



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 67: Question considered by the second emergency special session of the General Assembly from 4 to 10 November 1956 (continued).....	659

President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question considered by the second emergency special session of the General Assembly from 4 to 10 November 1956 (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker this afternoon, I would inform the Assembly that the draft resolution now sponsored by twenty Member nations has been revised by the addition of a new operative paragraph 5. The full text of this draft resolution has been circulated in document A/3436/Rev.2.

2. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (translated from Spanish): I would like to make a comment of a personal nature. The representative of Bulgaria accused me of making a slanderous statement, but I do not think he took the trouble to look up the meaning of the word "slander" in the dictionary. The Peruvian delegation has based its legal position in this debate on the text of the treaty of peace concluded with Hungary after the Second World War, on three articles of the Treaty of Warsaw, which I quoted [613th meeting], and on the agreement concerning the unified command, which I quoted *verbatim*. Consequently, if there has been any slander, it arose from the text of those treaties, which I do not think the Bulgarian delegation wishes to ignore or repudiate.

3. In so far as the facts are concerned, I was extremely restrained in the figures I quoted. I quoted the figure of 100,000 refugees which is given in all the newspapers; I quoted the number of tanks and the estimated number of troops sent to Hungary by the Soviet Union. I was very careful to take into account not only American but also British and French sources. There has therefore been no slander, and consequently the Bulgarian representative has ignored the real meaning of that word and has abused it.

4. I am sorry to have to make that charge, as I am sorry that the representative of Bulgaria has forgotten that the Peruvian delegation worked very hard to have Bulgaria and other countries accepted for membership in the United Nations, arguing not merely that they should be given the benefit of the doubt, or that it was possible that their political orientation might change, but saying that they were fully entitled to belong to the

United Nations, like Italy, Spain, Portugal, the Asian countries and today Japan, a country which I mention with deep satisfaction and congratulate sincerely.

5. But I must say to the Bulgarian representative that, when I explained my vote at the time I said that I desired the admission of the Bulgarian nation rather than the Bulgarian Government, and hoped that the representatives of that Government, however imperfect it might be, might represent at least some aspects of that collective entity—which I respect—the Bulgarian nation, I also hoped, and continue to hope, that the representatives of the Bulgarian Government, in this atmosphere of freedom, in this atmosphere where the love of justice and peace prevails, might be able to transform their psychology and their orientation and bring the real spirit of the United Nations to the Bulgarian people.

6. I have followed the debate on the Hungarian situation with great interest. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that it has been one of the most memorable discussions held in the United Nations, a discussion in which the debate has risen in crescendo and has been accompanied by strong emotion. Yet the debate has not overflowed the bounds of reason; on the contrary, the reasoning, the arguments have rather been the culmination of a surge of feeling. When justice is trampled upon and humanity is flouted or outraged, all decent men are stirred to emotion. But that emotion has been superbly contained and illuminated by the Charter, by the principles of law and justice.

7. And we knew that behind the opinion which was expressed here in eloquent speeches was the opinion of all mankind. It might be said that this debate constitutes a splendid symphony in honour of justice, peace and heroism, because in our enthusiasm we have not been able to differentiate between what we should do for the just cause of Hungary and our admiration for that extraordinary and exemplary heroism, which sets the seal of greatness on the present era, an era which had been considered one of mediocrity and pettiness. A breath of heroism has stirred through humanity in recent days, and we cannot forget that we owe this breath of heroism to the sacrifice and the unyielding courage of the Hungarian people.

8. But however great was the rising tide of our emotion—an irrepressible and contagious emotion which was in keeping with the human feeling reflected by the world Press—it should not be thought that the draft resolution which has been introduced here by the twenty Powers [A/3436/Rev.2] reflects only an emotion. No. How noble is the conjunction of feeling and reason, of emotion and wisdom! I must say, to the honour of my colleagues, who have worked much harder than I, and above all with respect to the country which has been the leader in this discussion and the creation of this draft resolution—the United States—that the work has been done in a calm, careful, measured and admirably controlled manner. We are en-

deavouring to adhere scrupulously to the facts, and we have measured not only our words, but even our punctuation.

9. That is why this draft resolution has been so carefully revised, in an effort to include in it as much of the wording of the draft resolution presented by Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3437] as was possible, and to adopt, in a more correct and appropriate form, what might be called the constructive or practical part of that draft resolution.

10. Whoever reads this draft resolution will come to the conclusion that the preamble is absolutely objective in character. It is not political in intention, nor is it a parade of diplomatic phrases. It is, rather, a series of factual paragraphs embodying a historical judgement or narrative written by the most scrupulous and conscientious of historians. The facts are based on documents.

11. There is, first, a verbatim quotation from the Secretary-General's report [A/3403]. Then there is a paragraph in which it is noted with grave concern that there has been no reply to the latest appeal of the General Assembly for the admission of United Nations observers to Hungary, as contained in its resolution of 4 December 1956 [1130 (XI)]. The attitude taken by the Hungarian Government is described in the most moderate manner possible, without criticizing or qualifying it in any way. Then we incorporate some of the admirably phrased sentences of the draft resolution submitted by the four Asian Powers, to which I would like to pay a tribute. We have also incorporated the clause of that draft resolution which notes the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the withdrawal of foreign troops and the cessation of intervention.

12. I would defy anyone to say that these paragraphs of the preamble are impassioned or that they show any partiality, or anything other than the strictest regard for justice and fidelity to historical truth.

13. In the operative part of the draft resolution, we must naturally draw the logical conclusions from the facts enunciated. I would like to point out, especially to the countries which did not assist in drawing up our draft resolution, and would ask them to note, how each one of the operative paragraphs of our draft resolution is only a logical, inevitable and inescapable consequence—and its logic is not merely the geometric kind of which Pascal spoke but that other logic of organic reason to which modern philosophers allude.

14. What do we say in paragraph 1? We say: "Declares that, by using its armed force against the Hungarian people" a fact which no one can deny—"the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is violating the political independence of Hungary".

15. If we all admit that force is being used, how can we deny, if we are honest with ourselves, that the use of force is a violation of the Charter? Can we simply say that the use of force against an innocent people is deplorable? Can we say that we regret the use of force after this force has been cruelly and overwhelmingly used for seven weeks to threaten the very existence of the Hungarian people? I appeal to the conscience of all honest men, how can we say any less than that the political independence of Hungary is being violated? That is the way Hungary feels, and that is the way all mankind feels. Nothing will be said here that is not an expression of the feelings of the Hungarian people, that is not the fervent and explosive feeling of all mankind.

16. And what can we do in view of the condemnation of this attack on the independence of a people who are an essential part of the United Nations? I repeat that this people have been imperfectly represented here by their Government, but who is it that belongs to the United Nations? Is it the rulers? No. The preamble of the Charter says: "We the peoples of the United Nations"—we, the countries of the United Nations. Can we, therefore, faced with an indisputable violation of the independence of one of those countries, say simply that we deplore it, that it surprises us and that we merely censure it? It is our duty to say that we condemn it.

17. I would point out, however, that the condemnation contained in paragraph 2 is objective. We are not making a subjective condemnation, which would have greater legal and moral consequences. We do say "we condemn the Soviet Union", although it is obvious that the Soviet Union is being partially condemned; but a subjective condemnation is a condemnation which involves the whole personality and implies a judgement which may have more serious consequences later. We have thought very seriously, we have weighed the difference between condemning an act and condemning a collective entity, and, in order to bring the operative part of the draft resolution into accord with the preamble, we have preferred to simply to condemn the violation of the Charter by the Government of the Soviet Union in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights.

18. I ask if there is anyone in this hall who can come to this rostrum and say, "It is not certain that the Hungarian people have been deprived of their fundamental rights." If we all believe that the Hungarian people have been deprived of their fundamental rights, I maintain that it is our imperative and unavoidable duty to condemn this attitude. We would be neglecting a duty of conscience, a legal duty and a duty of personal dignity, because, as I said the other day, the lower biological organisms can be amputated, but that is not true of higher organisms. The loss of one part of such an organism threatens its very existence. This principle of biological unity, which is linked with the principle of psychical unity, is very applicable to the United Nations. We cannot, without threatening our own unity, our own organic identity, allow the mutilation, the separation or the conquest of Hungary.

19. Then comes a provision we have already agreed on, in which the General Assembly "Reiterates its call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to desist forthwith from any form of intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary." What could be more natural than this call? No one can object to it.

20. Paragraph 4, which is the logical consequence of the preceding one, calls upon the Government of the Soviet Union "to make immediate arrangements for the withdrawal, under United Nations observation, of its armed forces from Hungary and to permit the re-establishment of the political independence of Hungary."

21. I shall be told that this appeal would be acceptable were it not for the phrase "under United Nations observation". But I maintain that no law-abiding country, no country which, by its acts, testifies to its belief that the United Nations represents mankind, can deny that worldwide body the right of observation. On the contrary, a country which stands accused, or which wishes to comply with its obligations,

is ready to respond to an appeal, should be the first to say: "Let the United Nations observers come, so that the Organization may see the work we are about to do and witness our desire to do our duty and fulfill our obligations."

22. It is therefore not only a question of duty for the Soviet Union, but of its honour, of its dignity as a people, to show that it will comply with this request under the auspices or observation of the United Nations.

23. The object of paragraph 5 is specifically to take into account a constructive part of the draft resolution presented by the four Asian Powers. We felt that, in this matter, there was wisdom in the old Spanish proverb which says that there is no worse step than the step that is not taken. The secondary measure which has been disdained may sometimes be the only one that can be taken to save the situation. We therefore thought that although our Secretary-General who has shown such determination and such efficiency—is already overburdened with cares, duties and responsibilities, he might accomplish this important task, and we have therefore not hesitated to rely on his ability to meet this new demand, because we felt that when a man is summoned by destiny—I might say by the Almighty—that man also receives the divine grace with which to accomplish his duty and carry out his mission. And so we said, let the Secretary-General, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly, take any initiative that he deems helpful in relation to the Hungarian problem.

24. I would say that this draft resolution—and I disregard the very modest part I played in its drafting—is a perfect text, and one to which there can be no objection. I am proud that I was invited to co-sponsor it, and I think it almost inconceivable that anyone could abstain from voting on it or could vote against it. That would be contrary to the dignity of this Assembly.

25. But I am a great respecter of differences of opinion, and often the different shades of opinion among people whose purpose is the same to enrich what we might call the attitude of a collective body. There will be, and I respect their attitude, delegations which believe that it is not wise or prudent to use this or that expression; each of them has its own way of doing things, every people has its own way of thinking, every diplomatic tradition has its own procedures. I respect such differences of psychology and tradition, and I shall therefore take the liberty of analysing carefully the very interesting draft resolution presented by the delegations of Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia.

26. Of course, I approach that draft resolution with an attitude of what might be called favourable anticipation, because the speech by Mr. Nehru and the eloquent statements made here by the representatives of Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia still echo in my mind, and because those speeches were not inconsonant with the fundamental principles laid down by other delegations.

27. I have no objection to the first and second paragraphs of the preamble. As to the third, it has been incorporated almost verbatim into our draft resolution.

28. My objections begin with the fourth paragraph, and I feel that out of respect for these Powers it is my duty to express my opinion frankly and with all respect. I cannot accept the statement:

"Noting that the failure to agree to and arrange for the withdrawal of Soviet forces is responsible for and has resulted in widespread non-co-operation, particularly by the workers of Hungary, and is preventing the emergence of peaceful conditions".

29. It is true, that there is resistance, and it is true that peaceful conditions do not exist. But what I cannot accept, in the name of the principle of causality, is that the cause of this very serious situation should be made anonymous, vague, confused and I might almost say equivocal. The fact that there is resistance and that there is no peace in Hungary is not due to the fact that there has been no agreement. No, it is due precisely to the fact that an agreement was not desired, to the fact that there are troops there, to the fact that when a government wanted such an agreement and was negotiating for it, the negotiators were imprisoned, and when that government wished to continue working under conditions which fulfilled the aspirations of the Hungarian people, it was overthrown by Soviet troops.

30. Faced with that fact, what is the position? Faced with that fact, which has been openly confessed here by the Soviet Union, which is undeniable, and for which the subjective and individual responsibility is clear, how can we accept the idea that it was an anonymous, objective, doubtful fact which caused the failure to reach agreement? What agreement could there be? Was the Soviet Union to make an agreement with itself, since the Hungarian people had no voice, since the voice of the Hungarian people which was represented by Mr. Nagy had been suppressed? Is it felt that agreement should have been reached between the puppet government and the Soviet Government? Whence is derived the principle that a person can make an agreement with himself or with the instruments he uses? I ask, what kind of legal concept is that? In certain cases a lack of logic produces a vertigo which is even greater than the physiological vertigo: the vertigo of the absurd.

31. Therefore, if this text is not amended, I shall have to cast a negative vote—and not abstain. My negative vote is categorical and well-founded and I would ask it to be recorded in those very terms.

32. The next paragraph of the preamble is just as bad, if not worse. It reads:

"Noting further the declaration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 30 October 1956 regarding the withdrawal of its forces from Hungary and that the United Nations and world opinion have repeatedly asked for such withdrawal,"

33. It would be sufficient to say: "Noting that world opinion and the United Nations . . ." or, if you wish, ". . . the United Nations and world opinion have repeatedly asked for such withdrawal". What is the purpose of alluding to the Soviet declaration? The Soviet declaration is a document which, for the sake of its own dignity, the United Nations cannot recognize. Why? Because it states: "We shall withdraw our forces from Hungary once order is re-established", implying that the Soviet Union is the one to re-establish order in Hungary. In addition to taking upon itself the inconceivable right of establishing order in another country, it sets no date for this to be accomplished. This is like the man who, when condemned to be hanged, was given the right to choose the tree from which he was to be hung; he never found the tree, and so he was saved.

34. Naturally the Soviet Union will never find that, within its concept of order—the Warsaw order of which the Russian Czar spoke—order has been established in Hungary. Unless, of course, in this case, in order to maintain order—once order has finally been established—it is found necessary to keep an even greater number of troops in Hungary.

35. Thus we cannot accept a declaration whereby the Soviet Union usurps the right to establish order in other countries, in contravention of the Charter, because Mr. Shepilov's document constitutes direct, written proof of the Soviet Union's violation of the United Nations Charter as that country takes upon itself the right to maintain order in Hungary.

36. I shall therefore be obliged to cast a negative vote on the fifth paragraph also, for the reasons I have given.

37. The sixth paragraph reads:

"Recognising that any improvement in the present situation in Hungary requires the urgent initiative and co-operation of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Hungary".

38. Which government is the Hungarian Government? The fact is that, as in the case of the withdrawal of its troops the Soviet Union was to negotiate with itself, here it is implied that there should be urgent co-operation between the Government of the Soviet Union and another Government, but which one? The government that Hungary is going to be given! After a government has been set up following a great popular revolutionary outburst, anarchy does not ensue.

39. Here it is essential that we cast back our political memories. What happens when a truly popular revolution takes place, not of factions or revolutionary fragments, but a tremendous mass revolution? The same as always happens, as happened in the American war of independence, and in the South American struggles for independence: a government that represents the will of the people immediately rises. And the men who form that government are generally superior men because fate wills—and God disposes—that at such times a superior man should appear or, if you wish, honourable men who, even though they may be mediocre, are able to organize a government efficiently with the impetus of the quasi-divine encouragement of the multitudes; for the co-operation of the people is then required in order to take measures, even drastic measures, to maintain order and re-establish the economy.

40. When is it difficult for a government to act? When it has no popular support. No matter how serious the problems are—we have already seen this and the European countries bear witness to it—if the government has the support of the people, all problems are simplified, all solutions seem possible.

41. Let it not be said, therefore, that there will be a vacuum in Hungary if the Soviet Union, in its generous benevolence, does not give it a government that will re-establish order. No, Hungary is a country with a great political tradition; it has been a country of great social, intellectual and aesthetic culture.

42. I cannot allow this people—who today are suffering so many misfortunes, who are being scourged, abused and martyred—to be insulted by the statement: "You can never organize a political government spontaneously; you are minors from the standpoint of political citizenship". I protest against this

reflexion, whether explicit or implicit. I maintain here, with all the strength of justice, that the Hungarian people, the Hungarian masses—those masses who have the admirable dynamism of religious faith and another faith which is always united with faith in God: the belief in freedom—are destined and are ready more so than other peoples, more so than their masters—to elect a government that will be in keeping with their traditions and culture.

43. This paragraph of the preamble therefore envisages a type of agreement, concession or transaction which the Soviet Union would make with certain elements, perhaps with the right of veto: "We do not like Mr. Horvath, or Professor X, or such and such a representative of such and such a social class."

44. I cannot conceive that the United Nations should support the establishment in Hungary of a heterogeneous government, a government lacking unity, a government which would again have to face the danger of strikes.

45. Let us not forget the extraordinary lesson Hungary has taught us. I ask here—and the representative of Bulgaria should know, although perhaps he does not read *The Observer* or other foreign newspapers—whether Hungary has supported the Kadar government? It has not. Massacres have ceased, the gunfire has been silenced, many citizens have been deported, every house has been searched for arms or supposed defectors, and yet—and this is the splendid part, the part that I shall always remember and now stress to you—a workers' council, a council of Communist workers who have an awareness of social problems and who live in the absolute conviction that there must be a classless society, says to Kadar despite his tanks: "We do not want your government and we are going to proclaim a general strike."

46. I ask you, then: when a people act in this way, are we going to allow the possibility of pseudo-agreements between the Soviet Union and that martyred people? No!

47. For all these reasons I shall therefore vote with great vehemence against this paragraph of the preamble.

48. We now come to paragraph 1 of the operative part in which it is deplored "that no steps have been taken in pursuance of the above-mentioned Soviet declaration . . ." But can the Hungarian people take any steps in pursuance of a declaration which usurps the right to establish order in Hungary and to set a date for proclaiming to the world that order has been established? This clause is, of course, vitiated by the reference to the Soviet declaration.

49. We must not attribute the deterioration of the situation to that non-co-operation. We must not deplore it. There would be greater cause for regret if that co-operation had occurred, if we were to receive the news today that the Hungarian people had surrendered, had accepted a puppet government, and were satisfied with that government. Would we not then be extremely sad? Yes, for that would indeed be something to deplore. What we should deplore is that the Soviet Union has not withdrawn, and left Hungary to organize the government of its choice.

50. Let us consider the emancipating movements in other countries. In our own experience, have we ever conceived that we should negotiate with the country occupying a territory, for the establishment of the government of that territory? No. Out with foreign troops! There can be no government, there is no free-

dom while foreign bayonets are present on national soil. May absolute and total acceptance of the will of the people prevail, as the Charter and the dignity of mankind require.

51. Let us now turn to paragraph 2; this we would support whole-heartedly. If the draft resolution contained only the first preambular paragraph and this operative paragraph, we could acclaim it.

52. Paragraph 3 is excellent too, precisely because it contradicts the preamble.

53. Paragraph 4 speaks of "the assurance that there will be no external intervention or pressures, armed or otherwise, from any quarter". If this refers to the pressure of public opinion, I would prefer that this part be deleted. But what pressure is it? Evidently there is a wonderful influence on the Hungarian people today. Despite all difficulties of communication, the Hungarian people cannot be unaware that their cause has received general acclaim and that there is a universal desire that they should have a free government. Therefore we must not include any phrase that could be interpreted as condemning that beneficial, encouraging and fruitful foreign influence.

54. In this case, I would also have to vote against the paragraph unless the words I have criticized are deleted.

55. Finally, in paragraph 5, the Secretary-General is requested "to initiate efforts both with the Hungarian and the Soviet Governments through their representatives . . ." I do not think we should tie the Secretary-General's hands. The Secretary-General knows full well that he has a Charter that must be implemented. The Secretary-General knows that he has a sacred mission: that of carrying out the resolutions of the General Assembly. If, under the Charter and under the General Assembly's resolutions—which have affirmed Hungary's right to self-determination—the Secretary-General decides on a course of action, a sound one, we will support it.

56. Therefore this part, suitably revised, has also been incorporated as operative paragraph 5 in our draft resolution.

57. I have set forth my delegation's point of view. But my conscience impels me, before I leave this rostrum—and I apologize to the General Assembly for this long speech—to say a few words on the basis of my ten years of work in the United Nations.

58. Our Charter represents a new international order, one which is different from the international order that prevailed in the nineteenth century, "the balance of power", under which the small Powers remained under the influence of the great Powers, that influence being checked, however, by the so-called balance-of-power policy. It was an imperfect system, I know. It was a bad system: It came to a crisis and then we sought another system: the system of law, the system of the moral entity embracing all mankind, that would be capable of passing a moral judgement and expressing its opinion. We established a Security Council that could control the use of force, prohibiting its use in any way contrary to the United Nations and contrary to law.

59. But the transition from an international system of balance of power—material balance of power, which was rightly called power politics—to a system of international legality, is difficult. If this was difficult in 1920, when the system to be replaced, though imperfect, was not so bad, we are now called upon to face

the problem of an international legal order and the reality of our Organization in a situation even more grave than that which existed prior to 1914.

60. Why should this be so? Because the war produced a settlement and readjustment that were entirely new for the world. The admirable prophecy which de Tocqueville made in 1837 in his wonderful book, *Democracy in America*, has been fulfilled. De Tocqueville, though he could not foresee the destruction wrought by the First and Second World Wars, observed that the world was tending towards the formation of two immense Powers—the United States and Russia—and he predicted their rivalry.

61. I have followed this problem closely. I have observed that the great Spanish seer Donoso Cortés also predicted that rivalry in 1849 and 1950. I have read the admirable pages of another great Hispanic philosopher, Jaime Balmes, who, in his *Refutación a Guisot*, foresaw Russia's power and that country's tendency to spread all over Europe and to absorb many European peoples.

62. Let us look at the present reality, however. Since the war, enthusiasm has been rising among all the young nations, and there have been encouraging events. The shadow of colonialism appears to be lifting, but, on the other hand, Soviet imperialism is an oncoming avalanche. I would ask that my words, which are the truth, be pondered by our brothers whom we all esteem, our brothers in the cause of freedom and in the cause of political and economic independence—our brothers in Asia and Africa.

63. Two Powers have clearly been formed. Some journalists have said that a line drawn from Stettin to the Adriatic could appropriately divide the spheres of influence of those great Powers. There were spheres of influence under the old balance of power, but there were also interrelationships, because if some small Powers were linked to the greater or lesser influence of a great Power, respect for some other great Power provided a certain measure of freedom in this clash of influences. This obviously prevented certain acts—imperfectly, to be sure—but it nevertheless prevented or minimized them.

64. We have heard in the United Nations, the highest, noblest and most idealistic theoretical pronouncements, but the underlying reality is the tremendous rivalry between the Western bloc, led by the United States, and the Soviet Union, which has not been satisfied with the line, the prophetic meridian from Stettin to the Adriatic, and has been seeking means of shifting it. This is the present tragedy.

65. Indeed, what are we witnessing today? We are witnessing a crisis in the darker aspect, the subterranean aspect, the tragic aspect of the life of peoples in the last few years. What hopes can we have? Can we place our hopes in the maintenance of a balance between these two groups? Can we believe that the Soviet Union should not lose its influence because then the influence of the United States would be invincible? No, that would be a most dangerous policy. What would be the effect of encouraging the Soviet Union, of giving it some degree of indirect support? To perpetuate the present position of deterioration would be to pave the way for the inevitable war, and the inevitable war would be nuclear war.

66. Neither the great Powers nor the small Powers should rely any longer on a policy of balance of power. The only course open to us is to cling, as a shipwrecked

man clings to a plank, to the precepts of justice and honour laid down in the United Nations Charter, which constitutes, as it were, the tables of the law of modern times.

67. I would be unfair, however, having accepted de Tocqueville's parallel, if I did not, like de Tocqueville, note the fundamental differences between the two leading Powers of the two blocs. According to de Tocqueville, the destiny of the United States is the conquest of nature for man. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has had a tragic destiny: the conquest of man for a bureaucratic group, for a group blinded by imperialistic dreams and the myth of industrial revolution.

68. We know full well that there are spiritual factors in the West. We believe in divine transcendence and in immanent justice; we believe that in history there is a force which inspires, encourages and punishes at a given moment; we believe that honour is a value in itself, and we believe matter to be at the service of the lofty spiritual values of mankind. On the other side, what do we find? The materialistic concept of life, the economic or vitalistic concept of power. The Romans had a policy of power but they never based their law on the policy they inconsistently followed; they based it on the pole-star of justice which Rudolf Stammier mentioned: immanent justice, justice as an eternal light. That same justice is the eternal light of the United Nations.

69. Our goal today is not to fan the rivalry between the great Powers. We stand to gain nothing by that rivalry, save the destructive proximity of war; we stand to gain nothing save the vicissitudes, the successes or failures, of that struggle of power politics. We must hold fast to this policy and force the Powers, large or small, to remain in the United Nations. We must keep them rooted in the framework of the United Nations and prevent them from doing anything without the United Nations, from having recourse to action or invoking vital interests.

70. No, there are no longer any vital interests except those of mankind, except those declared, supported and approved by the United Nations. Therefore it is in our interest to keep those Powers with us, in our Organization, on an equal footing of absolute fraternity.

71. Do they have more power? Certainly. The greater their power, the greater their responsibility. As in the Gospel parable, we may say: "Thou hast received five talents; five talents shall be required of thee." They have more industry: they have it for themselves and for others. They have greater literature: they have it for themselves and for others. Likewise, scholarships, technical assistance, human aid, fraternal aid should be for all. But all this must be without any strings attached and within the framework of the United Nations.

72. A person is only free when he submits voluntarily to the law. The man who follows his instinct is not free, and the person who follows the satanic urge called the thirst for power is still less free. Spinoza said that every being desires to survive, but the powerful one not only wishes to survive, it wishes to increase its power. The law of power is the law of accelerated motion: the more power I have today, the more I want tomorrow.

73. And how can this be prevented? By another Power that will also want more power itself, by rivalry,

by an armaments race, by a race of influences leading to the brink of an abyss and the catastrophe of nuclear war? No, All the Members of the United Nations have a place of honour here, each within its own category. There is juridical equality and within that juridical equality there is room for all kinds of ideas and hierarchies, because all peoples, like citizens in democratic republics, have equality of opportunity. It is a sacred equality of opportunity which permits small countries to play an extraordinary role in history. I do not wish to cite examples of the many small countries that have played an immense part in the history of mankind; I would speak with emotion, almost with tears in my eyes, were I to refer to the small countries of our beloved Latin America.

74. What then must be our policy? Not to encourage or to allow the Soviet Union to think for one moment that it will receive any sympathy in this struggle for power; nor to allow any Western Power—if it strays or mistakenly follows a blind policy—to count on our complicity or our silence.

75. The extraordinary historical event of recent times has been the General Assembly's attitude; it has been a consistent, worthy and just attitude; yesterday it stopped the Western Powers, today it is stopping and ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Hungary.

76. Here lies the hope of mankind: let us keep the great Powers firmly within the glorious framework of the United Nations. If we do not do this, if we do not have the unanimity to do so, if we let our spirit be led astray by the vagaries of influences or struggles, or by anxieties or doubts, we shall have betrayed our duty to mankind, and tomorrow we will be cursed by history.

77. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): If there were radio communication with the planet Mars, and the Martians could have listened to our debates of the last two weeks—especially to the statements of the representatives of the Soviet Union and its satellites—they would be forced to the conclusion that the army which is invading Hungary is the Cuban army, that the army which is massacring the Hungarians, deporting them to Siberia or driving them into exile is the Cuban army, for there is no other assumption consistent with the rules of logic that could explain why so many adjectives, arguments and words have been expended on Cuban problems and, if I may strike a personal note, on the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations at a time when the subject under discussion is the tragic case of Hungary. Such speeches compel me for the second time to impose, if only briefly, on the kindness of the General Assembly, for I cannot ignore the series of totally and absolutely false statements which have been made here.

78. Of course, the representative of the Soviet Union is quite right when he says that the Cuban Communists do not like the President of my country. We accept that as a fact, and consider it a great honour: the Cuban Communists are against the President of Cuba. We realize that that is no mere coincidence when we hear the chorus of lamentations of the Soviet Union and its satellites bewailing the fact that the revolution in Cuba has collapsed and has failed to overthrow the Government.

79. That is natural and logical: they were clearly demonstrating their great respect for the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other coun-

tries, which they are constantly proclaiming, and, at the same time, they were demonstrating an indisputable fact, namely, that the Cuban Communists do not like Mr. Batista.

80. Nevertheless, the Cuban Communists are not being murdered; the Cuban Communists are not being exiled; the Cuban Communists are not being deported. They live in Cuba with all the guarantees accorded by law to other citizens, and, like other citizens, they are subject to legal penalties only when they violate the law. All we ask is that the Soviet Union, which claims to be the champion of world communism, should treat the poor Hungarian Communists in the same way as we in Cuba, who are not Communists, treat the Cuban Communists, for, had they done so, there would not have been 75,000 Hungarians murdered, 200,000 wounded, 110,000 to 150,000 exiled, and 60,000 deported to the far reaches of Siberia. This is the difference between some countries and others.

81. As to the statements made here by the representative of Bulgaria [615th meeting], who in his enthusiasm went so far as to ask that the United Nations should send observers to Cuba, I would point out to him that there is no need for that. There is no need for it because every day two planes leave New York, twenty-four leave Miami, and three ships leave various ports of Florida, all bound for Cuba, and no United States citizen, no Latin American, no Englishman, no Frenchman—in other words, no one whose country has concluded the necessary treaty or agreement with Cuba—needs a visa to enter Cuba. Anyone may go, anyone who wishes to do so may go to Cuba. Any Swiss, American or Latin American who wishes to take a plane and go to Cuba today has no problem; there is absolutely no need for decisions by the United Nations on the question of observers. Why does not the Soviet Union imitate us and permit passengers to travel in the same manner to see what is happening in Hungary? That is the difference in the two situations.

82. Furthermore, everyone knows perfectly well that here, in New York, all Cuban newspapers are received daily and on the day of their publication. The magazine *Bohemia*, which is very strongly opposed to the Cuban Government, and whose edition of more than 300,000 copies weekly makes it one of the largest publications, if not the largest, in Latin America, sells 30,000 copies in New York every week. All the Cuban opposition newspapers are sold here in the Latin American districts of New York. There is no press censorship in Cuba. Anyone can read the fierce attacks published against the Government of Cuba.

83. Before proceeding to examine the draft resolutions which will be put to the vote, I wish to draw attention to the following fact, and I apologize to the Assembly for this digression, but I have no other recourse in view of the unjustified attacks that have been levelled against my Government: in Cuba, as in any democracy, there may be political differences, but on the question of Hungary there is absolute unanimity.

84. The Senate, both Government and Opposition, unanimously resolved to congratulate me on my conduct in the United Nations on the Hungarian question. The Lower House, also unanimously, adopted a similar resolution.

85. The magazine *Bohemia*, which is very well known in Latin America, published in its latest issue an article entitled "The Soviet Terror"; it writes that the terrorist methods which the Soviet Union has used to

stifle the rebellion of the Hungarian patriots is an ignominious stain on the régime in whose name it was applied. The article goes on to applaud the conduct of the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations—and I wish to place on record the fact that this weekly is in absolute and total opposition to the Cuban Government,

86. Again, the newspaper *Prensa Libre*, whose director, Mr. Sergio Carbó, is perhaps the most distinguished newspaperman in Cuba, and one of the most distinguished in the Americas, writes as follows—and this, mind you, is also an opposition newspaper: "Genocide, massacre of the people, that is the heinous crime which is daily being perpetrated by the Communist hordes in Hungary." The newspaper goes on to say that it fully supports the conduct of the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations.

87. Finally, I should like to read out the following very brief letter, which for me is the greatest of all compliments so far as my conduct in connexion with this question is concerned:

"My dear friend,

"Through the newspapers, I have been kept informed of the outstanding successes you are achieving in your fine work in the United Nations, particularly in connexion with most recent international events. It is a great satisfaction to someone like me, who have always admired you and valued and appreciated your great ability, to know that your Christian and valiant efforts are holding aloft the name of our country and our religion, in courageous defence of the right of every man to enjoy the precious gifts which God has given him, and that is why I wished to send you these few lines of warm congratulations.

"Your friend and humble servant,
"(Signed) Manuel Cardinal Arteaga,
Archbishop of Havana."

88. Thus, it is not by seeking to confuse the issues that the Assembly's attention can be diverted from the problems it must examine. In the view of the Cuban delegation, to compare Cuba with Hungary and the Soviet Union, as the Bulgarian representative tried to do, is an insult, and we protest against such statements by the Bulgarian representative, for it would be really humiliating for us if anyone were to give the slightest credence to the idea that the Government of Cuba is guilty of a thousandth part of what the Soviet Union is doing in Hungary.

89. I should now like, very briefly, to set forth the Cuban delegation's position on the substance of this question.

90. As my delegation has already announced, it will vote in favour of the whole of the twenty-Power draft resolution [A/3436/Rev.2].

91. The Cuban delegation will not vote for the amendments proposed by Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/L.216], because we feel that they would completely change the meaning of the original draft resolution. These amendments, possibly with the best of intentions, aim to vitiate completely what the Powers which submitted the draft resolution have in mind.

92. As to the separate draft resolution presented by Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3437], although some of its provisions might be acceptable, we cannot accept it as a whole.

93. To ask the Secretary-General to go to Moscow to try to find a solution of this problem when we have the letter [A/3435/Add.5] of 10 December 1956, that is, of two days ago, signed by the Chairman of the USSR delegation and absolutely refusing to accept the competence of the United Nations in this matter, seems to me to be dooming the efforts of the Secretary-General in advance and therefore wholly uncalled for on the part of the General Assembly.

94. In our view, this draft resolution is unacceptable because it is impractical and impracticable, the Soviet Union having said, I repeat, that it will not admit the Secretary-General to discuss such matters.

95. Since an important part of the Austrian draft resolution [A/3441] has now been incorporated in the twenty-Power draft resolution, it is our understanding that it is no longer necessary to put it to the vote. If it is put to the vote, we shall have to vote against it.

96. I should like to inform the General Assembly that information I have obtained today from the news agencies reveals that the Soviet Union is continuing to massacre men, women and children in the streets of Budapest and elsewhere in Hungary, that a new savage repression, unprecedented in history, is being carried out, that the Hungarians are still being murdered in defiance of all the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the principles of humanity.

97. The delegation of Cuba wishes to place on record once again its strongest protest against these actions, and announces that it will try by every available means to compel the Soviet Union at least to return to the ways of civilization.

98. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Two days ago, my delegation participated in what has now become the prolonged debate on this particular phase of the present item. In that statement [614th meeting], we set forth our position on what we believed to be the situation in Hungary and what we thought could best be done to achieve a solution. My delegation also pointed out that, according to its own lights, its approach to this problem was not so much one of merely discovering facts, or contradicting them, but of resolving a situation in which there was vast distress and which was likely, in a storm centre of the world, to create graver consequences than at present existed.

99. At the time of our statement two days ago, the draft resolution and amendments which have been submitted by India and some other delegations had not been circulated. If one does not have the documents in front of one, it is difficult to discuss them. Hence, I merely set forth our position with regard to conditions and our approach to this entire question. I am obliged to speak again in order to refer specifically to the draft resolution and amendments of which India is one of the sponsors.

100. Several statements have been made concerning the amendments and draft resolutions before the Assembly. I propose at this time to confine myself to the essential task that is placed upon the sponsor of a proposal—namely, to explain the proposal and request support for it.

101. I turn first to the amendments to the twenty-Power draft resolution [A/3436/Rev.2] which have been submitted by Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/L.216]. The speeches that have been made and the fact that there have now been two revisions of the twenty-Power draft resolution do not really leave room for much hope that the amendments will be adopted

—unless it is possible for us to persuade other members to support them. That does not mean, however, that we should not explain the reasons for these amendments and attempt to persuade members to support them. In the two revisions of the twenty-Power draft resolution, one paragraph of the four-Power draft resolution [A/3437] has been incorporated into the text, and an attempt has been made to incorporate into the final paragraph a part of the Austrian draft resolution [A/3441].

102. One has heard it said in the lobbies that the sponsors of the twenty-Power draft resolution have been unwilling to find ways and means of arriving at a common draft resolution. I should like to say here and now that what we have heard in this hall has given us no such impression; in fact, the impression we have received has been quite to the contrary.

103. With regard to these amendments, first of all I want to say that my delegation and my co-sponsors do not regard the second and third paragraphs of the draft resolution of the twenty Powers as necessary. What is more, apart from the question of whether they are necessary, they do cast the whole of the approach of the problem once again into the context of what has happened and not into a more constructive approach towards the present. Simply to keep on reiterating resolutions does not seem to us to be the right approach to make. That is the reason why we have suggested their deletion, and this suggestion was not made with any view to suggesting that the resolutions referred to should be rescinded or that they were not decisions of the General Assembly. In fact, these amendments are less material than the others. We do not think that there is any point in recalling those resolutions, especially as some other events have occurred and the context in which they were adopted has changed.

104. We agree with the fourth preambular paragraph, but there is one observation I should like to make in connexion with this. We have a report of the Secretary-General before us [A/3435], and I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the last sentences in this report. The Secretary-General states:

"I have not received any official reaction to this suggestion. If the visit cannot be made at the time proposed, it may be questioned whether it would be to the purpose."

The "suggestion" refers to the proposed visit to Budapest on 16 December. My delegation wishes to express its view that it does not totally concur in this doubt, because, so long as there are difficulties, efforts must be made. While the Secretary-General has thrown out the suggestion, we do not regard that as a categorical view on his part. On the other hand, we do not ourselves feel the same way about it.

105. We have asked that the sixth preambular paragraph be replaced by the text that appears in paragraph 2 of the amendments [A/L.216]. That, in substance, has now been incorporated in the revised version of the twenty-Power draft resolution.

106. The main amendments refer to the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, and we seek to substitute for operative paragraph 1 the words which appear in paragraph 3 of our amendments. We do so because, in our opinion, that operative paragraph is not in accordance with the facts of the situation.

107. Time after time my delegation has put forward the view that however disagreeable a government in a country may be, whatever may be the sins of a particu-

Jar government of the day, that government has to be separated from the State, and to suggest by some resolution that the independence of Hungary is not there is to us not only not in accordance with the facts, but contrary to the constitution of the United Nations, to the Charter and to everything else. So, while we agree with the sentiment that the people of Hungary at the present time are engaged in endeavours to alter conditions, and that there is resistance to the form of the authorities, and so on, as I said on the last occasion, we cannot subscribe to operative paragraph 1 as it stands, and that is why we have suggested that it should be rephrased in the following way:

"Declares that intervention of Soviet armed forces in Hungary should cease and that arrangements for their withdrawal should be made so that violence and non-co-operation will cease and the restoration of peaceful conditions be rendered possible."

108. We hope it will be clear to those who look objectively at this phraseology that what we are seeking in these amendments is to deal with the situation as it is; that is to say, to obtain the withdrawal of forces so that there will be greater co-operation between the different sections of the Hungarian people, since it seems to me that the gap between the people and the government of the day is the continuance of the presence of foreign troops and the fact that arrangements are not being made for their withdrawal. References have been made to this by the representative of Peru, and I shall draw attention to these later when I deal with the draft resolution itself.

109. For operative paragraph 2, we seek to substitute the following:

"Urges the Governments of Hungary and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to promote the realization of the above in accordance with the purposes of the Charter and the declared intentions of the two Governments."

110. We would have thought that that again was a formulation arising from the factual situation, since the present situation has come about because of the conditions in Hungary, the presence of Soviet armed forces and the activities that have gone on. Therefore, unless these two Governments do something about it, how can they achieve a result? However much we may disagree with an action, unless the participants in that action can be persuaded, compelled or in some way brought to alter their positions, it is not possible to get a different state of affairs. That, again, is a realistic approach to this question, and the amendment also states that the realization of the measures in operative paragraph 1 should be "in accordance with the purposes of the Charter and the declared intentions of the two Governments". These last two words have been objected to by the representative of Peru, as, indeed, he has objected to a lot of other things, but I shall deal with that later.

111. We also seek to replace operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution by the following:

"Declares that recent events in Hungary have shown that the use of force and violence cannot bring about or promote a solution of the grave situation in Hungary, but have aggravated it and imposed severe privations and denials of freedom on the Hungarian people."

112. We believe that the formulation of operative paragraph 4 in the draft resolution is not in consonance with the facts, and that the withdrawal of armed forces

under United Nations observation would mean the creation of other machinery and reference to other organs of the United Nations, and so on. Therefore we venture to presume that if greater thought is given to it by those who drafted it, they will find reasons for requesting this new formulation.

113. We have also asked for the addition of two new paragraphs, to be numbered paragraphs 5 and 6. The main proposal in this is that the Secretary-General should initiate efforts with the Hungarian and Soviet Governments, either through their representatives here or, later on, in their capitals, in order, in spite of all that has happened, to bring about a settlement or other change in the situation that would be satisfactory to everyone concerned.

114. Before explaining our amendments, further perhaps I should deal with our draft resolution itself [A/3447], because the intention of our amendments is, so far as possible, to bring the draft resolution of the twenty Powers into line with what we and our co-sponsors believe should be the draft resolution before the Assembly. So far as our draft resolution is concerned, the representative of Peru has made some very—shall I say—eloquent objections. I have no desire to follow him in any lengthy arguments, but, for the information of the Assembly, I think we should make our position clear.

115. Objection has been made to the phrase "Noting . . . the failure to agree and to arrange for the withdrawal of Soviet forces". We are asked, why should anyone arrange for the withdrawal of anything, because we are not concerned so much with passing resolutions as in getting something achieved? We have another instance where there are foreign forces, and we have been discussing arrangements for their withdrawal for a long time. Irrespective of how any forces get into a country, or for what purpose they remain, if they are to be withdrawn, some arrangements have to be made. Since, from the practical point of view, we refer to that "failure", we are told that there is some objection to the use of the words "non-co-operation", "workers of Hungary", and so on.

116. What has been suggested by that paragraph of the draft resolution is that, in the continuance of the situation, the main point of difference between the various workers' councils and the Government is not the form of the society, is not various other things of which the representative of Peru has spoken—and cursed with bell, book and candle—but the presence of these troops. That was the common point and the narrow gap, which is very deep, and that is why we have put it down. It refers to that particular phase of the situation.

117. We are also asked why we should refer to the declaration of the Soviet Union. The reason is very simple: the Soviet Union having declared that it intends to withdraw its troops, there is all the more reason why we should say that those intentions should be kept up, and we do not feel that there is anything wrong in referring to a previous declaration, which is valid, which is pertinent to this purpose. And, what is more, irrespective of the wishes of one delegation or another, all these countries are Members of this Organization, and we propose to treat them as such.

118. The representative of Peru has told us that those who vote against or abstain on the twenty-Power draft resolution will lack dignity. But, so far as we are concerned, acting according to one's convictions and, in the case of a representative gathering like this, accord-

ing to the desires and instructions of one's Government, is more consonant with dignity than acting in any other way.

119. I have no desire to follow him in the rest of his tirade, but we are more than convinced, after hearing that speech, that the phraseology of the main paragraph, relating to condemnation, is not even in regard to action, because the whole of that speech was really full of hatred and calculated to create further divisions in the world and to prevent the emergence of any kind of peaceful coexistence at all. Whatever our differences, we shall have to live on this planet, and the greater the differences, the greater the difficulties, the greater the need for patience and also for not heating up the "cold war".

120. Those are the reasons that have prompted us to propose these amendments and also to co-sponsor the draft resolution. In spite of the fact that speeches have been made against them, and also that the twenty countries—no doubt, after a great deal of deliberation—have found it impossible to incorporate them, and that there is obviously a great deal of resistance to them, it is the duty of the sponsors of amendments to try, up to the last moment, to obtain their incorporation. The amendments and the main draft resolution are in substance not identical, but their purposes are the same, and therefore, if the amendments are incorporated into the draft resolution, then the purpose will have been achieved. This being an open assembly of debate, one goes on with the feeling that, irrespective of what has been said, there is always room for further argument, for further persuasion, and we therefore request the General Assembly to adopt all these amendments.

121. I should like to say that my delegation has sought in its own poor way to suggest some constructive approach to this problem. We have been engaged on this question now for many weeks. We adopted the first resolution on 4 November. Since then we have adopted nine others and there are several more before us. But no one can say that the situation relating to these resolutions has been resolved, and in each resolution the path followed is the same and is directed towards the expression of indignation which, rightly exists, the detailing of conditions, either known at first hand or professed to be known at first hand, along with other repudiations. But it has not brought us any nearer a solution of any of these problems.

122. The first time that I had occasion to come to this rostrum on the Hungarian question I said that, so far as our Government was concerned, our concern was the establishment and the maintenance of a government in Hungary which responded to the will of the people, as obtains elsewhere, and that they should be enabled to fulfil the purposes of the Charter as members of an international community. This purpose governs our thinking, and that is why we have tried, as far as we could, to put forward a view that takes into account the facts, without being unduly perturbed by the amount of unreceptivity created at the moment on one side or the other.

123. This draft resolution that we have put forward does not stop at regretting something, or simply condemning anything, but it asks for action to be taken, and if that action is to be taken, it is necessary that conditions should be provided. My delegation finds it difficult to pursue a negotiation with the results of that negotiation also stated. Condemnation and negotiation cannot go hand in hand. That is the last stage, when

everything else has failed; and even then one does not know that it is the last stage—there are other stages. Therefore this draft resolution requires the serious consideration of everybody in this Assembly.

124. We do not say that the Secretary-General, or anyone else, would be able to provide a magic solution, but, in this great state of tension, when powerful forces are involved and powerful feelings are engaged, as my delegation said previously, the contact between those authorities, those personalities and those Governments that are directly concerned becomes of vital importance. It is not as though, by any particular approach, there will be a sudden change in the circumstances. But, simply to pass resolutions and to deal with the whole problem of the forms of government and their ideologies, their philosophies, from the time of Plato to Spinoza and from Spinoza to today, would not really solve these problems. We may be wrong about this, but we are entitled to submit our view, and I have no doubt that, some day, we shall have to come back to this position. Even after wars are waged, negotiations become necessary. Even today we have taken a wholesome step in the United Nations, in which we have put the past behind and gone forward. Similarly, in this case also, it is necessary that the great forces which are engaged in this conflict, in this difficulty, in this situation, should be approached; and this method of talking over the wall is not the best way to deal with them. That is why my Government has instructed my delegation to submit this approach to the Assembly. We shall, therefore, with the permission of the President, at the appropriate time ask for these amendments to be put to the vote.

125. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): We think it might be useful to make a detailed statement of our opinion on the amendments to the twenty-Power draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/L.216]. We note that these amendments are drawn very largely from the language of the draft resolution submitted by these delegations and Burma [A/3437].

126. May I say, first, that there is much in these amendments of which we approve; they contain in fact a resounding condemnation of the actions of the Soviet Union in Hungary. This is further proof that the oppression of the Hungarian people by the armed forces of the Soviet Union has evoked a feeling of revulsion, not only in Europe, not only in the Americas, but throughout the whole world.

127. I welcome this expression of agreement, but we must also give consideration to the fact that most of the ideas contained, both in the draft resolution and in these amendments, have already been expressed in past resolutions on this question. There is obviously no point in a mere reiteration of views previously expressed, at this stage, but the time has come for a careful and sober appraisal of the situation and for a deliberate and solemn expression of our convictions with regard to it. In doing so, we think it is important that we should not give the appearance of retreating from the principles on which we have agreed, by such an overwhelming majority.

128. The first amendment would delete the second and third preambular paragraphs of our draft resolution. We cannot accept this amendment, because we are convinced that there is not one sentiment in these two paragraphs with which the overwhelming majority of this Assembly is not in complete accord.

129. The second amendment proposes a new text as a substitution for the sixth paragraph in the preamble of our draft resolution. This paragraph in our draft resolution reads as follows:

"Considering that recent events have clearly demonstrated the will of the Hungarian people to recover their liberty and independence".

Now we see no reason to delete this paragraph. Surely this is a statement with which every Member of this Assembly can agree.

130. We believe, however, that the wording proposed in the second amendment is a useful addition to our draft resolution and we have, therefore, incorporated it as a final paragraph in our preamble. I would like to read that wording:

"Noting the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the cessation of intervention of foreign armed forces and the withdrawal of foreign troops".

131. The third amendment expresses ideas which are largely covered in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of our draft resolution, and we therefore do not believe that it would be useful to add them to our text. Certainly we cannot agree to make this substitution for our operative paragraph 1, which declares that the Government of the Soviet Union is violating the political independence of Hungary. Here again, we do not see how any member of this Assembly can disagree with this finding. Moreover, we do not think it is accurate to speak of the reaction of the Hungarian people to the oppression which they have suffered as non-co-operation, which is the expression used in this amendment. Surely no one can properly expect any people to co-operate with oppression.

132. The fourth amendment would appear to have as one of its objectives the deletion of our operative paragraph 2, that is to say, the paragraph that condemns the violation of the Charter by the Soviet Union. Frankly, as many speakers have said in the past few days, we believe that the time has come for this Assembly to express its condemnation of Soviet action in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights.

133. The fifth and final amendment would substitute three paragraphs for operative paragraph 4 of our draft resolution. Here again, we can see no reason to delete that paragraph from our text, which merely calls upon the Soviet Union to withdraw, and which we are convinced reiterates the views of the overwhelming majority of this Assembly.

134. We fully share the view that the use of force and violence in Hungary has aggravated the plight of the Hungarian people and has denied them their freedom, but that paragraph of the proposed amendment is ambiguous. As presently drafted, it could be construed as a reflection on the Hungarian people for having resisted their oppressors and, of course, we cannot accept that.

135. The same fault is present in the second of the three proposed paragraphs. This speaks of foreign intervention and external pressure—in the abstract. The facts, as known to all of us, are that the intervention and pressure have come from the Soviet Union, and that the Soviet Union has refused to allow any investigators to go in to see whether there has been any pressure from anywhere else.

136. The third of the proposed paragraphs—is not acceptable to us for several reasons. We believe that the Secretary-General has sufficient authority under the Charter to do whatever he thinks would be helpful with regard to the Hungarian situation; if he decides that it would be helpful to go to Moscow, he would undoubtedly do so, just as he decided, very properly but on his own responsibility, to go to Peking in behalf of the American flyers—members of the United Nations forces—who were being held in Communist China.

137. Moreover, we have already, in our resolution of 4 November [1004 (ES-II)], asked the Secretary-General "as soon as possible to suggest methods to bring an end to the foreign intervention in Hungary, in accordance with the principles of the Charter". Those words are quoted directly from that resolution, and it seems to me that this constitutes an adequate and, indeed, a more proper mandate for the exercise of his good offices, or any other appropriate initiative which he may consider helpful in the circumstances.

138. However, because we have noted a widespread desire to call attention, once more, to the possibility of a constructive use of the good offices of the Secretary-General—for example, as indicated in the Austrian draft resolution [A/3441]—we have added a new and final paragraph to our draft resolution which I would now like to read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to take any initiative that he deems helpful in relation to the Hungarian problem, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly".

139. For these reasons, the United States must oppose these amendments but, in so doing, let me draw the attention of the Assembly to the great effort which was made by the group of sponsors of our draft resolution to give expression to the widest possible consensus of views—including those expressed in these amendments. We, the sponsors, have exercised great care in our choice of language, to avoid certain things which have created difficulties for some delegations in respect of past resolutions. We have chosen to stress those aspects of this matter with which we believe the great majority of this Assembly is in full agreement. We have made an effort in good faith to ascertain the views of all the Members of this Assembly. Our draft resolution is, in essence, a summing up of the consensus of opinion of the General Assembly, as nearly as we—the twenty sponsors—have been able to establish it. For that reason, we believe it deserves the support of every delegation which has declared its sympathy with the valiant struggle of the Hungarian people.

140. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Yesterday [615th meeting] we heard a statement by Mr. Horvath, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, to the effect that, on instructions from its Government, the Hungarian delegation was withdrawing from the eleventh session of the General Assembly in protest against continuing attempts at interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary and against the blatant and insulting attacks which are being made here against the Hungarian Government and its representatives.

141. The Soviet delegation regrets that the abnormal situation which has arisen at this session has made the further participation of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic in the work of the General Assembly impossible.

142. The Soviet delegation has repeatedly drawn the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the work of the United Nations is becoming increasingly marked by the introduction of practices and procedures which are akin to dictation and the presentation of ultimatums, and are at variance with the Organization's principles. The United Nations is being drawn further and further into a sinister and dangerous political game in connexion with developments in Hungary. Again under the pressure of the United States and certain other delegations, the Assembly has for three days now been forced into dealing with a question whose importance has been artificially exaggerated and to set aside problems on the agenda of its current session which are of genuine importance for the maintenance and strengthening of peace.

143. This discreditable political game is necessary to those who like to fish in troubled waters and who, by impelling the United Nations into the course of violating the sovereignty and independence of free countries, are seeking to poison the international atmosphere, sow seeds of discord among peoples, and provoke new conflicts.

144. Certain influential circles in the capitalist world, chiefly in the United States, are working on the assumption that the more envenomed the international atmosphere and the greater the hatred and hostility among peoples, the easier it will be for them to carry out their irresponsible plans, to continue the armaments race, to keep the world in a state of alarm and insecurity or, to use Mr. Dulles' words, "on the brink of war".

145. The course of the debate on the latest draft resolution inspired by the United States indicates that the representatives of certain countries are seeking, by means of dirty insinuations, hysterical outbursts, unworthy attacks and insults, to make up for the absence of arguments which would justify this shameful document. However, as is well known, such behaviour does not betoken a sound or right cause.

146. The Soviet and other delegations have already, from this rostrum, given convincing facts regarding the systematic interference by the United States in the domestic affairs of the people's democracies. If any further evidence of this kind is required, representatives need only consider the latest speech by the United States representative, which is neither more nor less than yet another direct appeal for the overthrow of the people's democratic régime in Hungary.

147. This is no accident. Disregard for the national sovereignty of free countries and blatant intervention in their domestic affairs underlie the whole course of United States foreign policy. At the present time, the attention of the leaders of the United States foreign policy and of the so-called "strategic reconnaissance" of the United States is mainly focused on Hungary. However, the course of events shows that this is only part of a broad plan of subversive activities against free and independent countries, part of an irresponsible plan for world domination. This being so, it is absolutely essential that United States interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States and its subversive activities against such States should be considered by the General Assembly.

148. The United States representative has spoken here at length about human rights. He even went so far as to pose as the champion of the Hungarian workers. What are the human rights and fundamental freedoms to which the United States representative re-

ferred? He apparently has his own peculiar ideas on the matter.

149. In this connexion, I take the liberty of recalling recent events involving one of the small Latin American countries, Guatemala, which was subjected to an armed attack inspired by monopolistic circles in the United States and, in particular, by the United Fruit Company. As a consequence of armed force and intervention from outside, the legal democratic government of Guatemala was overthrown when it decided to put an end to the plundering of national resources by foreign monopolists.

150. Are not these the kind of rights which the United States representative would like to secure for the Hungarian people?

151. Moreover, this is not the first time that the United States representative has donned the prophet's mantle. This time, indulging in wishful thinking, he spoke [613th meeting] of the disintegration of the socialist countries and the collapse of Marxist ideology. Mr. Dulles said the same at the current session of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris. But how many such prophets have we heard in the past few decades! The Soviet Union and other socialist countries live on, thrive and prosper despite all these prophecies.

152. The representative of France, whose hypocritical statement could not fail to attract attention, spoke here [613th meeting] of the crisis in the United Nations resulting from the events in Hungary. It is quite evident that this line is being taken in order to divert the Assembly's attention from the aggression against Egypt perpetrated by France together with United Kingdom and Israel. But however strenuously they may seek to take cover behind the so-called Hungarian question, the aggressors will not escape responsibility either for the fact that French and British airmen bombed peaceful towns and killed utterly innocent civilians, or for all their crimes against the Egyptian people, and against the peace and security of nations.

153. The representatives of the United States and France, whose ruling circles fostered the Nazi clique in the past and are now promoting a revival of German militarism and the spirit of revenge, have dared to take the shameful course of drawing a parallel between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. It would be difficult to imagine a greater travesty of history.

154. The whole world knows that it was primarily as a result of the heroic exertions of the Soviet Union that the bloodstained Nazi régime was crushed and world civilization saved. Would not the representative of the United States be better advised to direct his attention to certain Latin American countries with which the United States is building up relations highly reminiscent of those between Nazi Germany and the countries which it enslaved?

155. I do not intend to dwell on the statements of other representatives who spoke in support of the United States draft resolution, because these speeches are as like as two peas. I should merely like to point out that they stubbornly evaded the incontrovertible facts presented here concerning the blatant intervention by United States ruling circles in the internal affairs of free countries and their subversive activities against the governments of those countries. Certain speakers—the representative of Belgium, for instance—pushed cynicism to the point of expressing concern and alarm lest disorder and chaos in Hungary should come to an end.

156. As may be seen, the restoration of normal conditions and order in that country does not figure in the plans of the Belgian and certain other representatives who have spoken against the people's democratic régime in Hungary. They persistently evade such questions as the presence of United States military bases and armed forces in foreign territories. At the same time, slander is being heaped upon the Soviet Union and its armed forces which, at the request of the Hungarian Government, helped the Hungarian people to put down the fascist *putsch* and to prevent the formation of a hotbed of war in the very heart of Europe.

157. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation deems it essential to point out yet again that Soviet troops are stationed in Hungary in accordance with the provisions of the Warsaw Treaty, the parties to which assumed certain political and military obligations, including that of taking "such other concerted action as may be necessary to reinforce their defensive strength, in order to defend the peaceful labour of their peoples, guarantee the inviolability of their frontiers and territories and afford protection against possible aggression". The stationing of the armed forces of any State party to the Warsaw Treaty in the territory of another party takes place by agreement among all the parties to the Treaty; such action is taken only with the concurrence of the State in whose territory troops are to be stationed and at its request.

158. The Soviet Government, in its declaration of 30 October 1956, announced its readiness to enter into negotiations with the Governments of the Hungarian People's Republic and other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty on the question of the presence of Soviet troops in Hungarian territory. This question is thus exclusively a matter for the Governments of the USSR and Hungary.

159. The Soviet delegation has already stated that the discreditable effort to make political capital out of events in Hungary, the incitement and encouragement of the remnants of the Hungarian fascist gangsters, the attempts to utilize the United Nations for purposes of exerting pressure on sovereign and independent States can only have serious consequences, the full responsibility for which will rest with international reaction, which is continuing to pursue an irresponsible policy based on the principle of acting from a "position of strength".

160. The Soviet delegation maintains that the draft resolution sponsored by the United States and other countries, which is a blot on the name of the United Nations, should be withdrawn, and that all attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic and other people's democracies should be firmly halted.

161. The Assembly should proceed forthwith with its task—the consideration of questions of vital importance to the cause of peace, a solution of which is awaited by the nations that have sent their representatives to the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

162.—The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Guatemala for a reply under rule 75 of our rules of procedure.

163. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): I was absent from the Assembly hall for a few moments when, as I understand, the representative of the Soviet Union referred to my country. I therefore regret that I did not hear his actual words.

164. My delegation has, however, informed me that in an attempt to justify the misdeeds being committed in Hungary, the Soviet Union representative asserted that the previous government of Guatemala had been overthrown by foreign monopolists, and went on to say that it had been overthrown by the United Fruit Company. I do not think there is a single Guatemalan who will suffer his country to be thus insulted, especially in connexion with a dispute between East and West, whether this forms part of the "cold war" or not.

165. May I point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that we have so far taken the circumspect course of showing our inflexible opposition to communism only by our votes. We have been trying to make it impossible for the representative of the Soviet Union to cast any aspersions upon our country in this respect. I would like to remind the Soviet Union representative that when the pro-Communist government of Mr. Arbenz was overthrown in Guatemala, not a single foreign soldier was killed. On the other hand, many Soviet soldiers have already died in Hungary, and 65,000 Hungarians have been murdered.

166. What the 1954 revolution in my country is blamed for is simply the fact of having enjoyed the approval of one of the two major groups into which the world is divided. We were not to blame for such approval, nor for the fact that it was shared by so many other nations represented here, for which we are grateful.

167. I would like to place on record my delegation's protest against the unwarranted attack on my country by the representative of the Soviet Union, and to assure him that his words can never justify the mass murders and crimes being committed in Hungary.

168. Mr. MALOLES (Philippines): The Philippine delegation will vote for the twenty-Power draft resolution of which it is a co-sponsor. We have little to add to the general feeling of moral condemnation and universal indignation which the events in Hungary have generated and which, I think, merit the vote and support of all Members of the United Nations.

169. No single or collective act could better express the solidarity and sympathy of the free world on a matter so vital as the fundamental freedoms of the oppressed people of Hungary than this universal resolve to uphold the Charter and to prevent further repressive acts of a great Power. Once again, this body has shown that it possesses the necessary resolve and vitality to make momentous decisions. Henceforth, no Power, however great or powerful it may be, can violate with impunity the fundamental freedoms of other peoples or flout the provisions of the Charter or prevent respect for human dignity and rights without incurring the moral opprobrium of the whole world. By this single act the United Nations will have dissipated the serious misgivings still entertained by many people all over the world that it is only a sounding board and a glorified debating club where people can bring all sorts of problems without offering adequate solutions.

170. My delegation cannot help noting the vehement language and the outraged tone of a great number of nations that have expressed themselves in condemning the United Kingdom and France during the Suez crisis. It has failed to note however, in the draft resolution of the countries loudest in their condemnation of France and the United Kingdom, the same outraged feeling and sense of indignation about the intervention of the

USSR in the affairs of Hungary. On the contrary, we see a sense of diffidence, of restraint, of trepidation and almost of apology when we deal with the Soviet Union. Does the moral or immoral quality of an act differ when it is done by a great Power or by a small one? Is it right for the USSR to intervene in Hungary and wrong for the United Kingdom and France to take preventive action on what they consider the defence of their own interests? Can we call the intervention of the United Kingdom and France in Suez aggression without being able to place the USSR intervention in Hungary on the same level? Is it moral or legal for the United Nations to direct France and the United Kingdom to withdraw their troops from Suez without being able to request the USSR to give the same measure of relief in Hungary? May we not condemn the USSR for violating the Charter in the same measure and in the same breath that the sponsors of the four-Power draft resolution have condemned France and the United Kingdom for less violent and less bloody acts?

171. These questions answer themselves, and hang heavily on our collective conscience. It is for this reason that our delegation, while highly impressed by the temperate and conciliatory language of the draft resolution sponsored by Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3437], finds it difficult to go along with that draft resolution for its failure to condemn the USSR for Charter violations in the forcible intervention and bloody repression of the fundamental rights and freedom of the Hungarian people.

172. There is, moreover, in the four-Power draft resolution, the faint but pointed suggestion that the interests of the Hungarian people cannot be served by violent intervention, from whatever quarter it may come. Does that mean that the action of the United Nations in providing relief for the refugees and providing for their resettlement and in requesting permission for its observers to report on the conditions obtaining in Hungary can be considered as implying intervention? This statement has aroused grave doubts in our minds as to the propriety of the said draft resolution.

173. For these and other cogent reasons we have decided to vote against it.

174. Our delegation, however, will support the Austrian draft resolution [A/3441], or its incorporation into the main draft resolution requesting the Secretary-General to take any initiative helpful in relation to the Hungarian problem in conformity with the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly. This suggestion in no way detracts from the validity of the twenty-Power draft resolution, it only reinforces it and gives life to its many other proposals.

175. Mr. BEN-ABOUD (Morocco) (*translated from French*): I shall be very brief and confine myself strictly to explaining my vote.

176. My delegation has carefully studied the three draft resolutions on the Hungarian question which are before the General Assembly. Taken as a whole, these draft resolutions sum up fundamental principles which should underlie the basic purpose of the United Nations—international co-operation. The spirit behind any initiative, any expression of view or any decision in our Organization should, in our view, be respect for human freedom, whether this takes the form of protecting the individual against despotism or of defending national independence against imperialism of one kind or another.

177. My delegation accordingly considers that the draft resolutions taken together are no more than a

just and timely application of these fundamental principles. No nation has the right to dictate to other nations because they are weaker than itself. Such an attitude simply masks the spirit of domination which has been manifest recently in the Middle East and in central Europe.

178. My delegation regrets, however, that between the wording used in the resolutions concerning events in the Middle East and that used in the draft resolutions concerning events in Hungary, there is a difference which is out of key with the basic similarity of all armed aggression, no matter where committed. Logically, the tripartite aggression in Egypt should have been condemned in the same terms and in the same spirit as are to be found in the twenty-Power draft resolution on Hungary condemning the Soviet Union for a violation of the Charter. The worth of the individual, the love of independence, the sacred character of national honour, human sacrifice, all these are the same wherever they may occur. All infringements of these moral values should be attended by the same sanctions, if the principle of the equality of man is not to remain a dead letter, devoid of all practical significance.

179. One of the most dreadful aspects of the use of force by one nation against another is the sad spectacle of the flood of refugees, particularly where innocent women and children are among them. We have been appalled, and the whole world has been outraged, by the unjust tribulations recently visited on these defenceless beings. There are today about 100,000 Hungarian refugees. Happily, they have been given relief and assistance, and Morocco has contributed its share.

180. The world, however, is beginning to forget the spectacle—made even more horrible by poverty and the resulting human degradation—of nigh on one million Arab refugees. No condemnation has been pronounced in this connexion. Familiarity with the situation is beginning to breed forgetfulness and indifferences. Today territory is still being seized and towns have been bombarded, besieged and wrecked. Yet no voice is raised to condemn these land-grabbing plans and acts of aggression.

181. I would recommend that the representative of Peru defend with equal ardour the principle of the universality of moral values. Two resolutions, adopted almost nine years ago, are still a dead letter; there has not been the slightest reaction, not the least word of condemnation, no sign of a real stand. There have been deportations in that part of Egypt which was recently invaded.

182. I will not, however, allow myself to embark on a comparative study of these acts of aggression in the Middle East and in Hungary. My delegation's intention is simply to abstain from associating itself with an incoherent policy which would be interpreted as applying one standard here and another there. It is essentially in order to avoid such discrimination that strict logic compels us to abstain. Other Middle Eastern countries, particularly those which have just been subjected to the bewil-dering shock of the tripartite aggression, also intend to abstain, no doubt for the same reason as ourselves. There are also other reasons which it would take too long to enumerate.

183. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on the otherwise excellent twenty-Power draft resolution, although we approve in principle the stand it takes against the use of force and dictatorial methods.

184. On the other hand, the Moroccan delegation will vote in favour of the other two draft resolutions, sub-

mitted by the four Asian Powers and by Austria respectively. Like the previous one, these two drafts will contribute to the survival, the strength and the authority of the United Nations, which by its heartening stand on moral principles has strengthened our faith in human progress everywhere.

185. The United Nations furnishes the only practical means of continuing this progress and of safeguarding peace and freedom, without which no advance is possible. These two draft resolutions, like the previous one, take a stand against the use of force and seek to halt foreign intervention, to ensure respect for the national aspirations of the majority of a country's inhabitants and to strengthen collaboration and co-operation between Governments and peoples through the machinery for peace provided by the United Nations.

186. Thanks to the steps which they request the Secretary-General to take in the diplomatic field, these resolutions encourage us on all occasions to have recourse to peaceful means and so justify the hopes we place in this international Organization.

187. Until the last day or two we have adopted a wait-and-see attitude, in the hope that an acceptable agreement might be reached without recourse to a war of words or to measures which might lead to subsequent complications. Meanwhile, however, we have voted consistently in favour of the principle of sending observers appointed by the United Nations in accordance with its right to take cognizance of all international disputes.

188. Today it is clear that the United Nations appeal has not been heeded, despite our hopes, and that it is time to proceed to constructive measures. Out of a genuine sense of duty, we should have been happy to vote for all three draft resolutions if our conscience had not prevented us from associating ourselves with statements of views which would be interpreted as a dual-standard policy, involving discrimination between groups of human beings whose moral standing is basically the same.

189. Mr. JACOBSEN (Denmark): We have before us two main draft resolutions on the same question: the twenty-Power draft resolution [A/3436/Rev.2] co-sponsored by my country and the four-Power draft resolution [A/3437]. The difference between them is above all in the wording: one, in clear language, contains a formal condemnation of the Soviet Union; the other, in weaker, unclear language, also contains, without using the word, a condemnation of the Soviet Union which cannot be misunderstood.

190. I fear that the adoption of two different draft resolutions on the same subject, which are couched in different language, may cause confusion. My country likes tolerance, but not tolerance towards intolerance. Tolerance towards intolerance is a snake which devours itself from its tail-end. We do not like, as is done in the four-Power draft resolution, to call murder "non-co-operation". Our minds rebel against such an undertaking. Therefore it will be impossible for us to vote for that draft resolution.

191. What matters to us is to adopt a clear, strong resolution which relates the facts. But we can clearly see that there are also advantages for somebody who is not willing to follow as far as we go to have an opportunity to express his own censure of the Soviet Union, even if it is less strong. We should not like to prevent anybody from expressing his censure of the Soviet Union. The passage of two draft resolutions—

the strong and clear one by a big majority and a weaker one by a smaller majority which is otherwise composed—may cause some confusion, but it also has its advantages.

192. Therefore, if the four-Power draft resolution is voted on paragraph by paragraph, we shall vote on the different paragraphs according to their merits. We will have to vote against paragraph 3, because it may also be interpreted as censuring those who are fighting for the freedom of Hungary with their lives at stake. There is nothing that we would find more inappropriate. We will also have to vote against paragraph 5, because we find that what is proposed here is completely impracticable. On the draft resolution as a whole, however, we will abstain, in order to give all those who want to condemn the Soviet Union an opportunity to do so, even if they are not willing to do it in as strong terms as we do.

193. Mr. PINARD (Canada): I should like to make a few brief remarks to explain further the votes by the Canadian delegation on the draft resolutions now under consideration in this Assembly.

194. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by twenty delegations [A/3436/Rev.2]. It would have voted in favour of that draft resolution even if the additional paragraph had not been inserted by the co-sponsors. As I have already indicated in the debate on this matter, we strongly support the draft resolution, which condemns the conduct of the Soviet Government in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence.

195. There are a few amendments to this draft resolution offered by the delegations of Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/L.216]. In spite of the very able statement made yesterday [616th meeting] by the representative of Ceylon, and also in spite of the explanations given today by the representative of India, we shall vote against these amendments. We shall do so because we feel that these amendments as submitted bring about deletions of substantial portions of the twenty-Power draft resolution, for which we shall vote. If some of these amendments were submitted as additions to the twenty-Power draft resolution and not as substitutions for some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, my delegation would vote in favour of some parts of the amendments.

196. However, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia when it is voted on as a whole. We shall do so because we find ourselves in agreement with the greater part of it.

197. While it is true that there is inevitably some overlapping involved in the considerable number of draft resolutions with respect to the Hungarian question, we can only hope that there will be some cumulative effect of this repeated expression of world opinion on events in Hungary and the conduct of the Soviet Government. It also seems to us very important that this expression of opinion should be as wide as possible, and in this spirit we shall vote for both these draft resolutions, which we regard not as necessarily conflicting but as complementing one another.

198. In the paragraph-by-paragraph vote on the four-Power draft resolution, we shall abstain on certain portions because there seems to be some possibility of ambiguity. As a few representatives have already mentioned, it seems to us that the wording of paragraph 3, for example, might be misinterpreted as a criticism of

the courageous struggle of the unarmed Hungarian people against overwhelming odds to obtain control of their own country. For this reason, we shall abstain from voting on this paragraph.

199. Similarly, we shall abstain on paragraph 4, because it seems to us that this too could be wrongly interpreted as in some sense meaning a criticism of the efforts of the United Nations to deal with the Hungarian problem.

200. Finally, we shall abstain on operative paragraph 5, because it seems to us that it is perhaps preferable not to specify quite so precisely what action should be taken by the Secretary-General in fulfilment of his general responsibilities under the Charter. We prefer, in this connexion, the wording of paragraph 5 which has been added to the twenty-Power draft resolution. In view of this addition to the twenty-Power draft resolution, we shall abstain on the corresponding paragraph in the four-Power draft resolution.

201. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): The Polish delegation wishes to explain why it will vote against the twenty-Power draft resolution. We shall do so because in our view it is very doubtful whether the interests of the Hungarian people will be served or whether we shall help Hungary to settle the difficult and painful problem with which it is faced by generating in this Assembly an atmosphere in which passions are inflamed and differences of opinion are exacerbated.

202. We view with concern the new turn for the worse in the situation in Hungary—which means further casualties and further losses to the national economy. We believe, however—and we have repeatedly said as much from this rostrum—that the Hungarian people and the Hungarian working class will ultimately succeed in safeguarding the cause of socialism, progress and national sovereignty. That is the affair of the Hungarian people themselves, and no interference or appeals for the dispatch of observers will make their task any easier; they can only help increase tension in that part of Europe.

203. For this same reason we adopt a similar attitude in regard to the four-Power resolution and the amendments to the twenty-Power draft resolution.

204. As regards the Austrian draft resolution, which calls upon the Secretary-General to achieve a solution of the Hungarian problem, we cannot see our way to voting in favour of it. The Hungarian problem, we repeat, can only be settled by the Hungarian people themselves. It seems to me that irrespective of this or that plan for a visit by the Secretary-General to Hungary—and this matter has been the subject of discussion between him and the Hungarian Government—the Secretary-General himself cannot take upon himself a task like that of settling the Hungarian problem.

205. Mr. MATSCH (Austria): As I indicated in my statement yesterday [616th meeting], when I introduced the Austrian draft resolution, my Government is vitally interested that a constructive step be taken in addition to the action undertaken by the United Nations so far. It was with this intention that the Austrian delegation submitted its draft resolution. At that time we stated that we would not press for a vote on it unless the situation required it.

206. Since the basic idea contained in our draft resolution has been added in operative paragraph 5 of the twenty-Power draft resolution, my delegation will not

ask for a vote on its draft resolution if the twenty-Power draft resolution is adopted.

207. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now proceed to the vote. The Assembly has before it a draft resolution submitted jointly by twenty Powers, namely, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America [A/3436/Rev.2]; amendments to that draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/L.216]; and a draft resolution submitted by Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia [A/3437]. In accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure, these draft resolutions should be put to the vote in the order in which they were submitted. Furthermore, rule 92 provides that amendments to a proposal should be put to the vote first.

208. The General Assembly will therefore vote first on the three-Power amendments [A/L.216]. I now put the first amendment to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions.

209. The PRESIDENT: The second amendment has been accepted by the sponsors of the twenty-Power draft resolution, and I shall therefore not put it to the vote as an amendment.

210. I shall now put the third, fourth and fifth amendments to the vote.

The third amendment was rejected by 46 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.

The fourth amendment was rejected by 46 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

The fifth amendment was rejected by 48 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

211. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the twenty-Power draft resolution [A/3436/Rev.2]. Separate votes have been requested on each paragraph.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 58 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

The second paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 56 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.

The sixth paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

The seventh paragraph was adopted by 56 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 53 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 49 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 54 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 53 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 57 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

212. The PRESIDENT: A roll-call vote has been requested on the draft resolution as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: ~~Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia.~~

~~The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 55 votes to 8, with 13 abstentions.~~

213. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

214. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): The only draft resolution of which the General Assembly is now seized is the draft resolution submitted by three co-sponsors and ourselves. In view of the fact that all the amendments that have been proposed have been overwhelmingly defeated—and they contained the substance of this draft resolution—it is the desire of my delegation and our co-sponsors that we should not press this draft resolution to the vote.

215. My delegation wishes to state its view that, even large number of abstentions and a small majority, that would be an abuse of the procedure of the Assembly, the Assembly having just now adopted a resolution to the contrary and having defeated, in defeating our amendments, the main purpose of it. We have no desire to be a party to that kind of procedure.

216. Secondly, the purpose of the draft resolution was to set in motion some constructive step. We believe that a constructive step is impossible if, at the same time, a contrary decision has been taken in the way of a decision on the issue itself.

217. For these reasons, we request that the draft resolution be not put to the vote.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.