

posal to abolish it throughout the world. Nevertheless, the legal system of one country could not always be applied in another. From a humanitarian and philosophical point of view, his delegation disapproved of the death penalty. But Governments in whose countries the death penalty existed, could not be asked to apply it.

46. If the Soviet Union delegation would agree that the First Committee, instead of addressing itself directly to the Greek Government, should recommend the Conciliation Committee to come to an understanding with the Greek Government, that would perhaps be the best solution. Moreover, it would be preferable not to mention names, but to draft a general resolution that would cover any similar cases likely to arise in the future.

47. His delegation thought that the First Committee was not competent to approach the Greek Government directly. Hence, it could not vote for the Soviet Union draft resolution. Still, if it was decided that the Conciliation Committee should continue its efforts, his delegation would be willing to propose that the Committee should enter into negotiations as previously defined by Ecuador.

48. Mr. LONDOÑO Y LONDOÑO (Colombia) recalled that when he had supported the Polish representative's appeal in the case of Mrs. Zeygos (275th meeting), he had stressed the objections to considering specific cases. If the First Committee were to replace the Greek tribunals and function as a court of appeal, it would be going beyond its competence. His delegation had, however, said before that it would never turn a deaf ear to appeals for leniency.

49. As the representatives of Ecuador and Uruguay had said, in the Americas there had always been a superior authority to intervene and prevent wars from involving unduly severe punishments. Colombia, in particular, felt that it had complied with the precepts of justice and equity without resorting to capital punishment. Accordingly, his delegation would support any appeal to conciliation and justice in the national, as in the international, sphere. It was in that spirit that his delegation had submitted its draft resolution (A/C.1/510). If the First Committee were to make the appeal suggested by Colombia, an atmosphere of mercy might prevail in all the countries that were trying to regain peace on the morrow of wars and internal crisis, and international peace could only benefit by it.

50. The Soviet Union representative had said that there was no need to carry out executions once a rebellion was over. But it was after peace had been re-established that the Nürnberg trials had been held, and that exceptional courts had

functioned both in Central and in Western Europe. In France, in particular, punishment for acts of collaboration had continued for two or three years, and no one had thought of protesting.

51. As for Greece, that country had been involved in a conflict that had not been its will and in which other States had taken part. His delegation was nevertheless convinced that the hour of mercy had come and that out of liberty, moral progress and international co-operation would be born.

52. The peoples of the Americas had not known the horrors of war, and Colombia, in submitting its draft resolution, was sending a peace message to all the peoples of the world.

53. The First Committee could not continually revert to the case of persons whom Mr. Vyshinsky described as idealists and Mr. Pipinelis as criminals; that would imply that legal procedure was being applied to reach a conclusion as to the validity of sentences passed by military tribunals.

54. Mr. Vyshinsky had referred to the famous metal box in which was found the Government list which Cardinal Mindszenty was planning to bring into power. But similar problems would naturally have to be examined in the case of Greece, and neither the First Committee nor any United Nations organ could substitute itself for the various States which alone were qualified to apply laws and execute sentences.

55. What the First Committee could do would be to ask all the Governments in the world to do everything in their power, without prejudice to internal order and international security, to suspend death sentences; that would contribute to the re-establishment of peace throughout the world. So long as blood was flowing, so long as Catholics in Central Europe were dying for their faith, conciliation would be nothing but an empty word.

56. His delegation therefore requested all Governments to adopt a more conciliatory attitude and to stay the hand of the executioner who was preparing to carry out the death sentence on political prisoners. That was the spirit in which his delegation had submitted the draft resolution (A/C.1/510).

57. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said it would be desirable that the various delegations should be able to study the Paraguayan proposal as soon as possible. Likewise, the representative of Ecuador might perhaps submit his suggestions in writing.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Paraguayan proposal was in process of reproduction.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 26 October 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPEN (Turkey).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece (continued)

DEATH SENTENCES PASSED BY GREEK MILITARY COURTS (continued)

1. Mr. GONZÁLEZ ALLENDES (Chile) recalled

that he had already stated that the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/507) could not receive general support in the Committee. He had pointed out (295th meeting) that the representative of the Soviet Union might perhaps submit a general formula to include all possible cases of political executions taking place in countries where a state

of war existed. Though the USSR representative had stated that he was willing to reply to any questions put to him, Mr. Vyshinsky had answered the Chilean invitation by saying that the reply would be found in the newspapers. The fact was that the representative of the Soviet Union had not accepted that invitation. With reference to the USSR representative's comments, the representative of Chile said that he did not think it necessary to explain the democratic position of his Government; if any country had concerned itself in the United Nations with the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, that country was Chile. It had been concerned over the right of Soviet women married to foreigners to follow their husbands to the latter's country. The same was true of his country's attitude towards the violations of human rights that had been committed in Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania. On the other hand, when the observance of human rights had been mentioned the representative of the USSR had erected a barrier consisting of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. When Chile defended the rights of man, Mr. Vyshinsky's position had always been to accuse and never to defend. Thus in the Congress for Peace and Democracy in Montevideo in 1937, the activities of the USSR delegation had been very different from their present activities. Mr. Vyshinsky did not want the sentences imposed on the eight Greek guerrillas to be carried out. But it was because of the accusations that Mr. Vyshinsky had made that so many Marxists had been executed in the USSR in 1937.

2. The Chilean representative said that the formula he had suggested had not been intended as an escape clause. It was a broader and more generous formula than the one proposed by the USSR delegation. If it were true, as the representative of the Soviet Union had stated, that the capitalistic economy was subject to cycles, it was likewise unquestionable that the right to life in the USSR and its satellites was subject to cycles. He said that several years previously there had been a kind of illness in the Soviet bloc. In fact, if at that time blood had been drawn from the Soviet bloc the result of the analysis would have been "window reaction, positive". At that time it was dangerous for certain people to approach a window. He recalled the fate of the leaders of the Czechoslovak Republic, of Mrs. Kosenkina and other persons. At present a new cyclic period afflicted the Soviet bloc. A new blood test of the Soviet organism should give the results "chancellor reaction, positive two plus". He mentioned the names of Mr. Dmitrov and Mr. Laszlo Rajk, well-known Marxists who had been branded as traitors. Others had been sent to Siberia and the representative of Chile wondered what would be the destiny of certain of his colleagues belonging to other delegations.

3. His delegation did not wish to enter a debate regarding what representatives had done at different times in their lives, but would do so if compelled to. However, he did not wish to go further into the matter. He could not vote in favour of the USSR draft resolution as the latter was in fact contrary to the interests of those whom it was supposed to protect. Moreover, the matter was not within the competence of the Committee. He could support any general formula which would not lead the Committee into the absurd position of transforming an inquiry undertaken

on behalf of Greece, which had been invaded from several sides, into an accusation against that same country.

4. The CHAIRMAN, pointing out that the item under discussion was the Greek question, requested the members of the Committee to remain strictly within the limits of the subject, in the interests of the normal conduct of the work of the Committee.

5. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, while keeping in mind the Chairman's appeal, he could not ignore what had been said by the representative of Chile, who had repeated all the slanders and libels always used by Chile against the Soviet Union. The things referred to by the Chilean representative had one common feature, namely, that they were not relevant to the question under discussion. The Chairman was quite right; the Committee was discussing certain death sentences. The representative of Chile had endeavoured to divert attention from that subject.

6. Mr. Kiselev said that the statement made by the representative of Greece at the previous meeting to the effect that the eight Greek partisans could not be pardoned since such an act would not benefit the Greek people had produced a grievous impression. It could be seen how the Greek monarcho-fascist Government was squirming before its own people and was endeavouring to suppress the will of that people by terror and by the killing and extermination of free-thinking persons who happened to disagree with the view of the Government. Waves of executions of patriots and of persons who had formerly resisted the German occupiers, had been begun by the monarcho-fascist Government three years previously and were still continuing.

7. Turning to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Colombia (A/C.1/510), Mr. Kiselev said that that proposal was not relevant since it did not relate to the item under discussion. His delegation would therefore vote against it. On the other hand, the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Paraguay (A/C.1/509) was relevant to the item under discussion. However, it proposed calling upon the Greek nation rather than upon the Government of Greece. It was the latter alone which could put an end to the execution of death sentences. The proposal was therefore unrealistic and devoid of any object.

8. The only correct, equitable and just proposal was that of the USSR as amended by Poland. Mr. Kiselev read the text of that draft resolution (A/C.1/508) and stated that it expressed the profound feelings of world public opinion aroused by the executions of Greek patriots. That draft resolution, the only one dealing with the substance of the question under discussion, would be likely to save the lives of the nine patriots who had been sentenced to death, and he appealed to the members of the Committee to support it.

9. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that his delegation was in favour of conciliation and good offices because it was certain that violence and hatred led to more violence and more hatred. In that connexion he recalled the condemnation of violence by one of the founders of the Indian nation, Mahatma Gandhi. It was necessary and urgent that the United Nations should find a solution to the impasse brought about by the problem of

Greece and of the Balkans. It was well known that the region of the Balkans had always been a danger spot with regard to the maintenance of world peace. The General Assembly was therefore fully justified in seeking all means to end the differences and disputes that had arisen in that part of the world. As had been stated by the representatives of the Philippines and of Ecuador, the matter under discussion should come within the framework of the functions carried out by the Conciliation Committee. Support had already been expressed for the idea that the work of the Conciliation Committee should be continued, and that Committee would then be the appropriate body to make an appeal to the Greek Government on behalf of those who had been sentenced to death, since it was the same Committee which would have to take steps to solve the problem as a whole. He regretted that the representatives of Ecuador and the Philippines had not put forward their view-points in concrete and specific form, so that the matter might be referred to the Conciliation Committee, which was the appropriate body to deal with the matter. It was for that reason that his delegation had suggested that the whole question, along with the records of the First Committee, be referred to the President of the General Assembly, who was the Chairman of the Conciliation Committee.

10. While he sympathized with the Colombian proposal, he feared that it did not really focus attention on the specific problem before the Committee. While the proposal submitted by the representative of Paraguay was a humanitarian and opportune one, the First Committee could not appeal directly to the Greek Government because the responsibilities of the United Nations in the matter had been assigned to the Conciliation Committee. Mr. de Alba thought that it might be desirable to suggest that the Chairman of the Conciliation Committee, having been provided with reports submitted by the Chairman of the First Committee, should make an appeal to the Government of Greece so as to avoid being faced by a consummated fact when a resolution was eventually adopted. If a formal and categorical promise were given by the representative of Greece, including guarantees concerning the persons named in various proposals and a denial of the facts which had been brought forward in the Committee, it would be possible to leave the present preoccupation aside. Since that was not yet the case, from the humanitarian point of view, and in accordance with certain of the ideals of the United Nations, the responsibility concerning the lives of those eight persons could not be evaded.

11. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that it would be beneath the dignity of the Committee to make any reply to the slanderous insinuations of the representative of Chile. Nor was it necessary to dwell on the methods of political diversion resorted to by a number of delegations in order to evade the issue raised in the USSR draft resolution, of which the Chairman had reminded the Committee. In that connexion, Mr. Manuilsky said that he was referring particularly to the delegations of Colombia, Chile, El Salvador and France. Since there was no such thing as a constituted Government in France at the present time, the French representative might be considered as having expressed his own point of view or perhaps that prevalent in the country in which the Committee was work-

ing. However, he would rather hear the views of the United States representative.

12. Mr. Manuilsky said that the draft resolution submitted by Paraguay could not be put to the vote, since it was incorrectly addressed. At no point in the discussion of the Greek question had the whole Greek nation been accused of the acts intimated by the proposal submitted by Paraguay. The Greek nation was the object of such acts and was suffering from them. Such an innovation bore witness to the manoeuvres resorted to to whitewash the monarcho-fascist Government of Greece and to justify it in spite of the documented and authenticated accusations against it. The corrupt group of persons, imposed upon the Greek nation as a result of foreign intervention, which had turned the civil war into a profitable undertaking with the profits being derived from the pockets of the American taxpayers, was the question being discussed by the Committee. The so-called Athens Government was accused of carrying out mass executions of innocent persons on the basis of secret black-lists compiled by police *agents provocateurs*. It was accused of subjecting witnesses and defendants to horrible tortures which human conscience could not ignore. In spite of its assertions that the civil war in Greece was over, the Greek Government, actuated by the desire for vengeance, had still further increased the terror waged against democratic elements. Mr. Manuilsky stated that his delegation further accused the Athens monarcho-fascist Government of having systematically led the First Committee into error and confusion, through its representatives in the United Nations, by hypocritical promises concerning the possibility of extending mercy to accused Greek democrats and patriots. In fact, instead of reviewing those sentences, Greek military tribunals were meting out new ones, as was proved by the recent execution of the well-known trade union leader, Georgi Demosthenes as well as the death sentences pronounced on 13 October against eight democratic leaders of the resistance against the hitlerite occupiers. Mr. Manuilsky repeated the names of those leaders, which would remain engraved in the history of the Greek people and could not be expunged, while those now condemning them would be thrown into the refuse heap of history.

13. Responsibility for the policy of torture and killings was borne not only by the monarcho-fascist Government of Athens, but also by that Government's foreign supporters. Rejection of the USSR draft resolution would be tantamount to sanctioning and endorsing further exacerbation of feelings and further aggravation of the internal situation in Greece. Such action would be fraught with dire consequences which might engender a threat to the peace in the Balkans. Stating that he hoped that the First Committee would be guided by political reasonableness and logic in adopting a correct decision, Mr. Manuilsky said that part of such a decision ought to be a move which would save the lives of the eight condemned Greek leaders and patriots.

14. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) said that for two days the Committee had been listening to statements on a subject not relevant to the item referred to it by the General Assembly, namely threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece. That item referred specifically to the external relations between Greece on the one hand and its three northern neighbours on the

other. The Committee should be considering the report of the Conciliation Committee that had been established to seek a pacific settlement of the existing differences between those four parties, but Mr. Vyshinsky had endeavoured to divert attention from that report by raising a matter which was entirely outside the scope of the Committee to decide. It was natural to feel a sense of distress in regard to any person sentenced to death, but that was not the question before the Committee. The USSR proposal could not be accepted, because it raised a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Greek Government. Even if that matter were not wholly within the jurisdiction of the Greek Government, the Committee was not a court of appeal to examine the guilt or innocence of the eight persons mentioned. The Committee was a political body, and he therefore hoped that the USSR proposal would not be accepted and that the Committee would then continue with its examination of the proper subject with which it was concerned.

15. Contrasting the position adopted by the USSR and Ukrainian SSR representatives in the present matter with that which they had taken in the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Committee regarding the violation of human rights in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, Mr. Martin quoted from the summary record of the statement made in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on 10 October, by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR.¹ That statement had been to the effect that the United States and United Kingdom delegations were inducing the General Assembly to consider the question of alleged violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in those countries in gross violation of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. The statement continued to the effect that the Governments of Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania had not given their consent and would never do so since the matter lay within their domestic jurisdiction. On the following day, 11 October, Mr. Vyshinsky had taken a similar position in the same Committee, and Mr. Martin quoted paragraph 7 of the summary record of that meeting.² He called the Committee's attention to a passage from Mr. Vyshinsky's statement to the effect that charges of violations of international obligations and peace treaties were being used as a convenient pretext for interference in the domestic affairs of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. Those arguments had been continued at length and had been repeated by the representatives of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Having argued that the accusations against those three countries constituted an invasion of domestic jurisdiction, the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR were now seeking to tell the First Committee that the trial in Greece of the eight persons named was a matter of international concern in which the General Assembly and the First Committee must intervene.

16. It might be asked why Mr. Vyshinsky and Mr. Manuilsky had taken those diametrically opposite positions during the past ten days. Mr. Martin thought that it was not because those two representatives believed that there should be one law for religious leaders and another for revolutionaries, but because they wished to divert attention from the report of the Conciliation Committee. Whatever their motives, the Canadian dele-

gation would not support the USSR draft resolution, and he strongly urged that the Committee vote on the latter and proceed to the real question before it, namely the threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece.

17. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) noted that the representatives of Chile and Canada, among others, had described the USSR draft resolution as an attempt to divert the Committee's attention from the main issue under discussion. For his part, Mr. Katz-Suchy believed that the real attempt at diverting the Committee's attention was to be found in the irrelevant references by the Chilean representative to alleged violations of human rights by the people's democracies. The Canadian representative had compared the present situation with what he described as an almost identical situation during the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee regarding the alleged violations of human rights in Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary. If the situations were really similar, the question was not why the Soviet Union and other delegations were taking a different position at the present time but why the Canadian delegation, for instance, had reversed its position and was now citing Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter while in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee it had not considered the possibility of violating domestic jurisdiction. The Canadian representative knew well that the convicted persons in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary were not sentenced because they were priests but because they were criminals. They had been sentenced after fair and public trials, the verbatim records of which were available to all. Thus the situation was quite different from that prevailing in Greece where the executions were merely part of a civil war being waged by the Government against the Greek people.

18. Mr. Katz-Suchy believed that all the statements made by different Greek representatives, as well as all their manoeuvres and irrelevant arguments, would not destroy the sympathy which had been engendered in the Committee towards the proposal for clemency for the victims of Greek Government persecution. It was noteworthy that the Greek delegation had not denied one of the accusations levelled against its Government. It had not denied that death sentences were being passed or that prisoners were being maltreated. Instead, the Greek representatives had made irrelevant accusations against Greece's northern neighbours. Mr. Venizelos had told the Committee how he and his friends had suffered when the National Government of the EAM and the coalition of democratic parties had been in power. But he had not explained that the friends to which he referred had collaborated with the German invaders. Mr. Venizelos had said that he was a liberal and a humanitarian but no one could put forward such claims while at the same time defending or attempting to cover up the terror prevailing in Greece. It was a fact that blood was being shed in Greece at the present time and if Mr. Venizelos claimed that the prison camps were open to inspection, one could only ask whether that applied universally. For example, it must be remembered that when the correspondent of *The New York Times* had asked to visit a certain part of the Makronesos camp his request had been refused.

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Ad hoc Political Committee, 11th meeting.*

² *Ibid.*, 12th meeting.

19. Mr. Katz-Suchy believed that the Committee should not adopt a general resolution which would provide no guarantee of security to those persons about whose lives the Committee was concerned. He rejected the Paraguayan draft resolution because, as had been explained by previous speakers, it was not the Greek people that was responsible for events in Greece. If it were so they would doubtless have put an end to the terror long ago. In fact, United States and British intervention had prevented the Greek nation from setting up a Government which reflected the popular will. Consequently, it was useless to appeal to anyone but the Government of Athens.

20. The need for some concrete action on the part of the Committee must be apparent to anyone who listened carefully to the speeches of the Greek representative wherein there was clearly a threat that the executions would continue. The Committee must take due notice of that threat, for there could be no doubt that the outcome of the present discussion would have its effect on the situation in Greece. If the Committee wanted to find a solution to the whole Balkan problem it was the internal situation in Greece which must be its first concern. The primary task, therefore, was to adopt a proposal along the lines of the Soviet Union draft resolution which would lead to conciliation between the opposing parties within Greece.

21. The Canadian representative was not correct in saying that the Committee would have to review the sentences passed by the military tribunals. The Committee was not asked to examine the indictments themselves or the methods employed in conducting the trials. The Soviet Union's proposal was not an attempt to change the Committee from a political body into a court of justice. All that was being asked was that it should act to save the lives of the eight persons listed in the draft resolution all of whom had a better record as fighters for democracy than any member of the Greek Government. Anyone who calmly studied the statements of the Greek representatives must inevitably conclude that rejection of the Soviet Union proposal would be interpreted by the Greek Government as approval of its actions and as a sign that it could proceed immediately with the executions. That had already been the case. When the question had been raised in the First Committee, during the second part of the third session of the General Assembly, and had been ruled out of order by the Chairman (243rd and 250th meetings), the Greek Government had subsequently executed two persons. Today, the danger was the same. The threat had been repeated, and those who voted against the Soviet Union draft resolution in the roll-call vote which Mr. Katz-Suchy intended to request, would be responsible for the lives of the persons concerned.

22. The CHAIRMAN declared that the last part of the statement of the Polish representative was an attempt to influence the voting of the Committee. He therefore declared it to be out of order.

23. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) held that every statement was an attempt to influence the voting of the Committee and that as a representative of a sovereign State it was his right to interpret anything that happened in the Committee according to his opinion. He believed that if the Committee postponed action in the matter there would be a danger that the executions would be carried out

before anything could be done. He therefore appealed to the Committee to accept the Soviet Union draft resolution, which was purely humanitarian in purpose.

24. Mr. BOETTNER (Paraguay) explained the reasons which had led his delegation to submit its draft resolution (A/C.1/509). Whenever an item referring to the threats to the political independence and the territorial integrity of Greece had been discussed in the First Committee the debate had been characterized by vehement charges and counter-charges from both sides relating to terrorism and persecution. It was apparent that Greece was the scene of a direct clash between the two apparently irreconcilable political and social ideologies which divided the whole world and endangered international peace and harmony. Obviously the supporters of both sides feared that their opponents would, at some time or other, attempt to impose their views upon the rest of the world by force. However, there was ample evidence in history to show that one ideology could not impose itself and destroy another merely by force. For instance, Christianity had survived and grown in spite of the persecutions of earlier ages. The only permanent solution must therefore be sought through mutual respect for the rights and ideas of all. Those who championed individual freedom and democracy must respect and tolerate the ideology of those who disagreed with them and allow them full freedom of speech. On the other hand, it would not be right to accept clandestine activities aiming, by means of terrorism, sabotage, intimidation and other illicit means to undermine the very foundations of the legal and ideological institutions of the majority. Only by adopting a conciliatory attitude would it be possible to create an atmosphere of world harmony and peace.

25. Returning to the specific case of Greece, Mr. Boettner observed that the problem had two aspects, a legal and a humanitarian one. As regards the legal aspect, clearly the First Committee was not a court of appeal and did not have the necessary evidence to make a decision. Moreover, it might also be violating the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of a State. As regards the humanitarian aspect however, certainly something ought to be done. The correct course for the First Committee to take would be to appeal for leniency for those condemned to death by military tribunals and for an end to acts of sabotage and terrorism which often resulted in the death of innocent victims.

26. Mr. Boettner explained that his delegation fully agreed with the substance of the draft resolution submitted by the Colombian representative and if this were adopted would have no objection to withdrawing his own proposal. However, if the Committee did not adopt the Colombian draft resolution the Paraguayan delegation would insist that a vote be taken upon its own proposal.

27. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) said that he had not previously invoked the rules of procedure during the discussion of the Soviet Union draft resolution because he had not wished to limit the debate or create the erroneous impression that his Government had anything to conceal. The Committee had heard repetitions of the insinuations and wild accusations which had been levelled frequently against Greece in the past. The delegations of the USSR, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR

among others, had indulged in lengthy oratorical speeches to which it was unnecessary to reply. There were, however, certain questions of fact regarding which Mr. Pipinelis felt that an explanation was needed.

28. In the first place, it had been alleged that the Greek representatives had misled the Committee on 29 September because he had announced (276th meeting) that no further death sentences would be executed when, in fact, an execution had taken place on the following day. Actually, as the record showed, Mr. Pipinelis had not stated there would be no further executions. He had merely explained the functions of the Court of Appeals which would be established. Furthermore, the execution referred to had taken place on 30 September, the morning of the day upon which the clemency bill was introduced in the Athenian Parliament. That bill did not become law until six days later. Mr. Pipinelis recalled that he had frequently repeated in the Committee that, after the enactment of the clemency bill, no death sentence had been executed in Greece for any act of sedition.

29. That, however, was merely one aspect of the question. The main point was that the First Committee could not take a decision regarding the sentences on the eight persons referred to in the Soviet Union draft resolution without undertaking a study of the history of each case. Otherwise, any conclusion would be arbitrary and, if the Committee recommended that the sentences be annulled, it would be guilty of accepting the slanderous accusations against Greece upon their own merits. On the other hand, if the Committee wanted to take a just decision it would have to become, in effect, a court of appeal and would have to examine the complete dockets relating to the cases of the condemned persons. Mr. Pipinelis recalled that, some days previously, he had stated (294th meeting) that everybody was perfectly free to verify the Soviet Union's accusations by investigating the facts on the spot. Surely that was evidence of the good faith of the Greek Government. It was especially noteworthy that the delegations from which the accusations emanated refused to proceed to any kind of verification. Indeed, the Soviet Union itself did not permit any investigations upon its own territories.

30. Turning to the main aspect of the question Mr. Pipinelis recalled that the original Security Council Commission of Investigation concerning Greek Frontier Incidents had carried out an extensive investigation on the spot, as a result of which it had been clearly established that the root of the problem was the unfriendly attitude towards Greece adopted by its northern neighbours. In 1947 and 1948, the General Assembly had accepted the conclusions of that Commission and had proceeded with its work on the basis of those conclusions. The General Assembly had rejected the artificial thesis that the situation was a result of the internal conflict within Greece. Nevertheless, the delegation of the Soviet Union and others were stubbornly persisting in ascribing the troubles to Greece's internal situation. Only recently, during the work of the Conciliation Committee, the representative of the Soviet Union had presented a list of demands relating directly to the internal policies of the Greek Government. As was known, the Conciliation Committee had rejected those demands. A further attempt was now being

made to induce discussion of the internal affairs of Greece by introducing a humanitarian appeal. But what would be the effect of an attempt by the General Assembly to change the administration of Greek justice which, as in every civilized country, was not subject to interference from any quarter? Presumably the Greek Government would have to reply and were it only for reasons of courtesy, would have to explain its action. Thus, a series of accusations and counter-statements would arise which would, in fact, divert the attention of the First Committee from the principal question which it had to solve. The Committee would be induced into discussing the question of the threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece from the aspect of the internal situation of Greece and might ignore the other factors, of which above all was the relations between Greece and its northern neighbours. Consequently, the Committee's work would be distorted and an injustice would be perpetrated against the Greek Government.

31. Mr. Pipinelis also pointed out that, if the Committee wished to consider the humanitarian aspects of the problem, it should not ignore the fact that human lives were lost daily as a result of raids from across the frontiers into Greece; nor should it ignore the plight of the Greek children who had been abducted by force and were being detained in other countries.

32. Mr. Pipinelis reiterated that the policy of his Government was guided by the principles which he had outlined in his statement on 29 September. Acting on its own initiative, after the civil war had come to an end, Greece had immediately undertaken conciliatory measures of pacification, tolerance and mercy designed to put an end to internal discord. Those measures were but a beginning, and Greece as a sovereign and independent State would take further measures as its security became more firmly established. The Greek Government would persevere in that policy by sovereign and spontaneous acts and it would never have been induced into discussing it with anybody.

33. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that the statement of the Greek representative itself exposed the falsity of the assurance which he had given on 29 September. At that time he had assured the Committee that there would be no further executions because a clemency bill had been submitted to the Greek Parliament and was in process of adoption. His assurance had proved to be worthless some twelve or fourteen hours later when Georgi Demosthenes had been executed upon sentence of a military tribunal. If it was true, as Mr. Pipinelis said, that the execution had simply been due to the fact that the legislation had not yet been enacted, then why was it that, as late as 13 October, eight more prominent public figures had been sentenced to death in Athens, and that similar sentences were still being passed by military tribunals throughout Greece? Was it the intention that the sentences should not be executed? If so, that situation was unheard of; it would mean that the tribunals had no authority. No court passed a sentence without intending that it should be executed. As to the statement that the military tribunals were equitable it was sufficient to note that, out of the eight innocent defendants named in the Soviet Union draft resolution, three had been condemned

to death by a mere majority verdict of the military judges of three to two. Everyone knew it was a universally accepted principle of jurisprudence that doubt should always be construed to the advantage of the defendant. Hence in those three cases the verdict of the military tribunals showed that their actions were incorrect and inequitable. What need was there for the First Committee to become an "appeals court" as some representatives had insisted that it would become if it was to take a just decision? The facts were perfectly clear and the character of the military tribunals was apparent. Mr. Vyshinsky believed that it was not a question of interfering in the internal affairs of a State. The Committee must act in accordance with the dictates of conscience and the Polish representative was correct in stating that, in the forthcoming vote, the representatives would bear responsibility for the life or death of the persons convicted. Mr. Vyshinsky could not understand why the Chairman had ruled the Polish representative out of order when he had made that statement.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that he had ruled the Polish representative out of order on the grounds that his statement was designed to influence the votes of representatives. Actually, a more accurate expression to have used would have been to describe the Polish representative's statement as an attempt to intimidate the members of the First Committee.

35. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not agree that there had been any attempt at intimidation.

36. But Mr. Vyshinsky wished to go back to the substance of the matter and he recalled that the Greek representative had not denied that there had been any executions since the adoption of the clemency bill but had said that there had been no executions of death sentences in cases of sedition. Obviously that was an ambiguous statement since it was a general practice of the Greek Government to accuse the democratic fighters and patriots not of sedition but of "banditry". Thus, the Greek representative had attempted to confuse the Committee as to the real situation. Mr. Vyshinsky challenged the representative of Greece to give a clear assurance that all death sentences had been suspended and that no one would be executed in the future. The fact was that none of the persons named in the Soviet Union draft resolution were represented in Greece as political criminals at all; they were described as common law criminals. Consequently, the draft resolutions submitted by the Paraguayan and Colombian representatives would not help them in any way and offered no solution.

37. The Greek representative had invited representatives of Member States or their agents to visit the Greek prison camps in order to see for themselves that there was no cruelty or persecution. The Polish representative had clearly shown the falsity of that offer when he had referred to the sections of the prison camp behind barbed wire into which no journalists were admitted. It was unnecessary to visit Greek prison camps and "re-education" institutions because everyone knew of the tortures and cruelty practised there. Mr. Vyshinsky described the brutal methods which, he said, were employed at Makronesos to induce prisoners to abandon their political views.

38. The Greek representative had asserted that the cause of the trouble in the Balkans was to be found not in the internal situation in Greece but in the policies of its northern neighbours. That allegation, was, of course, completely unfounded as would be shown when the First Committee came to discuss the report of the Conciliation Committee. Equally unfounded was the assertion that the Soviet Union delegation was trying to shift attention from one aspect of the question to another. The USSR delegation had no intention of obstructing discussion of the Conciliation Committee's report: on the contrary, it intended to take a very active part in that discussion. Of course, the Greek delegation did not wish to have the Committee discuss the question on the basis of the situation within Greece because then it would become quite obvious that there was no threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece from its northern neighbours. As the Soviet Union delegation had stated three years previously the complaint was a complete fabrication.

39. As evidence of the policy of the Greek Government with regard to its political prisoners Mr. Vyshinsky cited an article published in the newspaper *Vradini* in October. The article called for merciless treatment of "communists and bandits". It referred to the execution in the Peloponnesus of an eighty-year old liberal and urged that the same fate be meted out to all when opposed the Greek régime. It called for the abolition of re-education camps as an unnecessary expense and urged that all judicial procedure be abandoned in the suppression of guerrilla activities. Mr. Vyshinsky asserted that the article reflected the policy of the Greek Government.

40. Mr. Pipinelis, and later the representative of Canada, had endeavoured to convince the Committee that the action proposed in the Soviet Union draft resolution involved an interference in the domestic jurisdiction of Greece. The Canadian representative had referred to the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee regarding the alleged violations of human rights in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania and had endeavoured to show that the Soviet Union delegation was now reversing the position of principle which it had previously espoused. The Canadian representative had already received a reply to the argument but it must be pointed out that, in fact, it was the Canadian delegation which could be charged with changing its position. The latter had not objected to interfering in the internal affairs of Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania and only referred to Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter in connexion with Greece. Actually, Mr. Vyshinsky believed that Greece was no longer a truly sovereign State. Its domestic jurisdiction had already been violated and its internal affairs were being directed by other States. The true situation was described in an article by Paul Porter, the former head of the United States mission to Greece, in *Collier's* of 20 September 1947 wherein it was stated that the Greek Government was under the domination of the United States and the United Kingdom which were exploiting the country in exchange for economic aid. Since the Greek Government was not master in its own house it was difficult to base an argument on the preservation of Greece's domestic jurisdiction. However, the Soviet Union draft resolution was not aimed at violating that jurisdiction. It was merely proposed

to demand that certain unjust sentences be revoked.

41. There were several ways of conniving with the sentences that had been imposed by the Greek military tribunal. One position would be that those sentences were justified, but that position would be so indecent that not even the Greek delegation would wish to adopt it. Since the matter had to be twisted in some way or another and attention had to be diverted from the core of the question, another method was resorted to and all kinds of irrelevant problems were being brought up. The questions raised by the representative of Chile were a case in point. Thus, when the USSR had entertained diplomatic relations with Chile, its Embassy had been shot at with revolvers from a passing car; that was not supposed to be a violation of human rights or of international law! But the fact that a visa had been refused to the wife of a son of a Chilean diplomat in some country had been considered to be a world-shaking event. That scandalous question had been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly in spite of his delegation's objections, but nothing had come of it because the question was so ludicrous. That and other matters that had been raised were being exploited in order to exacerbate the anti-Soviet campaign being waged in certain countries.

42. Mr. Vyshinsky said that, when submitting his proposal, he had thought that one meeting would suffice to solve the matter because it was so simple, so humanitarian and so obvious. It would be a regrettable fact to be noted by a future historian that for three days the majority of the Committee had sought desperately for ways and means to reject that proposal. Thus the Chilean representative had not given facts but had spoken of other things, so much so that the Chairman, who usually used his gavel in one direction only, had been forced to call the Chilean representative to order.

43. In addition to the remarks made by other representatives who had criticized the Colombian proposal, Mr. Vyshinsky said that it was incorrect to say that there prevailed in the world a situation which was not conclusive to plans for readjustment of international peace and security as was intimated in the first paragraph of that proposal. There was no such threat to an atmosphere of conciliation and justice except in the case of certain countries, including Greece. He rejected with indignation such an accusation, directed against all countries of the world. The second paragraph of the Colombian proposal dismissed the concrete question of executions in Greece and replaced it with a request addressed to all Governments of the world. He stressed the fact that the USSR could not accept that because in the Soviet Union the death sentence had been abolished not only for political crimes but for all crimes. He believed the same to be true of certain Latin-American countries. That being so, the proposal made no sense, and was obviously intended to cover up the actions of the Tsaldaris Government in Greece with references to Governments in other countries. Moreover, as he had already pointed out, it was not political crimes of

which people were being accused in Greece. The Greek courts themselves covered the matter by references to banditry and common-law crimes. Therefore, if it was the desire of the Committee and of the General Assembly to put an end to the death sentences being meted out and put into effect in Greece, the Colombian proposal could not be adopted.

44. The Paraguayan proposal (A/C.1/509) was not far removed from the Colombian text, though it put the matter in different terms. It amounted to an accusation flung in the face of the Greek nation, accusing the latter of the crimes which were in fact being perpetrated by the Greek Government. It did not make sense to speak of an end being put to the executions by the Greek nation. Thus the draft resolution submitted by Paraguay was also unacceptable.

45. The proposal submitted by the delegation of Ecuador (A/C.1/512), calling upon the President of the General Assembly to enter into consultations with the Greek Government concerning death sentences passed by military courts for political reasons, was also inadequate and unacceptable, since the Greek Government, in order to cover up the unbridled terror in Greece, alleged that the reasons for the death sentences were crimes of common law supposedly committed by the defendants.

46. Turning to the Uruguayan draft resolution (A/C.1/511/Rev.1), Mr. Vyshinsky said that it was so utterly colourless that it could not be considered in any way adequate in that matter, which required decisive and determined steps and measures. The Uruguayan proposal would merely recommend the commutation of all death sentences passed in any country. The subject of the discussion, however, was Greece. Bringing in other countries could only be done by those who either failed to understand the political significance and import of their action, or understood that import and merely attempted to thwart the matter and to stymie it for political purposes.

47. As the representative of Mexico had said, it was impossible to tie the concrete question raised by the USSR delegation with the general aspects of the Greek question, because while the Committee deliberated, the eight persons sentenced might be shot. That was exactly what would happen, and it was his conviction that as soon as the Committee adopted a decision which did not state unequivocally that the Greek Government was called upon to revoke those sentences, those executions would be carried out immediately. Mr. Vyshinsky challenged the Greek representative to deny that such would prove to be the case. However, the USSR representative feared that the majority would not vote as it ought to. Under all sorts of pretexts, the Committee would fail to act to prevent that horrible crime, namely the execution of persons who had fought for the freedom of their country, for their own freedom of conscience and for the freedom of conscience of the whole people of Greece, as well as for the political liberation of Greece.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.