviet Union.

106. We also support the idea of free elections in Hungary, but, again, let this be their own choice, the choice of the people of Hungary. With all respect to the sentiment and principles which are expressed in this draft resolution, in all fairness we do have honest doubts whether this draft resolution, if adopted, would have the effect it seeks to achieve. Therefore, the Indonesian delegation will be unable to support this draft resolution because of the considerations I have mentioned. The difference between my delegation and the sponsors of this draft resolution is not, I believe, on matters of principle, but rather on the conduct of policy at a certain moment in seeking a peaceful solution of a certain situation.

107. My Government believes in the kind of approach I have described dealing with a difficult and delicate situation such as the one before us. Exploring persistently the possibilities for a just but peaceful solution, we will continue to conduct ourselves in that way.

108. In regard to the second draft resolution presented by the United States delegation [A/3319] I think its intention is to carry out the humanitarian

tasks recommended in the resolution of 4 November as quickly and as smoothly as possible. This endeavour certainly has my delegation's support. This morning we heard with satisfaction the announcement of the Government of the Soviet Union that it, too, has already begun to send medical supplies, food and so on to alleviate the plight of the Hungarian people.

109. The United States draft resolution, however, unfortunately is couched in terms which are rather controversial and which will therefore, I am afraid, make its implementation only more difficult. This certainly would not be helpful in serving the purpose intended. My delegation would like to see this draft resolution confined to the humanitarian tasks, that is, couched in terms which would make its implementation easier rather than more difficult. If the harsh or accusing phrasing were taken out, my delegation would be able to support it whole-heartedly. The question of phrasing is important in this kind of endeavour.

110. If one wants a resolution to be adopted by the greatest possible majority, one can, without relinquishing one's principles, permit or acquiesce in the use of a kind of terminology in a resolution which, while not wholly meeting with one's sentiments, still is most appropriate to meet the need for general support. In the case of the Middle East question, for instance, or rather in the case of the aggression of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt, my delegation and all the Asian and African delegations acquiesced in terming this United Kingdom and French aggression against Egypt just "military operations against Egyptian territory" [resolution 997 (ES-I)]. This term did not fully meet our sentiments, but we agreed to it for the sake of attaining general support, taking into account the different positions of several delegations towards the United Kingdom and France, positions we wished to understand. While for us, indeed, for the great majority of the Assembly there was the fact of clear-cut aggression against Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel, the word "aggression" or even the phrase "deploring such aggression or such actions", let alone condemning them, was not introduced in the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation. The word used in the preamble was merely "Noting" and the draft resolution only expressed the grave concern of the General Assembly over the developments.

111. We indeed gave much consideration to the objections of some Powers against using those harsh words in a resolution. We acquiesced in this moderation and incorporated words in the resolution only in the most business-like way. Therefore, we hope that in this question of Hungary also the same considerations can prevail, without, I must say again, compromising anybody's principles. Accordingly, with regard to the United States draft resolution [A/3319] I should like to suggest that it be amended in such a way as to read as follows:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"I*

*"Considering that distribution of food and medical supplies is urgently needed by the civilian population in Hungary,*

*"1. Requests the Hungarian authorities to facilitate the receipt and distribution of food and medical supplies to the Hungarian people and to co-operate fully with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as other international organizations*

such as the International Red Cross, to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Hungary;

"2. *Urges* the Hungarian authorities to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General and his duly appointed representatives for the carrying out of the tasks referred to above.

## "II

"*Considering* that large numbers of refugees are leaving Hungary,

"1. *Requests* the Secretary-General to call upon the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to consult with other appropriate international agencies and interested Governments with a view to making speedy and effective arrangements for emergency assistance to refugees from Hungary;

"*Urges* Member States to make special contributions for this purpose."

112. Amendments [A/3325] to this effect will be formally submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, India and Indonesia. I believe that so amended the draft resolution would maintain its essence of obtaining the speedy carrying out of the needed humanitarian work which is indeed a very urgent matter and one which should be viewed in the most objective manner in order to secure its success.

113. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the Austrian delegation [A/3324], I think that in general we agree with the ideas contained in it. I hope that my delegation will be able to support that draft resolution, but first I should like to study it and I reserve the right of my delegation later to define its final position on it.

114. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): The General Assembly has before it a number of draft resolutions, the amendments to one of the draft resolutions presented by the delegations of Ceylon and Indonesia together with my own delegation, and there is also pending the resolution of 4 November 1956 [1004 (ES-II)]. I should like to deal with the resolutions which are before us today in the order in which they have been submitted.

115. There is first of all the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316] which deals in substance with the situation in Hungary. With regard to that draft resolution, the position of most delegations has already been stated, because that draft resolution deals with the subject matter covered by the resolution of 4 November.

116. I should like to reiterate what I said from this rostrum yesterday [569th meeting]. Having considered the position in Hungary, the Assembly passed a resolution which requested the Secretary-General to make certain investigations and report to it. That resolution is still pending. We are told and the Secretary-General has informed us that he is not in a position to make that report. It appears to me in the normal course of things entirely an unusual proceeding to go on to other decisions. The decision of the Assembly of 4 November is, on the face of it, a clear indication that the Assembly wants information. The Assembly wants to know what the Secretary-General is able to do in these matters.

117. It is quite true that my delegation abstained on this resolution for the reasons I set out yesterday. But even though a delegation abstains on the vote, when a resolution is adopted it becomes the resolution of the Assembly. In our opinion, there is a duty cast upon the Assembly at least to conform to its own resolution passed only a few days ago. Therefore, we think that the five-Power draft resolution apart from all other

considerations, to which I shall refer in a moment, is misconceived. We are not able to support it, and shall vote against it.

118. Secondly, in making this approach to the problem, my delegation desires to submit with respect that we are not giving sufficient thought and attention to the resolving of the problems and the difficulties that exist in Hungary at the present moment. There was no one here who does not appreciate that there has been fighting, suffering and unsettlement and that there is not the stability required. Any decisions that we adopt here must be directed to the improvement of those conditions. Furthermore, my delegation cannot subscribe at any time to any phraseology or proposals before the Assembly which disregard the sovereignty of States represented here. For example, we cannot say that a sovereign Member of this Assembly, admitted after due procedures, can be called upon to submit its elections and everything else to the United Nations without its agreement. Therefore, any approach that we make as though this is a colonial country which is not represented at the United Nations, is not in accordance either with the law or the facts of the position.

119. With regard to the subject matter, it has disturbed our minds and caused my Government and people a great deal of anxiety; as I said yesterday on this rostrum, we have, as a Government, as all Governments do, the right to exert what influence we have and make such approaches as are possible to assist in resolving this problem and to bring about a situation where the Hungarian people will be able to settle down to constructive tasks and enjoy their national independence.

120. I am to say that in the correspondence between the Prime Ministers of the Soviet Union and India, the last part of which was communicated from New Delhi and received here this afternoon, the Soviet Government informed us of a determination to deal with its relationships with their neighbouring socialist States on the principles of mutual respect of their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and friendship, co-operation and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. This appears in the declaration of the Soviet Government of 30 October, and it is reiterated.

121. There is the problem of the Soviet troops. The Government of India is informed that Soviet troops are to be withdrawn from Budapest in agreement with the Hungarian Government as soon as order is restored. And the Russian Government intends to start negotiations with the Hungarian Government in regard to Soviet-Hungarian relations in conformity with this declaration.

122. It is entirely up to the Assembly to make its own decision with regard to these matters. As far as our Government is concerned, we have made efforts in this direction with a view to attaining the ends that are put forward in these resolutions. In agreement with Yugoslavia, Poland and other countries, who are very near to Hungary and whose problems though not identical are of a similar character, we think that we should not do things here merely out of emotion or other reactions or out of our political predilections, forgetting the interests of the Hungarian people and of the Hungarian State. Therefore, any attitude which is taken which will retard this process of the withdrawal of troops and the settling down of the Hungarian people will be contrary to our general purposes.

123. For those reasons, we think that the five-Power draft resolution is not one which we can support. We consider that it will not assist in the purposes in which

the Assembly has interested itself. We also think it is not consistent with the requests we have made to the Secretary-General and the tasks assigned to him. What we are really doing is asking the Secretary-General to make an investigation and to report; and then, before we hear from him, proceeding to take decisions. Either our first decision was wrong and we do not want information—in which case we should say so—or we ask the Secretary-General to do something and then we disregard that. There is also the *aide-mémoire* which he submitted yesterday [A/3315], in which he informed the Assembly that he had taken steps in this direction and that he is awaiting a reply. He also points in that *aide-mémoire* that nothing of this kind can be done without the co-operation of the Hungarian Government. In his communication, the Secretary-General says that there is a Hungarian Government with which he is in correspondence. I think that *aide-mémoire* should be regarded as expressing the view of the United Nations, because no one has challenged it so far.

124. We come now to the second draft resolution [A/3319] before us, which stands in the name of the United States of America. This draft resolution is of an entirely different category, and I would like to say that we are in agreement with its purposes. If I am right, the purposes of this draft resolution are humanitarian, that is, the relief of suffering. But a purpose always gets rather distorted when material that is relevant to other purposes is imported into it. Therefore, my delegation, while agreeing with the purposes as being in conformity with the general approach towards relieving suffering whatever may be the causes, has tried to remove from the United States draft resolution such parts as make it unacceptable to us, and to retain all the rest, even though we might not have phrased it in that way; that is to say, if my delegation and those who co-sponsored these amendments had to submit a draft resolution *de novo*, we might not have adopted this phraseology. But we are anxious to retain as much of this draft resolution as we can and to take away from it only those things that have no relevance at all or may come in the way of its purposes. I will not read out the various amendments since the Indonesian representative has already read them out to this Assembly [A/3325].

125. It is our submission that the draft resolution as we seek to amend it meets the purposes which the United States draft resolution has in view, without importing into it other considerations and that it will achieve the end to which my colleague from Indonesia has just referred, namely, to bring to this draft resolution a larger degree and wider extent of support.

126. In regard to the whole question of the relief of suffering in conditions of war or conditions of civil disturbance, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that these matters have been taken into consideration by the nations of the world and have led to the formulation of the Geneva Convention in regard to a disturbance of this character, whether the disturbance be a civil disturbance, a civil commotion, internal might be said—and therefore as coming within Article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter—or an international war. It is the submission of my delegation that these matters of relief should be dealt with in accordance with the Geneva Convention. If it is dealt with in accordance with the Geneva Convention, the channelling of aid should be through organizations of a character which do not call into question the nature of that aid or its purposes or whether, in a packet con-

taining medicaments, arms are going in, or anything of that kind. Therefore, in these circumstances, the aid should go to the International Red Cross which would decide the local organs through which their further transmission should take place.

127. I am sure that the Assembly will share the feeling of my delegation that we were glad to hear this morning from the representative of Yugoslavia that the International Red Cross has not met with any resistance from any party concerned, and that the International Red Cross is functioning through the Hungarian and Yugoslav Red Cross missions. Therefore, it is the appropriate international authority free from political or national bias which conforms to the terms of the Geneva Convention, and is the appropriate authority to deal with this matter.

128. While we have no desire to have a specific mention of this apart from what appears in the draft resolution, half the troubles arising from political controversy would disappear if we would separate the humanitarian aspects from our own political objectives. That is why my delegation has moved these amendments, and I hope that after the statement that the representative of Indonesia has made and that I have made—and that I am sure those who speak after me will make—it will be seen that we are in agreement with the purposes and the motives that lie behind the United States draft resolution [A/3319]. But we cannot agree with its formulation; however, we are in agreement with the main purposes. We hope, therefore, that these amendments will find favour with the sponsor of the draft resolution.

129. I will not follow one of the preceding speakers into a discussion of topics that are not before us now. This is the second emergency session of the Assembly dealing with the problem of Hungary. The first one dealt with the problem of Egypt and, normally speaking, it would be out of order, I suppose, to deal with the topic of the first emergency session in the second emergency session; but it would not be out of order to deal with what has been said in the second emergency session by someone else if the President did not rule him out of order. Therefore, it is necessary to state that it is a little inconsistent to try and tell us at this time that the aggression committed by the Anglo-French alliance on Egyptian territory is in defence of peace and has any relation to this problem whatsoever. Therefore, in view of that fact having been mentioned, my delegation wants its expression of opinion to be placed on the record.

130. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) (*translated from French*): I have already had the honour at the outset of this debate [564th meeting] to state the position and sentiments of my country. I shall confine myself at this juncture to explaining the vote which we intend to cast on the draft resolutions now before us. Belgium was among the countries which immediately offered assistance to Hungary. My country has in particular offered to admit 4,000 Hungarian refugees. There is therefore no need to say that we will vote for the United States draft resolution [A/3319]. There is also no need to say that we sympathize with the thought underlying the Austrian draft resolution [A/3324].

131. With regard to the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316] I can best express the feelings which will prompt our vote by reading a passage from a statement made last Sunday in Brussels by Mr. Spaak, the Foreign Minister of Belgium. Mr. Spaak said:

“The Soviet Union is in the process of destroying all the hopes awakened by recent developments in



that country. Was de-Stalinization to lead to this bloody adventure? I do not yet know what will result from the discussion now taking place in the United Nations. I hope with all my heart that a strong expression of reprobation will cause the leaders of the Soviet Union to reflect. I hope that they will understand that their honour, their interests and their reputation in the world require that they should allow the Hungarian people themselves to choose in freedom the régime they desire. Whatever the outcome of this struggle, the events in Hungary are taking their place in the glorious history of the age-old struggle men have fought to safeguard their rights so that justice may triumph and freedom reign."

132. Mr. JOJA (Romania) (*translated from French*): I must apologize for taking up the time of the Assembly but I feel obliged to reply to a number of assertions that have been made. I will be very brief. The New Zealand representative was, I fear, unfortunate in his strange reflections on recent events. He wondered whether the Romanian representative did not expect the flames of Budapest to spread to Bucharest. I believe that I can tell him not to worry; they will not spread. The Romanian people will be prepared to give a fitting reply to any reactionaries who might hope from a safe distance that the flames of rebellion and white terror will destroy its creative work. But that is not why I asked to speak.

133. I feel that I must draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that it is odd and inadmissible that the representative of a Member State of the United Nations should feel able to ask such a question. Does it not reveal the sinister thoughts that lie behind the solemn phrases that abound in the statements of certain representatives? I should like to record the Romanian delegation's disapproval of, and protest against, the New Zealand representative's statements. I trust that I have the Assembly's permission to do so.

134. Mr. GUNewardENE (Ceylon): I stated yesterday [569th meeting] in categorical terms that as regards the Government of Ceylon, we would only be too prepared to accede to any request for a cease-fire. In point of fact, we are able to support very strongly the request made in the previous resolution [1004 (ES-II)], as well as in the draft resolution [A/3316] that has been placed before us, for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Hungary and also that no further military forces should be brought into Hungary for any purpose whatsoever.

135. In the same way that we registered our protest against the United Kingdom and France for their armed intervention in Egypt, we certainly protest even in stronger language against the action of Soviet forces in Hungary.

136. The point was made by Sir Pierson Dixon, my very esteemed friend and distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom, that the United Kingdom and France have accepted the cease-fire and have freely undertaken to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory. We are certainly grateful for that statement. At the same time, although there was no reason for bringing up the Egyptian question in connexion with this debate, the statement was also made that they were willing to do so and that Soviet Russia was not so willing. I should like to remind Sir Pierson Dixon that in spite of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly, Anglo-French forces landed in Egypt in defiance of the resolution [997 (ES-II)]. I believe that such action may sometimes set a bad example for others.

137. Soviet Russia seems to be carrying out the same policy, at least for the time being, of retaining its forces in spite of the resolution adopted by the Assembly. I hope that Soviet Russia will have the same realism and practical wisdom which were displayed by the United Kingdom and France, and agree to remove their forces from Hungary forthwith and promptly. As a rule I do not like such qualifications as "as soon . . . as order is restored". It can take many years before order is restored. Also, of course, it depends on one's definition of "order".

138. In these circumstances, I would rather adopt the phraseology that was used in the case of the resolutions relating to the United Kingdom and France "promptly", "without delay", "immediately". I trust that Soviet forces will be withdrawn from Hungary so that the people of Hungary may be able to settle their own affairs.

139. We certainly denounce armed intervention in the affairs of a country, whichever that country may be. I freely admit that there was a Warsaw Treaty, under which Soviet troops had the right to be in Hungary, a reason which certainly could not cover the action of the United Kingdom and France in Egypt. If comparisons are being made, however odious it may be, it is sometimes necessary to point out such facts.

140. My Government holds the view that, whether for reasons of restoring order or in the name of peace, we do not want foreign forces to interfere in the internal affairs of a country, whatever pacts there may be. The Government of Ceylon does not believe in military pacts and has always denounced them. These actions are sometimes the results of military pacts. We do not believe in military pacts. I hope that Soviet Russia will not plead the Warsaw Pact in order to keep its forces in Hungary.

141. An extremely unfortunate and tragic situation has taken place. I want to assure my Latin American friends, who stated that the lips of the Asian countries have been sealed on this question, that the lips of the Asian Prime Ministers have not been sealed. Prime Minister Nehru has in unmistakable terms expressed his point of view. My own Prime Minister, Mr. Bandaranaike, used strong language just the other day in connexion with the presence of foreign forces in Hungary. All political parties in Ceylon, except the Communist Party, have expressed similar sentiments. All the Asian countries and all their Prime Ministers have expressed their horror at the unfortunate happenings in Hungary. That does not mean, however, that we are here to make political capital out of other people's sufferings.

142. We in Asia believe in a philosophy of life; we do not believe in making political capital out of human suffering. In the name of humanity and in the furtherance of humanitarian causes we do not try to make use of such occasions for the expression of our political views, even for purposes that are supposed to be noble. Believing as we do in a philosophy of life, we deplore the fact that political considerations should be brought into humanitarian work.

143. There is no denying the fact that Hungary needs assistance. Hungary needs aid, medical supplies and all the sympathy and good will that people can give. However, let that be given in the spirit of humanitarian work, in the spirit of humanity, in the spirit of understanding. This is not the occasion for vindictiveness, for revenge or for the gospel of hatred. In the name

of humanity, let there be no gospel of hatred. Whatever one's views may be, they have been expressed on the political issue. On the humanitarian issue, however, let us get rid of such considerations.

144. In these circumstances, I have no alternative but to express my strong disapproval of the United States draft resolution [A/3319] in its present wording. I should certainly wish to applaud the United States for the noble objectives which it has in view, for the very real interest in its expressions of sympathy and support and for the declaration that the United States is prepared to spend so much money. However, even in a good cause, words sometimes matter—language counts.

145. Therefore, together with the delegations of India and Indonesia, and with the support of the delegation of Burma, we concluded that the humanitarian objective should be the primary motive of the draft resolution. I hope that it will be possible, therefore, to accept unanimously the amendments that we have proposed. This question should not be a subject of debate, because the relief of human suffering is not a matter for debate. There is not one of us who is not moved by the suffering in Hungary. Let us therefore take a unanimous stand on this question. It is in order that we might be able to take a unanimous stand that our amendments [A/3325] have been placed before the Assembly, and I hope that they will be received in that spirit.

146. As regards the political issues, I state again in categorical language that we are pledged to the upholding of the democratic ideal. We who believe in democracy would like to see the right of self-determination be given to every country of the world. We believe in the freedom of speech, we believe in the freedom of assembly, we believe in the freedom of the people to vote a government out of office. We believe that it is the right of a people to determine what their future should be.

147. Therefore, we would always welcome free elections. But in the name of free elections I would certainly not support the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316] because it serves no practical purpose. I certainly would like to have free elections—in the way I think they are free—in Russia, in Poland, in Romania, in Eastern Germany, in Hungary, in all countries of the world, and even in some of those other democratic countries with different political ideologies. There are also others with the name of democracy, with the name of freedom, who do not have the same concept of democracy as I have. There are countries in the world who believe that sometimes the bullet is superior to the ballot. But we who believe in the supremacy of the ballot would like to have seen free elections.

148. The mere moving of a resolution to the effect that we should like to have free elections in Russia, in Poland, in Hungary and in these countries will not secure the result. It may have excellent propaganda value, but I am not a party to that business. We are not aligned with any power politics. We are not aligned with any power blocs. We only deal with questions as and when they arise. With regard to the present occasion, the bringing into this resolution something in connexion with elections and asking the United Nations to interfere with the sovereign rights of peoples is a dangerous principle. On the present occasion it may sometimes suit the fancies and the wishes of several Members. But they must visualize the time when such interference may be possible even in the domain of their own affairs.

149. Therefore, on principle, I would not have the United Nations interfering in elections. How are elections to be held? Surely elections must be held on the basis of a constitution. Did it not take Pakistan eight years to draft a constitution? Are we going to say that elections are to be held pending a constitution? Are we going to wait for eight years for it? No, I certainly do not say so. Elections therefore must be based on a constitution, and a constitution can be drafted only after peoples have expressed their wishes. It is a long process. The mere saying that elections must be held means nothing.

150. Let us get down to practicalities. It is all very well to talk of free elections. I believe in free elections. My country believes in free elections and all of us believe in free elections. But the mere adoption of a draft resolution in this form does not bring about free elections. Therefore, I have no alternative but to say that I cannot understand how this should be interposed in the draft resolution, asking the United Nations to do something which is impossible of achievement. Of course, I have no doubt that it is also premature, because we have already assigned to the Secretary-General a task of first-class importance, of great magnitude, to survey the position and to submit a report to us. It is only after the observers have gone in, if they do go there—and that must be at the express wish of the Government of the country—and it is only after the submission of a report that we can get down to the practical business of what we should do: whether elections are to be held, what elections should be held, and what should be done next. It is like putting the cart before the horse. I am not prepared, therefore, in the name of propaganda, or in the name of revenge, or in the name of anything else, to subscribe to something that is utterly futile. In those circumstances I have no alternative but to oppose that draft resolution, though with much regret.

151. I have already commented on the two draft resolutions before the Assembly and I hope that we will be able to take a unanimous stand on this affair. Believe me, we feel very deeply about the sufferings of the people of Hungary. All Asian countries feel very strongly about it, and it is a pity that even the Hungarian sufferings should have brought to the political arena the injection of a discussion on the Egyptian issue, which is quite apart. I do deplore these tendencies. Let us discuss issues as and when they come and express our verdict on the issues before us.

152. U PE KIN (Burma): My delegation has already made its position clear on the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary. For the benefit of those who may still be in doubt, may I be allowed to repeat that my Government does not see any justification whatever in the course which the Soviet Union has taken in Hungary and has expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would take steps to effect speedy withdrawal of its troops from there. My delegation also added that the Government of Burma would support any effort of the United Nations which is not incompatible with the Charter or which the people of Hungary will not consider as tantamount to interference in their internal affairs. My delegation reaffirms its adherence to that declaration.

153. We now have before us a five-Power draft resolution [A/3316]. It will be recalled that on 4 November a resolution [1004 (ES-II)] was adopted by the Assembly to deal with the situation in Hungary. That resolution directed the Secretary-General to take certain actions, one of them being to get in touch with the

parties concerned in Hungary. The Secretary-General has reported to the Assembly that he has addressed an *aide-mémoire* [A/3315] to the Hungarian authorities on the subject and circulated it to the Assembly yesterday [569th meeting]. We have received no further progress report from him and my delegation therefore cannot appreciate the necessity for the draft resolution I have just referred to at this stage.

154. My delegation does not want to give any impression that it is opposed to the entire draft resolution. For example, my delegation is perfectly agreeable to the expression of deep concern that the provisions of the previous resolution have not been met. We support the view that the Hungarian people should enjoy freedom, independence and fundamental rights. We also consider that the Soviet Union's interference cannot be condoned as it constitutes a violation of the Charter. We have also expressed the hope that the Soviet Union will withdraw its troops speedily from Hungary. We also endorse the fact that the Secretary-General should continue to make every endeavour to obtain further particulars on the situation existing in Hungary.

155. But where does all this repetition of previous resolutions of the Assembly on the subject lead us? With due respect to the representatives who have sponsored this draft resolution, my delegation could find no constructive contribution in it towards a solution of the problem. It has only afforded further expressions of feelings of outrage.

156. Then, there is the question of elections as soon as law and order have been restored. That, in the opinion of my delegation, is the concern of the Hungarian people, and it is not for us to proffer suggestions. What do we mean by the term "as soon as law and order have been restored"? My delegation assumes that it envisages a situation following the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, and not before. Then, it is entirely up to the people of Hungary to say whether they want assistance from the United Nations in holding their elections.

157. If this contention of my delegation is erroneous, and if the draft resolution envisages a situation while the Soviet Union troops are still in Hungary, then it is impracticable and would remain only a pious wish.

158. For these reasons, and for no other, my delegation finds it difficult to vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/3316], but, because it contains, in several other paragraphs, sentiments which we fully share, my delegation will not oppose it. We shall abstain.

159. I come now to the second draft resolution that is before us today, the one submitted by the United States delegation [A/3319]. To be quite frank, my delegation does not feel quite happy about the wording of this draft resolution, although we are in full sympathy with its objectives. In connexion with a measure such as this, a measure taken to meet the needs of a people in a national tragedy, on purely humanitarian grounds, my delegation considers it inappropriate to introduce extraneous considerations—considerations of a political nature. All of us have had ample opportunity to express our views in that regard, and many of us have done so quite vehemently. Further opportunity to express their feelings on the subject has been taken by many delegations. That is the right of every delegation, and no one can deny it. But my delegation feels that this is no time to infuse angry feelings in a measure which is designed purely on humanitarian grounds. What we want is urgent action. Food and medical supplies and other neces-

sities should reach those who are in urgent need of them.

160. For that reason, my delegation welcomes the steps which the Soviet Union, as announced this morning by its representative in the Assembly, is taking to send food and supplies to Hungary. Generosity and relief—I do not wish to call it charity in this case—cannot be the monopoly of any side or of any one nation. Emotional and condemnatory remarks—for which there may be some basis for justification, or there may not—will not make the food that we are sending more palatable, nor the medical supplies that we despatch to possess more remedial properties. What we want is to despatch them speedily.

161. For that reason, I would recommend that we accept the amendments [A/3325] submitted by Ceylon, India and Indonesia, and introduced by the representative of Indonesia. Incidentally, the representative of Indonesia has very kindly associated the name of Burma with the amendments. I feel greatly honoured for that. But I have played no significant part in their preparation, and I would request the Assembly to accept the amendments as they appear in the document. I fully share the thought behind them, and I would happily commend to the Assembly the draft resolution as amended.

162. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): With the same respect that the representative of India showed when he said that, by their action, the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/3316] were not expecting to resolve the Hungarian problem, I must say that we had not expected to find so influential and enthusiastic a defender of the Soviet Union's position in the person of the representative of India.

163. I should like calmly and serenely to review recent events because, from certain statements just made, it might appear to anyone not familiar with the background that the aggression in Hungary was perpetrated, not by the Soviet Union, but by certain countries which sponsored the draft resolution. Let us not distort the facts to such an extent that we seem to be the ones responsible for the slaughter in Hungary while the Soviet Union appears to be the country to have rushed to its aid.

164. The facts are indeed otherwise. The incontrovertible facts are as follows: Hungary had a Government which, owing to the invasion by Soviet troops, appealed to the United Nations for assistance. That cannot be denied. The Hungarian people resisted the invasion by Soviet troops. That, too, cannot be denied. They were Soviet troops, not any others. Soviet troops, in other words the Soviet army, accounted in Hungary for over 75,000 dead and nearly 100,000 wounded. That is another fact which cannot be denied, on which all of us agree, except, of course, the authors of the aggression.

165. A puppet Government has been imposed upon Hungary, not through any intervention by Cuba, Ireland, Italy, Pakistan or Peru, the sponsors of the draft resolution. I repeat, a puppet Government has been imposed by the might of Soviet arms and against the will of the Hungarian people who are still resisting the invasion by Soviet forces. That, too, cannot be denied.

166. That is why—and may I say so with all respect—I take such a grave view of the thesis expounded here by the representative of India who held that all this was legal, that such action was proper, and that the United Nations must not react when confronted with



an invasion launched by a Member State which by force, violence, and the use of its army, imposes a Government which does not reflect the wishes of the population. However you look at the problem, that would, in my view, constitute a precedent which the United Nations cannot and must not accept.

167. What do we actually propose? We propose in our draft resolution that, in the first place, the Soviet Union should be called upon again to withdraw its forces from Hungary. Why? Because they are invading forces, forces which have no right to be on Hungarian territory. Why do we reiterate our request? Because we must do so since the Soviet Union has failed to comply with an earlier resolution [1004 (ES-II)] which we had adopted.

168. The statement of the representative of India that from an exchange of correspondence between the Governments of New Delhi and Moscow, it appeared that the Soviet Union would withdraw from Hungary when order has been restored, is another reason for all the free peoples of the world to be alarmed. The withdrawal of the Soviet army under those conditions means that no Hungarians will be left alive. If it has taken them only four or five days to kill 75,000 persons and wound 100,000, surely if they remain for another month there will be no Hungarians left to form a Hungarian society.

169. We consider that the first thing the Soviet Union Government must do is withdraw without delay. Until that happens there can be no negotiations between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of Hungary, since they are one and the same thing.

170. Two Governments can negotiate only if they have equal status; they can negotiate only if they are truly sovereign; two Governments, even those of a great Power and a small Power, can negotiate provided that they really represent the legitimate interests of their peoples. But the Soviet Union cannot negotiate with the present Government of Hungary for it actually is that Government; in other words it is the Soviet Union Government disguised as the Hungarian Government which has been imposed by the invasion, by the armed might of the USSR. This is so obvious that to speak of possible negotiations is a mistake which can only serve further to confuse world public opinion, enlightened though it may be.

171. With regard to the amendments [A/3325] that have been proposed, I do not believe that the representatives of Ceylon, India and Indonesia realize the implications of their amendments for if they did so I am sure that they would not have presented them.

172. I shall venture to explain to the Assembly the meaning of these amendments. I refer to the draft resolution [A/3319] submitted by the United States of America, operative paragraph 1 of section I of which is proposed to be deleted under one of the amendments. In other words, we are being asked to delete from the draft resolution the very essence of the United Nations Charter, the very essence of the provisions of the United Nations, the most elementary principles of international law and international morality. Public opinion would be confronted with the spectacle of the United Nations—the General Assembly—agreeing to delete a request calling on the USSR to cease immediately actions against the Hungarian population. That would be a mistake which, I think, we can in no circumstances permit, not even for the sake of achieving unanimity which, for obvious reasons, we shall not achieve in any case.

173. We are also asked to delete from the preamble of section I the words "that the military authorities of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are interfering in the transportation and distribution of food". But what if that statement happens to be true? It certainly is true because had they not intervened there would be no problem. Had the armed forces of the Soviet Union not prevented food supplies from reaching Hungary through Austria, there would have been no problem at all. And if the statement happens to be true, why omit it? For what reason? Because the truth must not be told when the Soviet Union is involved but can be told only when other Powers are involved. I do not think this is a sufficient reason for amending this draft resolution.

174. The only effect of the amendments proposed by Ceylon, India and Indonesia would be to give full and open satisfaction to the Soviet Union. It would appear as if the Soviet Union were not responsible for the invasion of Hungary. We are asked to delete every reference to the Soviet Union and to the armed forces of the Soviet Union. The General Assembly would be making a serious mistake and would severely disappoint world opinion if it adopted the proposed amendments.

175. The representative of Burma raised an interesting question concerning a passage in our draft resolution which caused us to reflect at the time, for it may genuinely give rise to doubt. It is the one which says "that free elections should be held in Hungary under United Nations auspices, as soon as law and order have been restored . . ." [A/3316, para. 2]. The first step to be taken before law and order can be restored is, of course, the withdrawal of the invading Soviet occupation troops. Only when the people of Hungary are in a position to determine for themselves, through the United Nations, the form of government they wish, should the elections be held.

176. In my view that does not constitute interference, for it would remedy the situation created by the Soviet Union's interference. Can the action of the Soviet Union in Hungary be effected with impunity? Can an invading army enter each of our countries, destroy the Government, slaughter 75,000 persons, wound 100,000 others, eject the remainder from the country, force women and children out of the country, set up an absolutely spurious puppet Government, and then claim that the action taken was quite proper and the United Nations can do nothing about it for if it did it would be interfering in the domestic affairs of the country concerned?

177. Clearly, we are faced with a theory which, if it is allowed to constitute a precedent, will be the end of the United Nations itself. About this, there can be no doubt. The Cuban delegation, in the case of the Egyptian question, voted in favour of all the resolutions presented. The nineteen-Power resolution, the Canadian resolution, the United States resolution—all of them, one after the other, were voted on affirmatively, by the delegation of Cuba, because we felt that Egypt was in the right. In this case, we shall vote the very same way, because we feel that in this particular case the people of Hungary are in the right. They have been the victims of an unjustified persecution, and the free nations of the world have a sacred duty to defend the rights of the people of Hungary. The delegation of Cuba will vote in favour of the draft resolution which it has co-sponsored [A/3316]; it will vote in favour of the United States resolution [A/3319] without any amendments; and, of course as we do not oppose any of the other previous resolutions, we shall certainly vote in favour of the Austrian resolution [A/3324].

178. Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia): I hope I explained very clearly yesterday [568th meeting] the views of my delegation on the general aspects of the question now under consideration. I should like now merely to say a few words in explanation of my delegation's vote on various proposals that are now before the Assembly.

179. My delegation will vote in favour of the amendments to the United States draft resolution [A/3319] submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3325]. If these amendments are adopted, we shall naturally vote in favour of the resolution as thus amended. In our opinion, these amendments eliminate the unnecessarily controversial elements which make it impossible for my delegation to support the original United States draft resolution—although we are in agreement with the purposes of that draft. The amended draft resolution would thus provide for the kind of action which, in our view, is most feasible and desirable at this juncture.

180. The Austrian draft resolution [A/3324], on the other hand, does not, in our view, differ in any really essential aspects from the United States draft resolution [A/3319] as sought to be amended by the delegations of Ceylon, India and Indonesia. It is therefore generally acceptable to my delegation, and we shall vote in favour of it.

181. As regards the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316] my delegation does not feel that this draft resolution is of such a nature as to contribute to an early solution of Hungary's present difficulties. It is more likely to aggravate the situation in which a solution might be sought and would thus merely add to the present difficulties. We shall therefore be obliged to vote against it.

182. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I am sorry that I am constrained to differ with the representatives of Ceylon, India and Indonesia as regards their amendments [A/3325] to the United States draft resolution [A/3319]. I appreciate the courteous frankness with which they disclosed their views, and I shall try to be equally frank and, I may say, equally courteous.

183. It seems to me that we would be making a great mistake if we were to strike out the various phrases which these three delegations suggest that we strike out. I should like to read what these phrases are. First, we are asked to strike out the words "the military authorities of the USSR are interfering in the transportation and", in the preamble to section I, before the words "distribution of food and medical supplies . . .". Well, we know it to be a fact that the authorities of the USSR are so interfering. Do we want to go on record as voting that something is not a fact when we know that it is a fact?

184. The next amendment would strike out paragraph I of the operative part:

"1. *Calls upon* the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to cease immediately actions against the Hungarian population which are in violation of the accepted standards and principles of international law, justice and morality;"

We have absolutely first-hand information—we in the United States from our own legation, and many in this hall from other sources—that that is precisely what is happening. Do we want to vote that it is not happening, when we know that it is?

185. Then the word "*Request*" would be substituted for the words "*Calls upon*", and the words "and the

USSR not to interfere with" would be deleted in paragraph 2 of section I. Well, the same objection holds to that amendment and to amendments to other places where "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" would be struck out.

186. Then, in section II of the draft resolution, the words

"as a result of the harsh and repressive action of the Soviet armed forces, increasingly . . . being obliged to leave . . . and seek asylum in neighbouring countries"

would be struck out from the preambular paragraph. Well, that is what is going on. We have heard from a number of countries which were volunteering to take as many as 1,000 of these refugees each. President Eisenhower is moving to take 5,000 of them here. There is no use saying that these dreadful things—unpleasant and tragic though they are—are not happening, when in fact they are.

187. We have no interest in propaganda. We have no interest in revenge. But we do not see that there is a distinction that can be drawn between the intent of these words which would be stricken out and the other passages relating to medicines and food. We think that both these provisions are humanitarian.

188. We think that it is humanitarian to take a step which may free a man from being oppressed. We think that it is just as humanitarian to take steps to provide people with international law, justice and morality as it is to take steps which will put food in their stomachs and give them medicines to cure their illnesses.

189. The fact is—and we sometimes forget it—that the United Nations is a moral organization. The United Nations has a moral standard. The United Nations Charter does distinguish between right and wrong. The United Nations was never intended to be a mere sordid cockpit in which the values of the criminal and the values of the law-abiding were indiscriminately scrambled up, and it is not that and should not become that.

190. That being true, it follows that there cannot be a double standard of international morality in the world. If discrimination is bad in one part of the world, as it is, then it is bad in another part of the world. If we deplore injustice here, we must deplore injustice there. If we are against prejudice in one area, we should be against prejudice in another area. If we resist brutality in one region, we must resist brutality in the other. And if we are going to raise our voices against oppression, if we are going to raise our voices against occupation by foreign troops in one part of the world, then we must be equally steadfast, we must be equally stalwart, with regard to other parts of the world.

191. So, in that spirit and for those reasons, I hope that the amendments offered by my friends from Ceylon, India and Indonesia will not prevail, and that our draft resolution [A/3319] will be adopted as written.

192. Mr. VITETTI (Italy): After the very eloquent and pertinent observations of the representative of Cuba, I have nothing to add with regard to the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316]. We have not heard anything from the Secretary-General because the Secretary-General probably has not received any information. Nevertheless, events in Hungary are becoming more and more grave, and while the Secretary-General studies, investigates and reports, the Hungarian people is being massacred.

193. I do not believe that there is anyone in this hall who considers that the murder of the Hungarian work-

ers, peasants and students is not important, and that what is important is procedure.

194. Coming now to the United States draft resolution [A/3319], I give it the full support of the Italian Government and I hope that it will be approved. At the same time, as soon as it heard of these initiatives the Italian Government decided and informed the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees that it was ready to admit 2,000 refugees from Hungary and to take care of them, and that it would also pay for transportation. I am happy to communicate this message to the General Assembly. I wish now to add that it has been suggested that the words "and of the Convention on Genocide" should not be mentioned in our draft resolution [A/3316], and I am in full agreement that they should be deleted from the text.

195. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): It was not my intention to return to this rostrum so soon after I had left it. I have heard as much as I could through the translation system of the observations of the representative of Cuba. My country happens to be in diplomatic relations with the Republic of Cuba, and I have not the liberty to follow him in the way in which he chooses to speak about other Governments and representatives. Nor am I consumed with passion and political prejudice in such a way as not to be able to discharge my obligations to this Assembly in conformity with the provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure. Furthermore, the observations that my delegation makes are addressed to this Assembly and not to the gallery.

196. For these reasons, I shall merely confine myself to the correction of errors of fact. If I thought differently, or if I behaved differently, I would read out the article on Cuba in *The New York Times* of 30 October, but that would not be proper.

197. Reference has been made to the "valiant defence" by my delegation of the Soviet Union. I think there are many differences about the Soviet Union in this Assembly. My Government often differs from it and has criticized it, but one thing about which there is no difference is that the Soviet Union is strong and, therefore, does not require my support.

198. There is another thing which I desire to convey to my distinguished colleague from Cuba. I represent here the Government of India—not the Government of Cuba or the Government of the Soviet Union—and therefore what I state here are the views of my Government. I have said repeatedly that we deplore the situation in Hungary. We would like to see the position where foreign forces were withdrawn from any country—whether they be called bases, contingents, parts of alliances or the conditions to which my colleague from Ceylon has referred. This does not mean that one may not treat the problem calmly, in the context of a legislative deliberation, as it were.

199. What I was really defending was the procedure adopted by the General Assembly. A few days ago, the Assembly adopted a resolution [1004 (ES-II)] in which the Secretary-General was charged with the task of performing certain duties. The Secretary-General is the highest officer of the United Nations. He is the number one public servant in the world. What is more important, his position is established by the Charter. Now, to that Secretary-General the Assembly has given certain obligations and certain duties as regards the present matter. Yesterday, he submitted to the Assembly an *aide-mémoire* [A/3315], stating that the investigations were being made.

200. What I said in my previous statement was simply that a resolution had already been adopted by this Assembly, that that resolution was still pending, and that an attempt was now being made to have the Assembly adopt another resolution which, so far as this aspect was concerned, contained nothing new.

201. I do not wish to make any protests against observations which the representative of Cuba addressed to me personally. It is not my practice or the practice of my delegation to answer personal attacks. When, however, statements are made to the effect that one Government is observing the whims of another Government, I must say this: perhaps the representative of Cuba is speaking from his own experience.

202. My Government does not owe allegiance to any other Government. I come from a country which is governed by a sovereign Parliament and in which the people have the free and democratic right to choose their own governors. We are not in any military alliances, and we are not under the military subjugation of anyone. I resent the observations which have been made in this respect. I am sorry that the President continues to permit the gallery to applaud observations that are totally unparliamentary in nature.

203. I would say the following with regard to the message that I read out. It results from the observations that I have made in this Assembly that my Government is trying, to the best of its ability, to use its good offices to bring about a solution of the present unfortunate, ugly and disastrous situation. I thought that, out of courtesy to the Assembly, I should communicate to Members information which I had—that is, that we were looking forward to the termination of the presence of foreign troops on the soil of another country. We also felt that we should communicate to the Assembly the fact that we had been informed that discussions on this matter were taking place with the Government of that country. Passions apart, I should like anyone to tell me how it would be possible to withdraw foreign troops from a country if no discussions to that end were held with whatever authority happened to obtain in the country. The troops cannot just fly into the air.

204. I can understand passions: I can also arouse them, if I want to. I am, however, speaking to intelligent people who represent Governments. I am not speaking only to people who come to listen to these debates. I hope that there will be no need hereafter to answer these rather unrestrained and irresponsible remarks by representatives who really ought to know better.

205. I come now to the observations made by the United States representative. I need hardly say that I appreciate those remarks, and that I am grateful to the United States representative for what he said. With almost every word of what he said in the latter part of his statement, my delegation and, indeed, all delegations here are in hearty agreement.

206. We make no distinctions about repression. We condemn repression whether it occurs in North Africa, in Central Europe or in Asia—and, for that matter we would condemn repression even if it should occur in our own country. Hence I could not agree with the United States representative more. When, however, we are asked to address ourselves to the particular problem of sending assistance and support in the context and on the basis, as I understand it, of what is contained in the Geneva Convention as regards the consequences of either foreign wars or civil commotions, then I say that that is an entirely different matter.



207. Surely, Mr. Lodge would be the last person to deny that, however complex a problem may be, however many aspects it may have, it is possible to deal with each aspect in its particular context; surely he would agree that one must confine oneself to each aspect if one is going to move forward with all the support required for the purpose.

208. The other aspects of the present problem have been dealt with in another resolution. I have not said that this fact was true or that that fact was untrue. We have been told that supplies to Hungary have been stopped. We are expecting the Secretary-General to inform us about this: that is what the Assembly has asked him to do. How am I as a representative of a Government going to convince other persons that I have all the facts before me when I am asked to vote on something which has no relevance to the conclusion?

209. I beg the United States representative to examine the amendments [A/3325] that we have proposed. We are not saying that no attention should be paid to the refugees. What we are saying is that the refugees must come under the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner, and that Governments should also be called upon to give any possible assistance. The Assembly will remember that, in my previous statement, I said that we had retained as much of the draft resolution [A/3319] as we could possibly subscribe to, in conformity with our thesis that the other aspect of the matter—the political aspect, if one wishes to call it that—was dealt with in another Assembly resolution and should be treated separately.

210. I am sure that the United States representative will forgive me if I say that my Government does not have to be told what are the fundamentals of liberty, that my Government does not have to be told that it is the duty of our people always to subscribe to those fundamentals of liberty. I hope that the kind of passion that has been demonstrated in this debate will be forthcoming in connexion with the oppression by imperial Powers in colonial areas. I hope that the same passion will be forthcoming when, in the Fourth Committee of the regular session of the Assembly, we speak about conditions in East Africa and in other parts of the colonial empires of the world. It is not my delegation that needs to be read any lessons on this matter.

211. I want to assure the General Assembly that we make no distinctions about repression, whether perpetrated by one Government or another. We make no distinctions, whether tragic events take place in one country or another. What is more, we go to the extent of saying that, if errors of this kind were to take place in our own country, we would not hesitate to be criticized for those errors.

212. In these amendments, we are not dealing with the position or the policies of the Soviet Union. That is not the policy of my Government. We should like to see the end of this situation in Hungary. We support the position that the Hungarian people, like any other people, must be able to have their own government. What I have said is this: When we are dealing with a country which is a sovereign Member of the United Nations, it is not possible for us here to sit down and decide that we are going to run an election in that country. I should like this prescription to be applied to the people who are prescribing it. Would the representative of Cuba agree that the United Nations should send a commission to Cuba to supervise elections there? I should like an answer to that question. I am sure that my Government would not agree to a commission being sent

to India for that purpose, because that would be a challenge to the integrity and liberty of our people. The situation would be different if we were not dealing with a country represented in the United Nations.

213. What I have said is not meant for a moment to minimize the position arising from the presence of foreign troops in any country. I think that the presence of foreign troops in any country—under the guise of bases, or alliances, or protection, or anything of that kind—is deplorable and is to be condemned as an action inconsistent with the liberty of nations.

214. A remedy to the Hungarian situation cannot be found in throwing political stones at people whom one does not like. I shall never come to the position where I should have to agree with the representative of Cuba on questions of human liberty.

215. I would, in all conscience, ask the United States representative to consider the amendments that we have moved. Their purpose is not to water down any political attitudes, but to enable us to give support to the humanitarian aspects of the present problem and to make our solution generally acceptable to the peoples of the world. The International Red Cross, the provisions of the Geneva Convention, the confining of the problem to the needs arising from the purposes of the Assembly resolution: these are the requirements of the present situation.

216. Once again I thank the United States representative for the courteous way in which he has responded to our request that these amendments be accepted. My co-sponsors and myself have submitted these amendments for only one purpose. Otherwise, it would have been easier for us either to abstain or to vote against the draft resolution and to say no more. We are as anxious as anybody to make a constructive contribution, and I am sure the United States representative would be the first to see that we all have our limitations and our points of view and that, therefore, we do this so far as our points of view and our understanding and knowledge permit us. The United States representative is in the happy position of knowing that certain things have happened. There are certain representatives who say they know that certain contrary things have happened. We have not been there, and we do not know the circumstances. We have asked the Secretary-General to inform us, and I say that it is not necessary to pronounce on these matters in order to obtain the purposes and objectives sought by the draft resolution [A/3319]. I feel, therefore, that the United States representative will understand the purpose of these amendments, and we hope that after further consideration he will be able to accept them.

217. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand): I come to this rostrum to outline in a few words the attitude of my delegation. The two draft resolutions which have already been submitted, one by five Powers [A/3316] and the other by the United States delegation [A/3319], in the view of my delegation contain the measures which are required by the situation in Hungary.

218. Some of the measures proposed in the United States draft resolution are of an urgent nature and should be adopted by this Assembly in order to bring much needed relief for the great sufferings of the Hungarian people. Consistent with the position it made known yesterday [569th meeting], my delegation will lend its wholehearted support.

219. Before I pass to the five-Power draft resolution, I wish to make a few comments on the draft resolution which has just been submitted by the Austrian delega-

tion, since it also deals with the question of relief and assistance [A/3324].

220. In the first place, my delegation finds that it adequately amplifies paragraphs 7 and 8 of the General Assembly resolution of 4 November [1004 (ES-II)]. At the same time, my delegation finds that the Austrian proposal emphasizes the urgency and the importance of the needs of the Hungarian people in their tragic plight. These considerations will show that my delegation appreciates with sympathy the motives which led the Austrian delegation to submit its draft resolution. We cannot help feeling, however, that it would be more appropriate and expedient if such a draft proposal could be amalgamated with the United States draft resolution, but, if for one reason or another, this cannot be done, my delegation will also vote for the Austrian draft resolution.

221. With regard to the five-Power draft resolution, my delegation feels that the measures proposed therein, particularly with regard to free elections, although they may be of less immediate urgency in comparison with the needs for relief, are also essential for the free and sovereign existence of Hungary. Without these measures, the sovereignty of Hungary would be only fictitious.

222. I turn now to the three-Power amendments [A/3325], to the United States draft resolution and particularly to the proposal to delete certain clauses. My delegation finds it difficult to understand why such clauses should be taken out of the United States draft resolution [A/3319].

223. In the first place, it seems to us that if we all want the relief supplies to reach the Hungarian people it is imperative that we must make a clear and specific request in the General Assembly resolution that the Soviet Union should not interfere with the receipt and distribution of these supplies. If we are reluctant to make such a request, we may defeat in advance the generally accepted purpose of bringing relief to the hands of the Hungarian people.

224. With regard to some of the other proposed deletions, although we may not have, and this applies especially to my delegation, tangible and concrete proofs as yet regarding certain actions of the Soviet Union for the simple reason that we have not an opportunity to go inside the steel ring around Hungary, I believe that no one can deny that the repressive action taken against the Hungarian people has been harsh. On the other hand, it would be difficult for anyone to dispute the fact that a large number of refugees are being obliged to leave Hungary and seek asylum in neighbouring countries. These, I maintain, are known to be facts, or at least some of them are known to be facts, and we must face them as such. My delegation, therefore, will not be able to support the three-Power amendments [A/3325].

225. However, in case the three-Power amendments are adopted, my delegation would be obliged to move two sub-amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3 of section I. In that case we should have to propose that the words "Hungarian authorities" be replaced by the words "authorities in control of Hungary", which obviously would mean and would cover both the Hungarian and the Soviet authorities, since it is known to be a fact that those two authorities are at present in control of Hungary. I repeat that my delegation will move these sub-amendments only if the three-Power amendments are adopted, and my delegation will do this only with the objective of rallying a large majority in support of the draft resolution.

226. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Brazil on a point of order.

227. Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil): I wish to raise a point of order. Last evening and again this morning the representative of France complained about the length of our debates on this very important matter. I think that so many speeches have been made that the matter has been fully discussed and that we are now just on the point of voting. It will be a lengthy process to hold a vote on three draft resolutions, with many amendments, so I move the closure of the debate.

228. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Brazil has moved the closure of the debate. If it is so desired, two representatives can speak against the motion and two can speak for it, but if there are no objections to the proposal of the representative of Brazil, I shall take it that the Members of the General Assembly are prepared to accept it.

*It was so decided.*

229. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We have before us three draft resolutions, which have been submitted in the following order: firstly, the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ireland, Italy, Pakistan and Peru [A/3316]; secondly, the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/3319]; and thirdly, the draft resolution submitted by Austria [A/3324]. In accordance with the rules of procedure, the draft resolutions will be put to the vote in the order in which they were submitted. We shall therefore vote first on the five-Power draft resolution [A/3316]. The representative of the Netherlands has asked for it to be voted on paragraph by paragraph and the representative of Peru has asked for a roll-call vote.

230. We shall now vote on the first paragraph of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

*The paragraph was adopted by 50 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.*

231. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the second paragraph of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt.

*The paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.*

232. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the third paragraph of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Libya, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Libya, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon.

*The paragraph was adopted by 49 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.*

233. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Secretariat has informed me that the co-sponsors have agreed to eliminate the concluding words "and of the Convention on Genocide" from the fourth paragraph of the preamble. We shall now vote on this amended fourth paragraph.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal.

*The paragraph as amended was adopted by 48 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.*

234. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the fifth and last paragraph of the preamble.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Panama, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal.

*The paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.*

235. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on operative paragraph 1.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland.

*The paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.*

236. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on operative paragraph 2. The South African delegation has asked for a separate vote to be taken on the phrase "under United Nations auspices".

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Ceylon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*



*In favour:* Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada.

*Against:* Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Philippines, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syria, Union of South Africa, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia.

*The phrase was adopted by 39 votes to 12, with 24 abstentions.<sup>3</sup>*

237. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the whole of operative paragraph 2.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Greece, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France.

*Against:* Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt.

*The paragraph was adopted by 49 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.*

238. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on operative paragraph 3.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*The Union of South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

*Against:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

*The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 9, with 13 abstentions.*

239. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on paragraph 4.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Liberia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon.

*The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 9, with 13 abstentions.*

240. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole as amended.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania.

*Abstaining:* Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted as amended by 48 votes to 11, with 16 abstentions.*

241. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution proposed by the United States of America [A/3319]. The Indian

<sup>3</sup> On 11 December 1956 the delegation of Poland requested that the name of Poland be included among the Members who had voted against.

delegation has suggested that we should take one vote on all the amendments submitted by Ceylon, India, and Indonesia [A/3325]. If there are no objections it will be so decided.

*It was so decided.*

242. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall therefore vote first on the amendments submitted by Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3325].

*India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary.

*Against:* Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland.

*Abstaining:* Iran, Iraq, Laos, Romania, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt.

*The amendments were rejected by 45 votes to 18, with 12 abstentions.*

243. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America [A/3319].

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

*Against:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania.

*Abstaining:* Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to 9, with 13 abstentions.*

244. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Lastly, the Assembly is called upon to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Austria [A/3324]. The Austrian representative informs me that he wishes to delete the last phrase of the first paragraph of the preamble, namely, the words "by the fighting which is still continuing". The first paragraph will therefore end with the word "subjected" and will now read:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Considering the extreme suffering to which the Hungarian people is subjected".*

245. We shall accordingly vote on the Austrian draft resolution as a whole, with that amendment.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Liberia, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

246. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I give the floor to the representatives who wish to explain their votes.

247. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I did not understand that we were voting on the Austrian draft resolution as a whole, and that is why I abstained. It is not that the delegation of Liberia is not in agreement with the draft resolution submitted by Austria. We thought that the Assembly was voting on the phrase "by the fighting which is still continuing".

248. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I feel that I owe my fellow representatives an explanation of why I asked that we should vote paragraph by paragraph on the five-Power draft resolution. The reason for this request was that I thought that in this very serious matter it would be of great interest for all of us to know how far those countries which wish to avoid at any price expressing any opinion on the sufferings that are taking place in Hungary, and on those who are guilty of causing those sufferings, would go in their abstention.

249. I find now, as a result, that there are certain countries which have even refused, or not given their vote to, a reaffirmation of a request to the Secretary-General to continue to investigate. I think that that is one extreme.

250. I am happy to note, on the other side, that there are certain countries which have not found it in their conscience to refuse to go along with certain paragraphs with which the whole of the neutralist bloc—if I may so call it—would not go along. There are certain of those countries which found that their conscience told them to vote for the second paragraph of the preamble; these also voted for the fifth paragraph of the preamble, and for paragraph one of the operative part. I wish to pay tribute to those in the neutralist bloc who have had the courage to vote in that way.

251. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation wishes to record its protest against the use by one delegation of the opportunity to explain its vote in order to explain the votes of other delegations. It is not part of the business of one delegation to come here and say why other delegations voted in particular ways. We also

object to labels being placed upon blocs of delegations. My delegation is the delegation of India, and that should be the end of it. We feel that if we are to be called a neutralist bloc we should, presumably, call others belligerent blocs, because neutrality only arises from belligerency. I wish to draw the President's attention to this and I am very sorry that he permitted that speech to go on.

252. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): I asked for the floor not for an explanation of vote but in order to make a very brief announcement which we believe should come at this time since it has to do at least with two of the resolutions which have just been passed by this Assembly.

253. In answer to the last operative paragraphs both of the United States resolution and of the Austrian resolution, I am authorized to announce that the United States Government is making available at once \$1 million to the Secretary-General for immediate use, through appropriate channels, for assistance to Hungarian refugees. We hope by this action to emphasize the urgency of this vital task which has become the responsibility of the world community.

254. Mr. LEGER (Haiti) (*translated from French*): The delegation of Haiti wishes briefly to explain the reason for its abstention from voting on the five-Power draft resolution. We could not agree that the United Nations should intervene in order to ensure that free elections were held in Hungary. We believe that the United Nations would have neither the time nor the opportunity to implement such a provision. Had it not been for that reservation which we have just expressed, we should have been very happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### Appointment of a Credentials Committee

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (A/3321)

255. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly has before it the report of the Credentials Committee [A/3321]. In paragraph 16 of this report, the Committee recommends that the General Assembly should adopt the following draft resolution:<sup>4</sup>

*"The General Assembly*

*Approves the report of the Credentials Committee."*

256. If there is no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

257. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I give the floor to those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

258. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet

<sup>4</sup> This draft resolution concerns the credentials of representatives to the first and second emergency special sessions of the General Assembly.

delegation voted in favour of approving the report of the Credentials Committee. At the same time it would like to emphasize that this vote does not mean that it considers that the People's Republic of China should be represented here by a member of the Kuomintang.

259. Mr. TSIANG (China): I voted in favour of the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee, despite the illegal stand which was taken by the Soviet Union delegation in that Committee and which is reflected in the report. I am glad that, in the Committee, there were six votes against the motion of the Soviet Union.

260. The Soviet Union representative thinks that I should not be here. One of the reasons why he thinks that I should not be here is that I do not like the doings of the Soviet Union in Hungary. The Soviet Union representative would like to have the Chinese Communists here, because they have declared their solidarity with the doings of the Soviet Union in Hungary.

261. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee. We observe that the Committee decided that the credentials of the Chinese Nationalist representative were in order and formally embodied that decision in its report. My Government recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the Government of China, and my delegation feels that we should place it on record that we voted in favour of the adoption of the Credentials Committee's report solely on the grounds that the credentials concerned, considered as a document, were in order. We reserve our position on the right of the Chinese Nationalist authorities to issue a document appointing representatives in the name of China.

262. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): Our vote in favour of the Credentials Committee's report does not extend to the credentials of the Kuomintang representative. This was clearly stated in our letter to the Secretary-General [A/3300]. I request that that letter be included among the official documents considered at the same time as the Credentials Committee's report.

263. Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to declare the following in explanation of its vote on the report of the Credentials Committee.

264. China can be lawfully represented in the emergency special session of the General Assembly, as in other organs of the United Nations, only by a representative appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize the Kuomintang's right to represent China in the United Nations. We therefore consider that this person's credentials should be regarded as invalid.

265. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution approving the report of the Credentials Committee in no way means that we recognize the Kuomintang representatives' credentials as valid.

*The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.*