



Friday, 3 November 1950, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Observance in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania of human rights and fundamental freedoms: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/1437) (concluded)	353

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

Observance in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania of human rights and fundamental freedoms: report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/1437) (concluded)

[Agenda item 25]

1. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland): The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had an opportunity to fulfil its duty by recommending the discontinuance of the item which, for the third time, faces a session of the General Assembly. The Committee would thus have bolstered the prestige of our Organization. But other considerations prevailed against justice, logic and good sense. The United States and the United Kingdom had their way in the Committee. The vote on the draft resolution now before the General Assembly was nevertheless significant. While five delegations opposed the draft resolution, thirteen, by abstaining, made plain their serious misgivings in spite of obvious pressure. In other words, eighteen delegations did not approve of the substance and wording of the resolution.¹

2. At this time I wish to state again that whoever comes forward with a claim that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be observed in other countries must come with clean hands. He who preaches must practise what he preaches. This is relevant, regardless of what the representative of the United States may think. We fail to see it in this case. I also dare say that some representatives came to the debate in the Committee with preconceived ideas. Their minds were made up before the discussion had begun. Any open-minded person could draw but one conclusion. That is, that each and every argument, facts, logic, and every appeal to reason and good sense were discarded *a priori*. The representative of the United States, for instance, sought refuge in railroading the issue in the direction of a totally irrelevant issue, namely, that of the alleged expulsion of Turkish nationalists from Bulgaria.

¹ For the discussion on this subject in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee*, 2nd to 6th meetings inclusive.

3. We are now considering this question in the Assembly, which is called upon to approve or disapprove the draft resolution before us. This Assembly can and should reject this draft, which is not inspired by the spirit or letter of the Charter. If adopted, it would not be conducive to the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights. Our Organization was meant, so the Charter says, to be a centre for harmonizing the action of nations. Can you truthfully say that these base affirmations, these slanderous statements and harsh words are meant to harmonize our actions? The answer must be in the negative.

4. But allow me to briefly restate the case. In the first place, after discussion at three sessions of the General Assembly, no one has been able to substantiate the allegation that fundamental rights have been violated by Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. All statements to that effect have been mere accusations, and empty accusations at that.

5. Another avenue was explored, that of redirecting the case into other channels by defining it as a dispute. For this purpose, the authority of the International Court of Justice was used. May I remind you, however, that the Court's answer is that it is

"... not called upon to deal with the charges brought before the General Assembly since the questions put to the Court relate neither to the alleged violations of the provisions of the Treaties concerning human rights and fundamental freedoms nor to the interpretation of the articles relating to these matters".²

6. However, this clear and unequivocal statement of the Court did not prevent the representative of Australia from calling it a judgment. That appears in the record of the second meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on 2 October. Neither did it prevent the representative of the United Kingdom from stating in the Com-

² See *Interpretation of Peace Treaties, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, page 70.

mittee, on 4 October, that it would be misleading and beside the point to maintain that the Court declined jurisdiction to interpret the articles of the treaties dealing with human rights. I should like to challenge the representative of the United Kingdom to show a single word or sentence in the advisory opinion of the Court according to which it pronounces itself on the subject of human rights. And yet many speakers in the Committee took the violations of human rights for granted.

7. Conscious of the weakness of their arguments, some representatives shifted the problem to another field, namely, to the alleged duty of the three governments to send their representatives to Lake Success and/or The Hague. And they concluded, as did the representative of the United States (his morning [302nd meeting]), that, since the three governments have not done so, that constitutes a proof of their guilt. The whole case arises, as is well known, from the peace treaties signed by those three governments. Yet not a single stipulation in those peace treaties imposes upon the three governments such a duty, and none of the delegations which voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Committee can prove the existence of such an alleged duty.

8. Of course, there was a possibility of having the representatives of those three countries in this Assembly, the simplest way being the admission of those States to the United Nations. Yet that admission was refused. I repeat—the simplest way of having them here was to admit those States to the United Nations. Thus we arrive at a very strange situation indeed. On the one hand, some representatives want them to be present; and, on the other hand, they refuse to admit them.

9. It is obvious that the whole case rests on the peace treaties. Therefore we maintained and continue to maintain that neither the General Assembly nor the International Court of Justice was competent to deal with the matter. But even the Court, in its advisory opinion of 18 July, denied the authors of the whole case the right to initiate any procedure as provided by the peace treaties without the clear and explicit consent and co-operation of the three States directly concerned. Thus, having failed with the Court, the proponents of this campaign returned to this forum in order to carry on.

10. In order to show some of the true aims, it is to the point to mention that the promoters of this campaign not only by-pass Article 2, paragraph 2 of the Charter, and distort the spirit and letter of Article 55 c, but that they conveniently fail to mention article 4 of the peace treaties with Bulgaria and Hungary and article 5 of the peace treaty with Romania. Those articles are pertinent to the case. They impose upon the three governments the obligation not to permit the existence and activities of organizations which, among other things, conduct propaganda hostile to the United Nations, including revisionist propaganda, organizations of a fascist type and organizations engaged in anti-democratic activities.

11. It has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt that those accused and sentenced during the trials in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania were leaders of organizations described in Articles 4 and 5 of the peace treaties. Why, then, such bashful silence about these stipulations? It is clear that the Bulgarian, Hungarian and Romanian criminals were to have been the spear-head of Anglo-American interventionism in the three

peoples' democracies. As the campaign in which our Organization is told to participate is but one facet of Anglo-American interventionism, it could not be expected that the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other countries would mention these articles of the peace treaties.

12. The real motive behind the draft resolution now before us is to obtain from this Assembly another go-ahead signal for the interventionist campaign of the United States, so that that Power can intervene whenever and wherever it suits its purposes.

13. In pursuing this aim, the United States and its friends forget to remind the Assembly that each and every country has its security laws. In the case of the United States and some other countries, the laws are conducive to witch-hunting where labour leaders and leaders of the peace movement are concerned. This witch-hunt is being encouraged by the highest authorities in the United States. It is therefore cynical to question the right of the peoples of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to enact such laws as they deem proper for the preservation of governments of their own choice. It is even more cynical to criticize the courts which the people of these three countries have established in accordance with their laws. The United States delegation has chosen to do so while the Scottsboro case, the Ingram case, the Willie McGee case and the case of the Martinsville seven stand out as examples of United States justice, and while those in charge of the enforcement of the law cannot boast of their integrity.

14. Racial discrimination against Negroes, Latin-Americans and Orientals is not only a custom in a large portion of the United States; it is sanctioned by law and by the courts of justice. Where, if not in the United States, could a congressman, during a congressional hearing, call a distinguished citizen: "You black so-and-so"? This happened on 4 August of this year. The United States representative cannot whitewash himself by calling the circumstances irrelevant to the case of human rights.

15. The record of the United Kingdom is far from good, especially where colonial people are concerned. Australia's policy toward aborigines and coloured people is a shameful one. The campaign against labour, the peace movement and all forms of progress is rampant. We shall not insist at this time on similar facts concerning Bolivia, Cuba and other accusing countries. What they really do is to follow the lead of the United States. Of course, they do it in accordance with the customs of their own ruling classes. When their moral right to appear as accusers was eloquently challenged in the Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union and by others, the representative of the United States remained silent. The silence was shared by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia. Is it proper for them, may I ask, to appear as accusers? While their own consciences are heavily burdened, they appear empty-handed with unsubstantiated allegations and slanderous accusations.

16. There is also another aspect of this campaign which was mentioned this morning by the representative of the United States. The United Nations is supposed to take part in a propagandistic attempt to overthrow the democratic and progressive régimes in Europe.

This was implicitly stated in the Committee by the representative of the Netherlands, on 5 October. He said in substance that the repeated discussion of the question would allow people in all countries still under the spell of communistic propaganda to realize the actual facts. This admission needs no comment. But what has our Organization to do with such wishful thinking of the representative of the Netherlands? Is it our function to incite criminal organizations against the lawful governments of these countries? The record of those governments speaks for itself.

17. In the course of our discussions, I have stressed the record of the three peoples' democracies concerned—social progress as compared with pre-war backwardness and oppression; the right of all to work instead of unemployment and misery; equality before the law in lieu of privileges; the raising of the standard of living; schools for all versus the illiteracy of bygone days.

18. Does the representative of the Netherlands really believe that the retention in one shape or another of the item before us will induce the peoples of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to desire the return of their previous lords and masters and the intervention of their foreign protectors? Of course, following this trend of thought, the representative of the Netherlands, as did some others, lightly dismissed the agreement between Church and State in Hungary, which was read in the Committee; and the quotations from the Bulgarian, Hungarian and Romanian Constitutions regarding religious liberty and so forth. Nevertheless, facts remain facts, and no wishful thinking or one-track-mindedness can dismiss substantiated arguments and replace them by unsubstantiated accusations.

19. What are we then to do at this juncture? The draft resolution is unacceptable both in its substance and in its wording. It is not a compromise as stated by the representative of the United States. It is a *diktat* of a coerced majority.

20. Paragraph 5, for instance, admits implicitly that no one else but those who sign the treaty or treaties have any rights in connexion with the clauses contained therein. At the same time, however, it aims at the continuation of a campaign of slander through the intermediary of the Secretary-General.

21. As to paragraphs 2 and 4, which are couched in harsh language, it is again necessary to recall that the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania were not found to be violating the obligations of their respective peace treaties, and the General Assembly has, therefore, no right to condemn them or to note its anxiety.

22. As I pointed out in a statement before the Committee, paragraph 3 contains a most deliberate, unfounded and extraordinary assumption that the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania are aware that breaches of the treaties are being committed. Where is there the slightest evidence to this effect? No allegations have been substantiated. As I indicated in the course of the Committee's discussions, such an assumption seems to be an excursion in the domain of psychology—a ridiculous excursion and, therefore, incompatible with the dignity of our Organization.

23. Paragraph 4 suggests that the General Assembly should subscribe to and endorse slanderous and baseless

accusations. This is indeed very dangerous. The allegation contained in paragraph 4 to the effect that the three governments have made no satisfactory refutation of certain accusations is a typical example of distortion. All accusations have met with clear statements containing the elements of every case. The circumstance that these refutations have been thrown overboard by the accusers is not a sufficient basis for the statement contained in paragraph 4.

24. Each and every element of the draft resolution—and the draft as a whole—gives every ground for its rejection. It is based on facts which are not substantiated, and the conclusions have nothing in common with real and substantiated facts. I therefore urge the General Assembly to reject it and thereby to discontinue the consideration of an item which has long enough been an obstacle to our efforts to develop friendly relations among nations, and which has contributed to preventing our Organization from becoming a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends.

25. Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): The delegation of New Zealand feels that it would be failing in its duty if it did not explain very briefly the policy that it adopts in connexion with this fundamental question of human rights.

26. This is not a new question. The point of view of New Zealand has been explained very firmly indeed on previous occasions, and that point of view remains unaltered. We deplore and condemn these grave and continued denials of justice, these breaches of those elementary canons common to all religions and to all moral concepts of what is right and decent and proper in the relations of man with man and in the relations of a government with its citizens. To us it is incredible that, in this year of grace, any government claiming to be a civilized administration should refuse even to discuss, in the terms in which it solemnly promised to discuss, such shocking allegations. While this denial of the most elementary rights exists, while there is this contumacious refusal to perform a bounden duty, the countries concerned will be held by the whole free world—by right-thinking men and women everywhere—to be in contempt of civilization and to be derelict in their duty to the world and in the observance of their pledged word.

27. I wish it were possible for the United Nations to do something more directly to assist the innocents who have suffered and are suffering. Today, action seems to be beyond our power, but it is within our power—and it is indeed our bounden duty—to express in the firmest possible words our detestation of what has taken place and our determination, as and when we can, to build a world in which such crimes cannot be repeated.

28. Mr. PLAISANT (France) (*translated from French*): Each time that this question has been placed on the agenda we have voiced our indignation that these crimes should go unpunished and that the culprits remain unconcerned.

29. The General Assembly has twice [*resolutions 272 (III) and 294 (IV)*] expressed its feelings; it has appealed to Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. It has asked those countries, which have applied to be admitted among us as equals, to clear themselves of the charges which disqualify them for admission and to fulfil their

obligations, especially those concerning the respect for human rights. Far from answering that appeal, the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania have persisted in the error of their ways.

30. In the meantime the International Court of Justice has given its opinion³ upon the questions which the General Assembly put to it last year. The advisory opinion was precisely what the French delegation had predicted. The Court recognized that the dispute which had arisen between some of the signatories to the peace treaties on the one hand, and Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania on the other, concerning the fulfilment of their obligations for the safeguarding of human rights, was a dispute which could be submitted to the organs of arbitration provided for in those treaties. It thus asserted that it was incumbent upon Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to submit to arbitration and to designate their arbiters.

31. The advisory opinion of the Court—as the French delegation said last year [234th meeting]—obviously could not, in the absence of specific stipulations in the treaties, supply us with weapons against the bad faith of the defendants and their systematic refusal to carry out the specific undertakings which they had accepted. Once again we are in the same impasse. While the victim suffers, the accused escapes both the charge and the verdict. If our conception of our duties and our responsibilities were less lofty, we might succumb to the temptation to let the matter go by default and judge those who refuse to appear in court *in absentia*. Wisdom has prompted us hitherto not to take that course, although we might have been morally justified in taking more drastic steps.

32. The case remains open; it cannot be closed so long as evidence can be accumulated and sifted. It is now up to the defence to present its case, so that justice may be done.

33. But there is one thing in this whole vast affair which we can—and must—condemn here and now. The highest international judicial authority has told us what the law is with regard to the procedure for the enforcement of the peace treaties. We know that Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania are under the legal obligation to submit to arbitration and to appoint arbiters. They have not done so; they have even explicitly refused to do so. That is inexcusable; it is a serious breach of a contractual obligation of which we are bound to take cognizance in this very Assembly, whose law is that contracts are sacred and which itself depends on an international contract.

34. The draft resolution of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee wisely refers to these considerations, the basic conclusions of which I have emphasized. In giving its approval to the draft resolution, the French delegation intends not only to register a protest against a betrayal of justice, but to record its insistence on the strict observance of contractual obligations and its respect for the safeguarding of human rights, which is an integral part of our national tradition and has now been proclaimed by the United Nations as our international ideal.

³ See *Interpretation of Peace Treaties, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950, page 65, and ibid., (second phase), page 221.*

35. Mr. ICHASO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): For more than two years our Organization has been concerned with the abnormal situation prevailing in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms and, above all, with the systematic refusal of the governments of those countries to correct such improper conduct.

36. Since the third session of the General Assembly, ample proof has been submitted of the fact that those peoples are being denied their elementary rights, and, as though such evidence were not more than enough, there is the testimony of very respectable persons and institutions and of all the free Press of the world, which leaves no doubt as to the grave responsibility of the Hungarian, Bulgarian and Romanian authorities have incurred in such serious cases as that of Cardinal Mindszenty, and others which need not be mentioned because they are well known in all countries where the expression of thought and reports on facts are not subject to official censorship.

37. The great majority of delegations in this Assembly has never had any doubt that under those totalitarian régimes the people are in a disadvantageous position in regard to their essential rights, notwithstanding the crude sophistries that the defenders of those States where official terror prevails have used in the attempt to conceal certain crimes—although no smoke screen or iron curtain thick enough to hide such crimes has yet been invented.

38. For that reason it is strange that in this fifth session the Assembly has, in my opinion, still acted in such a very cautious and circumspect manner on such a serious and important question. Perhaps that attitude may be attributed to the evasive answer given by the International Court of Justice. Although the Court's opinion in principle condemns the attitude taken by the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, it is not favourable to legal determination of the matter and rules out the possibility of submitting it to the methods of arbitration provided for in the peace treaties.

39. Ever since 1948, we have been in favour of a positive condemnation of the violations and transgressions repeatedly committed by the governments of these three Balkan nations without subterfuge or euphemism. We believe that in dealing with fundamental questions the United Nations should reject any policy of pretence, appeasement or evasion. The armed invasion of a sovereign State by the armed forces of another is, in our opinion, no more fundamental than disregard of human rights and the violation of the inherent rights of the individual in any country which prides itself on being civilized. For, although invasion causes material damage and loss of life, violation of the freedom and dignity of man causes just as irreparable moral damage and provokes a profound disturbance in the mind of mankind.

40. In my opinion, the argument that the safeguarding of human rights is a domestic concern of States is invalid. No State based on a free and respected citizenry can hide behind such an argument in order to avoid its fundamental duties to its subjects. Attacks upon individual freedoms, wherever they may occur, are of such a character that they go beyond national frontiers and assume a world-wide character.

41. It is to be noted that the Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948 [resolution 217 A (III)] is described as universal. The preamble to the Declaration states that a recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, and that disregard for human rights has resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind.

42. From this it follows that a just peace, that is, a genuine, stable and lasting peace, is incompatible with systems of government which attempt to enclose the human spirit in iron moulds within which the will is atrophied, thought is stunted and conscience ceases to exist as the governing principle of conduct.

43. Peace, the supreme desire of man and his greatest good on earth, requires conditions of life favourable to the full development of the individual in what is highest and noblest—freedom and dignity.

44. So long as there are régimes or governments which enslave the human spirit and prevent the individual from thinking, believing, feeling and acting in accordance with his mind and conscience, war will continue to be a constant threat to mankind.

45. On the other hand, we, the Members of the United Nations, are committed under Article 55 c of the Charter to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. It is therefore not optional but mandatory for the Assembly to intervene firmly in all cases of flagrant and systematic violation of fundamental human freedoms.

46. As I stated in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee when this matter was discussed, the Assembly, faced by the authoritative but over-literal decision of the International Court of Justice, must give up the idea of having the problem settled through legal channels and adopt a different course in order to arrive at a satisfactory solution.

47. With this in view, the Australian representative submitted a draft which was admirable in principle but drawn up in such prudent and cautious terms as to give the impression that he was afraid to roll up his sleeves and get down to the question. My delegation considered that it was necessary to go further and take an attitude in keeping with the acts which had been denounced; it felt that the fact that three States had not only persisted in violating human rights and fundamental freedoms, but had also turned treaties into dead letters and scoffed at the Assembly's decisions—thus clearly showing their inability to fulfil their commitments and to conduct themselves fittingly as members of the international community—should be subject to moral punishment.

48. The Cuban delegation, therefore, which supported the substance of the Australian draft resolution, submitted certain amendments with three ends in view. In the first place, the Assembly was openly to condemn the three accused governments, without circumlocution or consideration of extenuating circumstances. Secondly, it was to take note of the fact that the refusal of those governments to appoint representatives to the treaty commissions, in order to settle a dispute whose existence had been recognized by the Court, constituted yet an-

other proof that those governments did not observe human rights and fundamental freedoms. Thirdly, it was to decide that as long as the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania did not change their attitude, their applications for admission to membership of the United Nations would not be considered.

49. We do not deny the radical character and the strong tone of these Cuban amendments, but we believe that mild language cannot be used in the face of such stern realities. We consider that everything proposed by my delegation was just and in keeping with the seriousness of the facts. It was nevertheless easy for us to observe that the majority, for reasons which we respect—although we do not share them—was inclined to continue to deal more mildly with the matter. In the circumstances, it would have been futile categorically to insist on our point of view. My delegation has therefore confined itself to making its point of view on this question clear.

50. We were very grateful to the Australian representative for agreeing to revise the original text of his draft in accordance with two of our amendments. We believe that his understanding and generous attitude has at least made it possible for the Assembly to agree, as it surely must, to a specific condemnation of the attitude of the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania in systematically and stubbornly attacking the freedom and dignity of the human being.

51. Let that suffice. The United Nations has certainly made great strides in the defence of moral principles and the application of such principles. The events in Korea show that all the democratic peoples of the world stand ready to combat armed aggression wherever it may occur. The Assembly's condemnation of the improper conduct of the three Balkan States concerned—and it is certainly going to pronounce such condemnation—is a proof that our concern for human rights continues to grow and is about to take a concrete and fitting form.

52. The United Nations does not exist merely to discuss and settle conflicts between States by peaceful methods; it also exists to ensure man a secure, dignified and free life throughout the world.

53. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): We have reached the end of the third stage of the efforts the United Nations began in 1949—on the initiative of Bolivia, supported by Australia—to compel Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to observe those human rights which they had violated so shockingly that the feelings of all men in all parts of the world were outraged.

54. The procedure followed in this matter, which the civilized world wished to bring to a successful conclusion, was inspired by the principles of the Charter. The Charter is not only a multilateral treaty binding upon States, but also, I think, a code of political morals and a standard of conduct to which all peoples should aspire if they wish to consider themselves worthy of civilization and of the modern world.

55. We were disconcerted at the outset regarding the fulfilment of the Charter obligations to respect human rights; later we were led to take action in more practical and positive ways. My country raised the question within the framework of the Charter, but it then encountered the insurmountable barrier of Article 2, paragraph 7,

which constitutes an obvious contradiction in that admirable document: for the Charter attempts to promote rights whose observance it cannot require. In this case it cannot require observance, because respect for human rights is incumbent upon States and international compulsion cannot be brought into play in matters affecting internal sovereignty.

56. Faced with that obstacle, we found an expeditious solution in the peace treaties, articles 4 and 5 of which enjoin a contractual obligation which establishes a rule of positive law. The General Assembly found that in that matter it could act legally by invoking the obligations laid down in the peace treaties.

57. We know what course that action has taken. We know that the International Court of Justice handed down an advisory opinion in response to the General Assembly's request for such an opinion. In the Bolivian delegation's view that opinion does not in any way preclude positive action in order to ensure the observance of human rights.

58. As the representative of France has stated, the arbitration provided for in the treaties is binding upon the parties. The only negative element in the Court's opinion is to be found in the statement that a third party may not intervene in the organization of the arbitration tribunal.

59. That new effort having been frustrated, we reached the third stage in our struggle for observance of human rights in a confident and calm frame of mind. That struggle was not inspired by orders or proposals of a political character, but rather by the profound consciousness of mankind that the individual is the essential nucleus of society and that nothing is more tragically defenceless than a man confronting a State which disregards the law and oppresses him.

60. That consciousness, despite the legal provisions in the Charter obstructing coercive action, is nevertheless growing and, under the protective shadow of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the conscience of mankind is identifying itself with the will and fate of individuals of all countries and regions of the world.

61. In this third stage to which I have referred, my delegation has tried to introduce two concepts. The first is an interpretation of fact, for it is impossible to go into the abstract field of principles unless we start from facts, and the fact is the flagrant violations of human rights, reported to us persistently and eloquently, committed by the Governments of Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania. Those violations have provoked collective action of moral persuasion, which has convinced us that there is a universal concern for the observance of human rights.

62. Our amendment, which would have the United Nations intervene wherever there was a violation of human rights regardless of whether a State was concerned or not, was not adopted. Nevertheless, the fact is even stronger than the Assembly's action, for we find in the very important proposal which we have just approved—I refer to paragraph 15 of the resolution on united action for peace [A/1456]—that Member States are called upon to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, doubtless because it is felt that united action for peace cannot be achieved without respect for human rights.

53. In accordance with that conviction, my delegation tried to broaden the provisions of the Australian draft resolution. It desired that all Member States should be informed of the deliberations and studies of States and of the Secretary-General on these cases of violations, so that they might have a detailed account of activities which outraged their conscience as civilized nations. The draft resolution which we are approving condemns, invites, deplors and thus brings a moral and spiritual pressure to bear on the transgressors. I believe it constitutes a step forward, a firm step towards what we wish to achieve—the ideal proclaimed in Paris, which is one of the triumphs of which the United Nations can be proud.

64. I hope that we shall not waste time and that one day that moral objective will be reached; in other words, I hope that one day we shall not need legal subterfuges, but usher in that principle through the front door, so that the world may live without fear, relying on the respect which governments owe the individual, since governments are but the expression of the individual's will. In that hope, I urge the Assembly to vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

65. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The question of the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania is being discussed for the third time by the General Assembly.

66. At previous sessions, when the question was discussed, and in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee at this session, the USSR delegation and the delegations of certain other countries proved, on the basis of documentary evidence, the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, how illegal it was for the United Nations to discuss that question; furthermore, they exposed the absurdity and inconsistency of the slanderous accusations made by the representatives of the Anglo-American bloc against the three peoples' democracies—Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania—in connexion with the alleged non-observance by those countries of human rights and fundamental freedoms and their alleged violation of peace treaties.

67. In summarizing the substance of the discussions on this question and in analysing the motives of those who were responsible for its submission to the Organization, it is essential to note certain facts. Neither the United Nations Charter nor the fundamental principles of international law have ever provided—or now provide—any legal basis for the discussion of this question in the United Nations.

68. In the course of the discussion of the question, the USSR delegation has frequently called attention to the fact that the Charter categorically forbids the Organization to interfere in matters which lie within the domestic jurisdiction of any State and does not require either Member States or non-member States to submit such matters to the Organization for consideration. During the discussion of the question in the United Nations, none of the initiators of this slander against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania have been able, without contradicting common sense, the fundamental provisions of the Charter and the generally accepted principles of international law, to refute the indisputable fact that this

question lies exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of those three States and that the United Nations has nothing to do with it or is entitled to deal with it.

69. The authors of this plot, who have brought the totally unfounded charges against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, have also been unable to refute the universally recognized legal fact that the United Nations Charter does not confer upon the Organization and its subsidiary bodies the right to deal with questions which have arisen as the result of the Second World War and, moreover, does not confer upon them the right to concern themselves with questions relating to the interpretation or observance of peace treaties. Such questions are beyond the scope of the United Nations and do not lie within its competence. The fact that the question of the alleged violation of peace treaties by Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania was originally submitted to the General Assembly under the pressure of the Anglo-American bloc, and was subsequently submitted, under the same pressure, to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion, in itself constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter.

70. The attempt by the parties to this plot to base their argument on Article 55 c of the Charter, which calls for universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, is equally vain. It has already been proved frequently, by documents as well as by reference to the Constitutions and legislative measures enacted by Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, that these three peoples' democracies, after the overthrow of their monarcho-fascist régimes, have resolutely embarked upon a course of comprehensive democratic reform, which has fundamentally altered social, political and economic conditions in those countries and established them on the basis of real popular democracy.

71. The Constitutions of these States guarantee to all citizens, without distinction as to sex, nationality, race, religion, educational or property status, absolute equality before the law and the right to work, to leisure, to social security and to education. The Constitutions of these countries guarantee the inviolability of the citizen's person and his home and the privacy of correspondence; they guarantee freedom of speech and assembly, as well as the right to hold meetings and demonstrations and to take part in societies and organizations. Any propaganda for, or expression of, hostility, hatred or discrimination on grounds of race or nationality is punishable by law. The Constitutions of these States provide for the equality of all citizens before the law and for the application of that law to all citizens on an equal basis. All laws and regulations of the former fascist governments—the Horthy régime in Hungary, the Antonescu régime in Romania and the monarcho-fascist régime in Bulgaria—which limited the people's rights, have been revoked. The popular democratic authorities in these countries guarantee their citizens freedom of religion and of conscience.

72. As a result of these comprehensive democratic reforms, millions of people have, for the first time, received not only full freedom and wide democratic rights, but also the material conditions for leading an independent existence, free from want and fear of the morrow. As a result of agrarian reforms, millions of peasants

who owned no land or but little have been given land for the first time in the history of these countries. Unemployment has been abolished forever. Hundreds of thousands of unemployed persons have been given work. The right to work has not only been formally included and proclaimed in the Constitutions of these countries, but the peoples' democratic régimes now in power there have ensured the realization and implementation of that right.

73. The existence and development of peoples' democratic régimes in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania have proved clearly to the whole world that the peoples' democratic order is based primarily on the desire to ensure real equality for all citizens, irrespective of their race, sex, language or religion. Concern for freedom, equality and the greater welfare of the people is the very basis of the peoples' democratic régimes. That is the unalterable law of the development of the peoples' democratic order.

74. In the light of these well-known and irrefutable facts, the attempts of the enemies of the peoples' democracies to accuse these countries of non-observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms are pitiable and ridiculous.

75. The discussion of this trumped-up and slanderous Anglo-American charge at three sessions of the General Assembly has shown the whole world that the enemies of the peoples' democracies are trying to use the Charter and this Organization itself to foster enmity and hatred among peoples, to justify their attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign States and to make those States subservient to a foreign and hostile will. These intentions are contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. They are contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7 and to Article 55 of the Charter, to which I have already referred.

76. It is said that the United States delegation laid particular stress on the inclusion of Article 2 in the Charter in order to avoid United Nations interference in the internal affairs of the United States, where, as we all know, millions of Negroes are subjected to a repugnant and humiliating racial discrimination and to lynchings, just as they were a hundred years ago, and where racial discrimination is exercised in respect of certain other national groups which do not belong to the so-called Anglo-Saxon master race.

77. These facts are known throughout the world, and constitute a flagrant violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Yet the United Nations does not take up or consider this question, it does not include it in the agenda of the General Assembly and the question is not discussed in the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations, because it is obvious that, under the aforementioned San Francisco formula and in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, such questions do not fall within the competence of the United Nations. The Charter does not allow the Organization to interfere in the domestic affairs of States. This principle of the Charter applies alike to Members of the Organization and to non-member States. Thus any interference in the domestic affairs of these States constitutes a flagrant violation not only of the Charter, but of the generally accepted tenets of international law.

78. The representatives of the Anglo-American countries, who are fully aware of the injustice and illegality

of submitting this question to the United Nations, attempt to base their arguments on the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. It is well known that the political provisions of these treaties laid down the following fundamental clauses:

(1) Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania must ensure that all persons within their jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, enjoy human rights and fundamental freedoms:

(2) The laws of these countries must not establish any discrimination on the ground of race, sex, language or religion, and all manner of discriminatory legislation enacted by the former fascist régimes in those countries and the restrictions arising out of such legislation must be repealed.

(3) These countries must take measures to disband all political, military and para-military organizations of a fascist character in their territories, and in future must not countenance the existence or activities of such organizations, the sole purpose of which is to deprive the peoples of their democratic rights.

79. In accordance with these fundamental political provisions of the peace treaties, the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania have guaranteed in their Constitutions and legislative enactments the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all citizens without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, repealed the discriminatory legislation of the former fascist régimes and taken measures to disband fascist organizations. They are also taking appropriate steps to prevent the existence and activities of organizations whose purpose is to deprive the peoples of their democratic rights.

80. The trials held in these countries, which were used by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom as a pretext for attempted interference in the domestic affairs of these States, have shown clearly that the accused persons were leaders or members of anti-democratic and anti-popular organizations whose purpose was to deprive the peoples of those countries of their democratic rights.

81. The Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty and the "communist" Minister Rajk in Hungary were both arraigned and prosecuted for the same crime, that of leadership of organizations whose purpose was to overthrow the democratic régime in Hungary and to deprive the Hungarian people of their democratic rights. The same sentence was passed on them both, in strict accordance with the law. They were both accused and sentenced on the basis of the same law (Law VII, 1946, article 1, paragraph 1).

82. Mr. Cohen, the United States representative, by using the names of these criminals, these enemies of the Hungarian people, invoking their official positions and juggling with words, has endeavoured to show that the conviction of Mindszenty and Rajk was evidence of the existence in Hungary of terrorism and a violation of human rights. But in the eyes of all objective and unbiased persons, any such assertion is merely absurd. The fact that both these criminals, one in a cardinal's robe and the other garbed as a minister, were convicted by the Hungarian people's court for the same crime and on the basis of the same law, merely serves to show that in Hungary, as in the other peoples' democracies, all

citizens are equal before the law and have an equal responsibility for crimes they have committed, whatever their social or professional status.

83. This irrefutable and universally known fact serves to foil all the attempts of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Cuba and other countries to bring absurd charges against Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania, namely, that these countries have allegedly violated human rights and fundamental freedoms.

84. It is also well known that when the activities of a number of illegal and clandestine organizations were exposed in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, documentary evidence showed, in the first place, that nearly all of them planned to deprive the people of their democratic rights and were plotting the overthrow of the popular democratic régimes in those countries and, in the second place, that they had gambled on the restoration in those countries of reactionary or avowed fascist régimes of the type of the Horthy régime in Hungary, the Antonescu régime in Romania and the czarist régime in Bulgaria.

85. It was also conclusively proved from the documents that all these enemies of the Bulgarian, Hungarian and Romanian peoples were connected with the official representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States; they acted strictly in accordance with the orders of their foreign masters and worked for them as spies and saboteurs. The public trials showed that the defendants were not only the implacable enemies of the Bulgarian, Hungarian and Romanian peoples and of the popular democratic régimes in those countries, but that they were agents of the Anglo-American intelligence services and were consequently traitors to their countries and their peoples.

86. It is worth noting in this connexion that none of those who brought the question under discussion to the notice of the General Assembly has been able to deny, without flouting common sense and the generally accepted principles of international law, the universally recognized fact that the trial and condemnation of conspirators and persons guilty of crimes against the State, of spies and saboteurs, of those who have betrayed the national interest, is a question which is within the domestic jurisdiction of every sovereign State. No one has been able or will be able to dispute the right of sovereign States to take any measures against such persons which they may consider necessary in accordance with the law. No one—and that includes the United Nations—is entitled to interfere in such matters.

87. Not only those trials but also more recent trials, such as those of the Anglo-American spies Vogeler and Sanders in Budapest, have shown that there was a great and widespread network of spies and agitators in Hungary which was directed by the competent representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. At the trial of Vogeler and Sanders, the defendants and witnesses named and exposed approximately forty United States citizens and more than ten British subjects who were engaged in spying and subversive activities against Hungary. More than fifteen United States citizens and ten British subjects who had also worked as spies and saboteurs against Hungary were unmasked at the trial of Rajk in Budapest.

88. The trials have shown that the ruling circles in the United States and the United Kingdom are still continuing to nurture plans involving direct intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary. In their stubborn attempts to give effect to these plans, they rely on elements hostile to the popular democratic régimes of those countries, making spies of them and using them to carry out subversion.

89. As soon as one group of people carrying out espionage and subversion in these countries collapsed, new groups were planted. The defendants in the trials to which I have referred fully confessed that they had engaged in espionage and subversion. The confessions took place at public trials in the presence not only of large numbers of the public but also of all the foreign journalists in the countries concerned; those journalists categorically denied in their articles and special dispatches the slanderous allegations concerning those trials which were made in official United States and British propaganda. The trials made it abundantly apparent that all the threads of conspiracy and espionage in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania were manipulated by the official representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom.

90. The debate at three sessions of the General Assembly on the Anglo-American slanders about Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania has left no room for doubt that it was in order to distract attention from their subversive activities in those countries and to use the United Nations as an instrument for exerting political pressure on them that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom brought the question of the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania before the United Nations.

91. At this session of the General Assembly, considerable attention was paid in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the so-called opinion of the International Court of Justice which was rendered at the request of the fourth session of the General Assembly. As we know, the Anglo-American bloc, which is at the bottom of the slanders about Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, forced on the fourth session of the Assembly a resolution containing a request that the International Court of Justice should be asked to give an advisory opinion on the following four questions:

(1) Do there exist, between Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania on the one hand, and certain Powers signatories to the treaties of peace on the other, any disputes bearing on the implementation of the articles of the treaties concerning the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, which are subject to the provisions for the settlement of disputes contained in those articles of the peace treaties which deal with the interpretation or implementation of the treaties?

(2) In the event of an affirmative reply to the first question, are the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania bound to appoint their representatives to the treaty commissions?

(3) If they have not appointed their representatives to these commissions within the prescribed time limit, is the Secretary-General of the United Nations authorized to appoint the third member at the request of the

other party to the dispute, that is to say, at the request of the United States and the United Kingdom?

(4) In the event of an affirmative reply to the third question, would a treaty commission composed of representatives of one side alone, that is to say, of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, and of a third member appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, constitute a commission, within the meaning of the relevant treaty articles, competent to make a definitive and binding decision in settlement of a dispute?

92. Any objective observer with the rudiments of an education who reads carefully the four questions which I have just mentioned cannot fail to conclude that such questions have been raised only in order to further the wishes of the United States and the United Kingdom. They want to establish, by fair means or foul, a so-called treaty commission composed solely of an Anglo-American representative and a "third" member appointed on their orders by the United Nations Secretary-General. They want this "tripartite" commission, composed of two members—a commission without precedent in international practice—to adopt definitive decisions binding on Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania.

93. The tendentiousness, illegality and absurdity of the whole of this undertaking were fully exposed by the USSR delegation at the fourth session of the General Assembly. The delegation of the Soviet Union pointed out that the General Assembly was not competent to ask for the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on that matter because it was a matter exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. For the same reasons, as the USSR delegation further indicated, the Court was not competent to discuss that matter without the consent of the governments of the States directly concerned, namely, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. The head of the Soviet Union delegation, Mr. Vyshinsky, told the Assembly at that session [234th meeting] that the reference of that question to the Court in itself constituted contempt of the peace treaties, and a flouting of legal logic and, at the same time, an overt violation of the Charter and an act of disrespect towards the Court. The negative replies of the Court to the third and fourth questions in the General Assembly resolution fully confirm the soundness of the position which the USSR delegation adopted on this matter at the fourth session.

94. The International Court of Justice, which is an organ of the United Nations, is not competent to examine this matter for the further reason that the right to interpret the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania is not vested in the United Nations and its organs; under the provisions of those treaties, that right is vested solely in the contracting parties.

95. The United Nations and its organs have no right whatever to interpret these peace treaties. We know that under Article 96 of the Charter, the General Assembly may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on legal questions. In this case, however, the matter referred to the Court was not a legal question, but an issue raised for the definite political purpose of using the authority of the Court and of the General Assembly in order to exert shameless

political pressure on the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to change their policy on matters exclusively within their domestic jurisdiction.

96. The Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, as the parties directly concerned in this question, objected to any discussion of the unwarranted and illegal complaints made against them by the United States and United Kingdom Governments. The Court had no legal right to examine that matter. By taking cognizance of it and giving an opinion on it, the Court violated the Charter and its own Statute, as well as the generally accepted principles of international law.

97. That the Court was not competent to examine that matter was admitted later even by one of the judges who had previously voted in favour of the illegal opinion of the Court. In his separate opinion, Judge Azavedo stated that, before the Court could examine that matter, the consent of the States whose interests would be affected by the findings of the Court must be procured. His conclusion was that the Court should have refrained from giving any opinion on the questions referred to it by the Assembly.

98. Under the provisions of the peace treaties with Bulgaria (articles 35 and 36), Hungary (articles 39 and 40) and Romania (articles 37 and 38), the right to consider a question concerning the interpretation or non-execution of the treaties is vested in the contracting parties only and in no one else. This right has been granted neither to the United Nations nor to its organs. Furthermore, it can be exercised on behalf of the Allied Powers only by the heads of the diplomatic missions of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom to Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania respectively, acting jointly and in agreement. Despite these legal provisions, and acting in violation thereof, the Court not only took cognizance of the questions which the Assembly had illegally referred to it under pressure from the Anglo-American bloc, but also gave affirmative replies to the first and second questions. For the reasons I have just given, these replies were quite obviously worthless. The Court permitted an overt and gross violation of both the letter and the spirit of the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania by agreeing that two only of the other countries—the United States and the United Kingdom—might be a party to a dispute with any of those countries. This premise underlying the Court's approach to the case was fundamentally unsound and entirely distorted the provisions of the peace treaties.

99. In the strict meaning of the articles of the peace treaties I have mentioned, the parties to any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of these treaties can be only Hungary, Bulgaria or Romania acting separately, and the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom acting jointly and in agreement. If there is no such agreement between them, there is no second party to the dispute and consequently it is impossible to take any action under the procedure laid down in the peace treaties for the settlement of disputes concerning their interpretation or execution.

100. In the particular case before us, namely, the slanderous Anglo-American allegation concerning the non-observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, there is no such agreement between the Soviet Union, the United

States and the United Kingdom, because the USSR does not recognize the existence of any grounds for making complaints against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, which are honestly and scrupulously fulfilling all their obligations under the peace treaties. Consequently, since there is no concerted action on this matter among the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, the necessary conditions which would enable those three Powers jointly to become a party to a dispute with Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania do not exist. Without the participation of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom by themselves cannot constitute, nor have they any legal right to constitute, a party to such a dispute. Thus, since the Government of the Soviet Union does not support the illegal and slanderous accusations made by the United States and the United Kingdom against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, there cannot possibly be a party to a dispute with any of these three countries. And if there is no party to a dispute, then there can be no dispute, since there can be no question in this case of making any complaints against the other party, namely, Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania, under the peace treaties concluded with those countries.

101. If we are to speak of disputes, then the dispute is between the United States and the United Kingdom on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other; because the Soviet Union does not support their illegal and unwarranted complaints against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, which conflict with the provisions of the peace treaties and the Charter of the United Nations. The three countries in question have and can have nothing to do with such a dispute between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the United States and the United Kingdom on the other hand.

102. In these circumstances, the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania are under no compulsion to appoint representatives to the treaty commissions, because no such commissions can be created without the participation of the Soviet Union. Any attempt to interpret this question otherwise would be a gross violation of the relevant provisions of the peace treaties. Obviously there can be no dispute if there is no party to a dispute. And if there is no dispute, there is no need for the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to appoint representatives to a commission to examine non-existent disputes.

103. It follows that the replies of the International Court of Justice to the first and second questions are unfounded from both the legal and the political points of view. Consequently there are no grounds for accusing those three countries of non-execution of the peace treaties.

104. In view of these considerations, the Court's assertion that there exists a dispute with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania subject to the provisions of the peace treaties for the settlement of disputes is both worthless and unfounded in law. The Court failed in this matter to give a just and objective legal analysis of articles 35 and 36 of the peace treaty with Bulgaria or of the corresponding articles of the peace treaties with Romania and Hungary. The Court yielded to political pressure by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom who took part in its work and, instead of giving a legal definition of the dispute

in accordance with the provisions contained in the aforesaid articles of the peace treaties, took a one-sided, biased and political approach to the question.

105. The incorrect premise adopted by the Court in defining the term "party to the dispute", and hence in deciding whether a dispute existed, led it to give illegal and juridically inconsistent answers to the first two questions. These answers are unfounded in law, since they are based on the premise, which is erroneous and contrary to the peace treaties, that any of three States—the USSR, the United States or the United Kingdom—could be regarded as parties to the dispute, either severally or two of them together. Such an interpretation of those articles of the peace treaties by the Court constitutes a flagrant distortion of the letter and spirit of the treaties, which provide clearly and unequivocally that, for a dispute between two parties to exist, it is absolutely essential that all three States—the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom—and not one or two of them separately, should form one party, and that those three Powers should act in concert. The other party to any such dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the treaties must be Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania, separately, since an independent peace treaty was signed with each of those countries by the three Powers.

106. As I have already pointed out, the root of the matter is that the United States and the United Kingdom wished at all costs to obtain from the International Court of Justice an advisory opinion which would conceal and justify their illegal attempts, contrary to and in violation of the provisions of the peace treaties, to vest in the representative of the United States and the United Kingdom, and in another representative arbitrarily appointed by the Secretary-General at the instance of those Powers, the functions of a treaty commission.

107. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom sought to ensure that such commissions, arbitrarily and illegally set up, without the participation of the Soviet Union or of the representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary or Romania, should be regarded as commissions satisfying the provisions of the peace treaties and competent to take final and binding decisions. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom demanded at meetings of the Court, against all logic and common sense, in violation of the elementary rules of law and without the slightest justification, that the two persons arbitrarily and illegally appointed by them and, at their request, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to serve on such a commission should be regarded as constituting a tripartite commission established in accordance with the relevant articles of the peace treaties. According to this absurd idea, these two persons, who would act without any legal authority, were to dictate their final and binding decisions to the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania.

108. The members of the International Court of Justice, who had illegally taken cognizance of the question imposed by the Anglo-American bloc on the General Assembly, could not make up their minds to concur in the demands of the Anglo-American politicians, who had reached absurdity in their attempts to find some

legal "basis" for their inventions about the peoples' democracies.

109. This legal analysis of the reasons for the Court's decision proves the inconsistency of the Court's assertion that in this case a dispute exists with Bulgaria, Hungary or Romania subject to the relevant articles of the peace treaties.

110. In the light of the foregoing, the inconsistency of the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly is perfectly clear. The draft resolution refers to the unfounded and illegal opinion of the Court on the first and second questions; it also contains the totally unfounded and illegal charges that Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania have failed to appoint their representatives to the treaty commissions. Yet, as has been indicated, and as is clear from the replies of the Court to the third and fourth questions, those governments cannot and should not appoint representatives to the illegal and fictitious commissions which the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom are trying to set up by unilateral action.

111. The attempts of the Anglo-American bloc to use the United Nations and the General Assembly in order to bring illegal charges against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania are inadmissible, since they are contrary both to the Charter and to generally accepted rules of international law. The General Assembly has no right to censure governments of Member States of the Organization for matters which fall within their internal competence; it has even less right so to censure governments of States not Members of the United Nations.

112. The efforts made by the Anglo-American bloc to force through this draft resolution, originally submitted by the Australian delegation, which is directed against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, serve to undermine the prestige and authority of the United Nations and the General Assembly. The turmoil created over that draft resolution shows the whole world how the Anglo-American majority in the Organization is using the General Assembly for its selfish and tendentious political purposes, which bear no relation to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

113. In their attempt to divert the attention of world public opinion from the exposure of Anglo-American espionage and subversion in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have illegally seized the General Assembly of what they call the question of the "observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania". The discussion of this question at three sessions of the General Assembly has fully proved that the real reason why the question was raised was the desire of the United States and the United Kingdom to divert attention from the revelations concerning Anglo-American espionage and subversion in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania and to use the United Nations in order to exert political pressure on these countries.

114. During the debates on this question in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee at this session of the Assembly, the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia interminably reiterated their allegations, which have been exploded long ago, to the effect that Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania had vio-

lated human rights by exposing and condemning the Anglo-American spies and traitors to the Bulgarian, Hungarian and Romanian peoples—people like Mindszenty, Rajk, Shipkov, Kostov and Petkov. The charges contained in the draft resolution are mendacious and unfounded.

115. A review of the debates on this Anglo-American slander about Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania which have taken place at three sessions of the General Assembly can only lead to the conclusion that this attempt has failed completely and that its purposes have been fully revealed. Any attempt to hold further debates on this question in organs of the United Nations would be senseless and dangerous. Such a course would undermine the prestige and authority of the United Nations, which the Anglo-American politicians wish to use for their own ends. Such a course would lead to a flagrant violation of the Charter, since the purpose of the Anglo-American bloc in raising the discussion of such a question in the Organization is to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States and to use the Organization in order to exercise pressure on these States. Any further discussion of this question in the United Nations would constitute a violation not only of Article 2 of the Charter, which forbids the Organization to interfere in the internal affairs of any State, but also a violation of Article 55, which provides for the promotion of "peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples".

116. The clause in the draft resolution which invites Members of the Organization to submit to the Secretary-General evidence relating to the slanderous Anglo-American accusations against Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania is merely a further attempt to use the United Nations for the continuance of slanderous charges against the peoples' democracies. That provision can only be interpreted as an attempt to involve as many States as possible in this Anglo-American plot, in order to continue the campaign of slander and insinuation against three sovereign States. All this can only lead to an aggravation of the international situation and to increased international friction, and serve to divert the attention of the United Nations and its Members from the fundamental and primary task of maintaining and strengthening international peace and security and creating friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

117. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation has already made it clear that the draft resolution which is at present before the General Assembly has the wholehearted support of my government.

118. As many representatives have pointed out, here we have the case of three governments which have flagrantly violated obligations into which they solemnly entered under the terms of the peace treaties made with them. They have been accused of brutal maltreatment of their peoples and, although the International Court of Justice has clearly established that they are internationally bound under the terms of these treaties to take part in the arbitration procedure for which the treaties provide, each of them refuses, without the slightest shadow of justification, to take any step toward this

end. They are given the opportunity to have the charges made against them investigated and shown to be either well-founded or ill-founded.

119. As has been repeatedly said, the inference to be drawn from their obstructive conduct is only too obvious. They could not have given any more patent indication of their consciousness of guilt than they have given in persistently and cynically blocking and frustrating the procedure for which the treaties provide. There can be no excuse for this, and no reason except that these governments have too much to hide.

120. The draft resolution which is before the General Assembly condemns them for this behaviour, and it is difficult to conceive any condemnation that is more richly merited. It may perhaps be disappointing to the victims of their oppression that no more direct help can be brought to them to relieve them in the sufferings which they have to undergo. It may, however, be some solace to them to know that their oppressors are recognized and castigated before world opinion and that the conscience of civilized mankind is deeply perturbed over their fate and the inhuman treatment to which, day in and day out, they and their families are subjected under the administration of the three governments which stand arraigned before the bar of the world.

121. There are many people all over the world who, misled by the propaganda persistently disseminated by the apologists for régimes of this type, are tempted to believe that those who live under them enjoy the blessings proclaimed by those who support dictatorial governments.

122. I hope that these misguided people, when they hear how the three governments whose conduct the draft resolution condemns have obstructed any attempt at inquiry into their proceedings, may pause and consider what is the lesson to be drawn from such conduct. They may well ask themselves why it is that the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania should isolate themselves by such impenetrable barriers from the free world. They may ask themselves what it is that those three governments are so anxious to conceal. In any free country every one may inquire for himself, and it is only under these dictatorial régimes that mystery shrouds the lives of their citizens from the outside world.

123. Whatever else may be the effect of the resolution which I hope the General Assembly will adopt today, one effect I profoundly hope will be to give pause to those many people throughout the world who are beguiled and misled by the promises made by communist propagandists.

124. Mr. GOLDSTUCKER (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation wishes me to express its opposition to the draft resolution submitted for the consideration of the Assembly by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, and to explain my delegation's reason for this opposition.

125. In the opinion of my delegation, the United Nations has no right whatsoever to deal with matters falling essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, and if it does so it will act in flagrant violation of Article 2, paragraph

7 of the Charter. No arguments can disprove this fact because there are no arguments which can prove an illegal action to be legal.

126. It has been argued that the United Nations General Assembly can take up this matter because it concerns alleged breaches of the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. This contention is obviously false because everybody knows that the peace treaties with those three countries were concluded between the governments of each of the countries respectively, on the one hand, and the countries which were at war with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, on the other. The parties to the treaties, then, are Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania respectively, on the one hand, and the former enemies of those three countries, on the other. The United Nations is not a party to those treaties, and it has no right whatsoever to take up matters concerning their implementation.

127. Those peace treaties contain stipulations concerning the procedure which the contracting parties are obliged to follow in the event of disputes arising as to their interpretation or implementation. All those treaties clearly stipulate that any such dispute must be dealt with by the parties to the treaties themselves—that is, Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania on the one side and, on the other, the three great Powers signatories to the treaties, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States, acting together on behalf of all the signatories. I repeat, then, that any disputes which might arise in connexion with the interpretation or implementation of the peace treaty with Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania must be dealt with only and exclusively by the representatives of the parties to the treaty—that is, in practice, by the representative of Bulgaria or Hungary or Romania, on the one hand, and the representative of the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States appointed by them together and requiring the consent of each of them.

128. Only when the representatives of the two sides, themselves appointed, cannot agree on a third member of the arbitration commission envisaged by the peace treaty, can they require the assistance of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and ask him to appoint a third member. This mention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations clearly means that the power of appointing the third member to the arbitration commission in case of lack of agreement between the two representatives of the treaty signatories is given to the Secretary-General in person and can in no event be construed as giving the United Nations a right to interfere in matters concerned with the interpretation or implementation of the treaties.

129. From what I have just said it clearly follows that the United Nations General Assembly had no right whatsoever to take up the accusations levelled at Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania by some of its members because, in the first place, the accusations were concerned entirely with matters falling essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of those States, secondly, the United Nations is not competent to deal with matters arising out of the peace treaties because special machinery has been created for that purpose, and, thirdly, the accusers anyway do not constitute one of the sides to the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania.

130. It further follows from the aforementioned considerations that those delegations which have raised this matter in the General Assembly of the United Nations have made themselves guilty of a breach of the stipulations of the peace treaties to which I have referred and, in addition, have induced the General Assembly to commit a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter and to assume powers which were not given to it by the peace treaties.

131. As is well known, this unwholesome matter was referred by the General Assembly to the International Court of Justice with a request for an advisory opinion [*resolution 294 (IV)*]. Although the governments of the accused countries did not acknowledge the Court's competence to deal with this matter, and although they refused to give their consent or to appoint representatives, the International Court of Justice took up the matter, thereby committing a violation of Article 36 of its own Statute. It should be noted, however, that even the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, given at the price of violating its own Statute, precludes any possibility for the accusers to misuse their unjustified charges as a pretext for further attempts at direct interference in the internal affairs of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania with the help of the United Nations or with the help of a fake arbitration commission which they would have liked to appoint.

132. So much for the formal side of the item under discussion. As to its substance, I should like to make certain remarks.

133. The peoples of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, as a result of the allied victories over the forces of nazism and fascism, and as a result of the liberation of their respective countries by the Soviet army, chased from power their former ruling circles which had subjected their own peoples to economic exploitation and political, racial, religious and cultural oppression.

134. It is well known that the former ruling classes of these countries did not represent the interests of the people, but only their narrow class interests. It is also well known that those former ruling circles very readily allied themselves with Hitler and Mussolini and entered with them into the criminal conspiracy which brought about the Second World War. It is a historical fact that none of the present self-appointed and would-be accusers of the new Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania moved a finger or even raised his voice when men like Boris, Horthy and Antonescu kept their peoples in misery, starvation and ignorance and denied to them all fundamental freedoms and all rights to live a decent human life.

135. Moreover, the conscience of these self-appointed and would-be accusers does not seem to be stirred by the real and flagrant violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in other parts of the world. They turn a blind eye to such violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in their own countries or in territories falling under their power, where, if they felt genuinely concerned and were not mere hypocrites, they would be able to alleviate the lot of scores of millions of people.

136. But no, all that those hypocritical champions want is to besmirch, in the eyes of the uninformed, those peoples who for the first time in their history

have been able to take their destinies in their own hands and to recreate their countries in such a way as to guarantee, to each and every member of their nations, a decent and dignified human life based on peaceful work and real national independence and sovereignty. This real national independence and sovereignty, cherished by every honest man and woman in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, seems to be the very factor which has brought about the wrath of the present accusers. Those accusers are trying to misuse the United Nations as an instrument by means of which they can bring pressure on Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania and induce them to bow to interference in their domestic affairs. And if they cannot attain this aim—and they must know by now that their efforts towards this end will remain futile—they want at least to misuse this Organization as their propaganda agency against the peoples' democracies.

137. This is the real object and content of the draft resolution before us. My delegation thinks that it is irresponsible to debase this Organization into a mere tool in the service of the spiteful, reactionary and aggressive policies of some of its Members which try to obstruct the development of peaceful communities and of free peoples, and which, at the same time, offer a friendly hand to fascist Franco. That is why I appeal to all the delegations to reject this draft resolution and to cause this matter, which never should have been on the agenda of the General Assembly, to be taken off the programme of our deliberations.

138. Everybody who cares to know, knows that Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania are the scenes today of considerable economic and cultural progress. Everybody knows that those three nations have, within the last few years, solved all the age-long disputes which, on the instigation of their former rulers and foreign influences, separated them from one another and at times directed them against one another in deadly strife. Everybody knows that those free peoples have buried their long-protracted conflicts with their equally free neighbours, with whom they were at war only a few years ago.

139. There is, I submit, no other example of such a far-reaching pacification to be found in any other part of the world. Should this fact by itself not evoke a greater interest on the part of the United Nations than the impunity of that handful of individuals who, belonging to the old, corrupt and unworthy ruling circles, indulged in criminal activities in the service of foreign interests, and were punished in accordance with laws which they were consciously violating? This far-reaching pacification was made possible only after the peoples of these countries had themselves become masters of their countries, after they had eliminated the scheming rulers and foreign influences which had never cared for the welfare of the peoples and which had looked upon them—and look upon them—only as pawns in the interplay of their power politics.

140. The initiators of the present draft resolution should know that the times when Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania were used as such pawns in the hands of the imperialists are irretrievably passed. The new peoples' democratic republics have come to stay, whether the ruling circles of the United States, the United Kingdom and their associates like it or not. And we in Czechoslovakia, associated with them in a brotherly

alliance for peace and security, certainly wish to see them flourish and prosper in the interest of genuine freedom, progress and peace in the world.

141. Mr. BIRGI (Turkey) (*translated from French*): The draft resolution before us is a touchstone, as its acceptance or rejection by this Assembly will show whether the United Nations consents or refuses to let the principles of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms become a dead letter. Those principles are the basis of the Charter; they are enshrined in that moving document, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and they will soon, we trust, be proclaimed anew in a special covenant.

142. The first point we should note is that the text which we are considering refers to systematic and persistent violations of the great principles which I have just mentioned, in breach of contractual undertakings, and to the refusal to account therefor, likewise in breach of contractual undertakings recognized by the International Court of Justice.

143. Hence it can certainly not be claimed that it is a matter of picking a quarrel with the countries in question over isolated cases without compelling motives and without sound legal grounds.

144. I wish to analyse briefly the moral and practical scope of this draft. Its moral scope is certainly very great, since it includes a formal censure.

145. Such moral judgments, although they may appear to be purely theoretical, may on occasion prove to be rich in consequences for the future. I have ventured to repeat this basic fact in order to forestall any inclination on the part of representatives to be discouraged by the omission, in this text, of a reference to a material penalty and therefore to feel a certain indifference about the immediate fate of the draft resolution in this Assembly.

146. It should also be noted that paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft have a certain practical value; they keep the issue open, as it were, by inviting Member States to submit evidence and by asking the Secretary-General to inform the Members of the United Nations of any charges which may be communicated to him. In this way the United Nations will not shelve the case in so far as it relates generally to the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. If there should be new charges, or if any fresh evidence should be discovered, such evidence will be available to Members of the United Nations; they will be able to study it and to supplement their own material so that it may be used at the proper time.

147. For its part, the Turkish delegation has some very serious complaints to lodge against the Bulgarian Government straightaway, for that government is treating Bulgarian citizens of Turkish origin without the slightest consideration for human rights and fundamental freedoms. I informed the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the intolerable position of this mass of approximately 900,000 members of a minority living in Bulgarian territory. I refer to it again today because my delegation feels that the General Assembly, which is just about to proceed to the final vote on this draft, should take note of these tragic facts which have a direct bearing on that draft.

148. I shall be very brief, as the particulars of this serious question—serious both because of its extent and because of its nature—will shortly be placed at the disposal of all Members of the United Nations in documentary form. At this point, I wish merely to point out a few salient facts. The members of this minority apparently have some schools of their own and, according to Bulgarian statistics, the number of those schools is increasing. They have their own mosques. They have their newspapers in the Turkish language. On paper, moreover, they are assured of complete equality with the other inhabitants of the country. In fact, however, their position is such that unless they give up their traditional social standards and religious beliefs, and unless they put themselves unreservedly at the service of the government—and we know what kind of a government—their property and sometimes, indeed, their life, is forfeit. This has resulted in a disconcerting increase in the number of instances of clandestine escapes to Turkey and, to some extent, to Greece.

149. From about 1944 until about the end of 1948, those who wished to immigrate to Turkey could not obtain the necessary authorization from the Bulgarian Government, even though a settlement treaty in force between the two countries expressly stipulated that the Bulgarian Government would not place difficulties in the way of persons who wished to emigrate from Bulgaria. Then, in 1949, the Bulgarian Government decided to permit emigration but did not give effect to that decision for some time. That period might be called a period of screening, during which the Bulgarian Government reviewed the cases of those who wished to leave the country and determined whether their departure would benefit the State and rid the country of “non-assimilable” elements. When the records had been completed, the Bulgarian Government began to allow people to leave. This led to an ever-increasing influx into Turkey (approximately 24,000 persons during 1949).

150. Turkey received and continues to receive as many immigrants as its capacity for assistance and resettlement permits. I may add that the immigrants arrive in Turkey completely destitute even though the settlement treaty in force between the two countries explicitly provides that emigrants shall be freely entitled to take with them their goods and chattels and to dispose of their immovable property. Last August, however, the Turkish Government received a note from the Bulgarian Government in which it was asked to receive 250,000 emigrants within three months; the note also accused Turkey of preventing immigration.

151. The Polish representative has just argued that that “so-called expulsion” had nothing to do with the question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. To create a situation where the emigrants are so numerous that they cannot be received in so short a time; to insist nevertheless that they should be received; to leave them completely destitute; and to concentrate them on the frontiers, taking advantage of the fact that they really want to immigrate to Turkey, which is only too true, whereas it is possible to collaborate with the other party in order to arrange a reasonable programme allowing not only for an orderly flow of immigrants but also and above all for the transfer of the property and the capital of the persons concerned—does not all this constitute overt evidence of a contempt

for human rights and human dignity which is designed to further discreditable ends?

152. These tactics, which have been exposed by the Press of various countries, are calculated to achieve a number of purposes, chief of which are the following: in the first place, to confront Turkey with the overwhelming problem of resettling the refugees, because it is obviously impossible to resettle such a large number of persons—250,000 destitute individuals—in the short space of three months; secondly, to try to evade the responsibility for the distress caused thereby; thirdly, to get rid, *en masse*, of those who are no longer needed, after they have been stripped of everything which could be taken from them.

153. I shall not pursue this analysis of the meaning of this mass deportation, as I do not propose at this stage to speak of the political motives of Bulgaria. What I want is to show that the Bulgarian Government is systematically flouting the rules of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and manipulating human beings like putty, using them as it sees fit in the interests of its domestic and foreign policy. I hope that this brief account which I have tried to sketch for you has given you some idea of the situation. We are dealing with a great tragedy which, together with other known tragedies, we should bear in mind when we come to vote on the draft resolution now before us.

154. Mr. KYROU (Greece): On the basis of rule 76 of our rules of procedure, I have the honour to move the closure of the debate. The points of view of the majority and of the minority have been explained rather exhaustively, both in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and again here today. More than that, those points of view have been explained during the last two sessions of the General Assembly. From his high seat, the President can see that exhaustion is felt by the representatives who still remain.

155. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): You have heard the proposal of the representative of Greece. Under rule 76 of the rules of procedure, a representative may move the closure of the debate at any time. Only two representatives may then speak in opposition. I can already see the signs being made to me by the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR and Poland, who presumably wish to speak against the motion. I shall give them each ten minutes in which to speak and I shall call first on the representative of the Byelorussian SSR.

156. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Greek representative's proposal for the closure of the debate must be rejected. The representative of Turkey has just raised an extremely interesting question concerning Turkish nationals in Bulgaria. I had intended to take part in the debate and reply to the representative of Turkey on that question. That is my lawful right, as the representative of my country. I therefore consider that to close the debate at this moment would be incorrect, and I would interpret such a closure as an attempt to muzzle the delegations which want to answer the speakers who have already made statements. We have the moral and political right to reply to them.

157. Of course rule 76 of the rules of procedure clearly provides that a debate may be closed at any time. It also

states that the President may limit the time allocated to the speaker who takes advantage of that rule. That is for the President to decide. But the closure of the debate at this point would be absolutely incorrect.

158. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): I shall not take full advantage of the ten minutes the President has granted me. Despite the formal rule in the rules of procedure, it seems to me that it would be unjust to interrupt the debate when the list of speakers has not been exhausted. The Polish delegation does not intend to speak again, but it considers that it would be fair to continue the discussion in view of the number of speakers on the list.

159. I quite understand the Greek representative's desire to close the debate and go on to the vote. Nevertheless, I believe that the majority of this Assembly will not wish to be unjust to the minority.

160. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Under the rules of procedure, only two speakers may oppose a motion for the closure of the debate. The representative of Iraq is asking for the floor, but he may not raise a new point of order until I have taken a decision on the first question.

161. The two representatives who had the right to oppose the motion for the closure of the debate have stated their views. I therefore call for a vote on the motion for closure.

The motion for closure was adopted by 32 votes to 10, with 9 abstentions.

162. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Does the representative of Iraq wish to speak?

163. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): I wish to appeal to the President to be a little more lenient with representatives and to guide us more smoothly than he has been doing, especially with regard to my own delegation. I wished to know, before voting, whether closing the debate meant that explanations of votes were to be allowed or not. My voting depended on the answer on that point. Had the President permitted me to ask this question, I might have voted this way or that. But the President was in a hurry. I should like to ask: am I entitled to explain my vote or not?

164. The PRESIDENT: First of all, instead of saying that it was a point of order, it would have been better for the representative of Iraq to tell me that he wished to ask a question. The closure of the debate does not mean that a representative has no right to explain his vote. The representative of Iraq has the right to explain his vote.

165. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): My delegation is going to abstain on this proposal. We are not going to abstain because of our lack of sympathy for the aims and principles which underlie this proposal; we are going to abstain because we feel that any observation of human rights should be dealt with universally, and should be treated universally. We cannot think of human rights being observed in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania and forgotten in Palestine and Africa, especially in North Africa.

166. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/1437].

167. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): I request that the draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

168. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall therefore vote on the draft paragraph by paragraph.

The first recital was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The second recital was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

169. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I intend, if the representative of Poland does not object, to put to the vote paragraph 1 of the operative part, including sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).

Paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the operative part was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 of the operative part was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 of the operative part was adopted by 40 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 of the operative part was adopted by 40 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 40 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

170. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Owing to the interruption of the discussion of the agenda item on which a vote has just been taken, I was deprived of the opportunity to give my government's views on the question. I should therefore like to explain my vote.

171. Enough facts were adduced in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and in the General Assembly to show that the governments which had brought the question of the so-called observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania before the United Nations were in fact pursuing aims which had nothing to do with the true protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

172. There can be no doubt that the act of provocation involved in the submission of this question to the United Nations for its consideration, in the selfish interests of the United States and its accomplices, has been unmasked and that the undertaking has failed.

173. That is why the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR voted against a resolution which puts the United Nations to shame and undermines its prestige and the confidence of the peoples of the world. The Government of the Ukrainian SSR therefore does not recognize this resolution, which is a flagrant violation of the Charter and of international law.

174. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We now proceed to deal with the next item on the agenda: relations of States Members and specialized agencies with Spain.

175. I shall ask Mr. López, Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, to submit his report. First, how-

ever, I shall call upon the representative of Poland who has asked to speak on a point of order.

176. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland): A little while ago the discussion was abruptly closed, as was a list of speakers. Of course we abided by the President's ruling, but at this time—5.50 p.m.—I respectfully submit that the meeting should be adjourned until tomorrow morning.

177. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): A motion for adjournment has priority, of course. But when I asked the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to submit his report, my intention was, after he had done so, to ask the Assembly whether it wished to proceed to a discussion of the item. If so, I should have suggested that it should postpone the discussion until tomorrow.

178. Does this procedure satisfy the Polish representative?

179. Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland): I do not believe that the procedure suggested by the President

would be altogether fair because it may be that certain delegations have different representatives for different items. I presume that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in question is not very long, and that our work would therefore not be very much delayed if it were submitted at the beginning of tomorrow morning's meeting. I would, therefore, respectfully request the President to adjourn this meeting now.

180. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Since the Polish representative is not agreeable to my suggestion, the proper course for me would be to put his motion for the adjournment to the vote. But this is not even necessary since it is nearly 6 p.m., and we can satisfy him by closing the meeting.

181. The next item on the agenda, which we shall take up tomorrow morning, will be the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on the question of the relations of States Members and specialized agencies with Spain.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.