A-14, RFE NEW YORK, JAN 17 -- WILLIAM N. FRYE REPORTS IN
THURSDAY'S CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR FROM THE UN (Cut):

A UNITED NATIONS CIVIL SERVANT APPEARS TO HAVE WON A MONTH-
LONG BATTLE TO PROTECT THE IDENTITY OF ANONYMOUS WITNESSES WHO
TOLD THE UN THE STORY OF SOVIET BUTCHERY IN HUNGARY.

A SPECIAL UN INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED TO SECRETARY-
GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD JAN. 15 THAT POVL BANG-JENSEN, A
DANISH EMPLOYEE OF THE UN SECRETARIAT, BE INSTRUCTED TO DESTROY
LISTS OF NAMES OF WITNESSES WHICH HE HAS REFUSED TO TURN OVER TO
ANYONE--EVEN TO MR. HAMMARSKJOLD.

THE COMMITTEE WAS CRITICAL OF MR. BANG-JENSEN'S DEFIANCE OF
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. IT CONTENDED THAT THE DANE HIMSELF HAD
FAILED TO TAKE "RATIONAL" SECURITY MEASURES DURING THE PERIOD
WHEN HE POSSESSED THE DOCUMENTS--POINTING OUT, FOR EXAMPLE,
THAT HE HAD CARRIED THEM AROUND ON HIS PERSON, RISKING LOSS OR
FORCIBLE SEIZURE.

BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT MR. BANG-JENSEN MIGHT HAVE "ALTERED"
OR "DEFACED" THE DOCUMENTS, THEY ARE "NO LONGER ENTITLED TO
CREDENCE," THE COMMITTEE CONCLUDED, AND SHOULD BE DESTROYED.

OBSERVERS READING BETWEEN THE LINES FELT THAT THE COMMITTEE
HAD SOUGHT THE BEST WAY OF SAVING FACE FOR MR. HAMMARSKJOLD
WHILE GIVING MR. BANG-JENSEN THE SUBSTANCE OF VICTORY.

THE CASE REPRESENTED THE FIRST TIME IN THE UN'S HISTORY,
SO FAR AS ANYONE HERE CAN RECALL, WHEN AN EMPLOYEE OF THE
SECRETARIAT DEFIED ORDERS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE HANDLING
OF SECRET DOCUMENTS. IT CERTAINLY IS THE FIRST TIME A UN EMPLOYEE
HAS PUBLICLY DEFIED HIS CHIEF AND JOIN.
MR. BANG-JENSEN SAID HE WAS AFRAID THAT IF HE TURNED THE LISTS OVER TO MR. HAMMARSKJÖLD, THEY CONCEIVABLY MIGHT ULTIMATELY FALL INTO THE HANDS OF SOME SOVIET MEMBER OF THE SECRETARIAT. IN SUCH A CASE, THE WITNESSES AND THEIR RELATIVES IN HUNGARY WOULD BE IN MORTAL DANGER, HE POINTED OUT.

THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE DID NOT INCLUDE IN ITS FIRST REPORT ANY RECOMMENDATION ON WHAT PUNISHMENT, IF ANY, SHOULD BE DEALT OUT TO MR. BANG-JENSEN. IT PROMISED TO REPORT LATER ON THIS SUBJECT.

THE DANE HAS BEEN SUSPENDED FROM HIS JOB, AND THE TONE OF THE FIRST REPORT WAS SUCH AS TO SUGGEST THAT HE PROBABLY WILL BE DISMISSED.

MR. HAMMARSKJÖLD HAS BASED HIS CRITICISM OF MR. BANG-JENSEN ON THE CONTENTION THAT THE DOCUMENTS WOULD HAVE BEEN PERFECTLY SAFE IN THE SECRETARY-GENERAL’S CUSTODY, AND THAT IN ANY EVENT IT WAS HIS RESPONSIBILITY TO TAKE SECURITY PRECAUTIONS.

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL CAN ACCEPT OR REJECT THE COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT FEW EXPECT THAT HE WILL REJECT THEM.
THE TRIBUNAL SAID THAT MR. BANG-JENSEN HAD NOT FILED AN APPEAL AGAINST THE DISMISSAL ORDER OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

"THE APPLICANT HAS, ON THE OTHER HAND, CHOSEN TO ATTACK THE ENTIRE DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST HIM ON THE GROUND THAT THEY LACKED DUE PROCESS. "THE TRIBUNAL THEREFORE HAD NO ALTERNATIVE BUT TO ADDRESS ITSELF "TO THE LIMITED QUESTIONS OF PROCEDURE" RAISED BEFORE IT.

MR. BANG-JENSEN CONTENDED THAT THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO HEAR HIS CASE "PREJUDICED THE ISSUE AND PREJUDICED THE ISSUE" AND THAT THE PUBLICATION OF THE INTERIM REPORTS AND THE CIRCULATION OF THE FINAL REPORT PREJUDICED THE CASE BEFORE THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AND VITiated ITS PROCEEDINGS.

THE TRIBUNAL SAID THAT THE SECRETARY-GENERAL WAS ENTITLED TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO ADVISE HIM.

IT ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT "THE TRIBUNAL IS NOT CONVINCED ABOUT THE NEED FOR THE PUBLICITY GIVEN TO THE CASE FROM TIME TO TIME THROUGH PRESS CONFERENCES," ESPECIALLY WHEN THE COMMITTEE WAS SET UP ONLY TO ADVISE THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

NEVERTHELESS THE TRIBUNAL WAS UNABLE TO FIND THAT THE SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE WERE IN ANY WAY VITiated BY THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

THE TRIBUNAL SAID IT WOULD NOT PRONOUNCE JUDGMENT ON MR. BANG-JENSEN'S CLAIM THAT THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE INCLUDED MEMBERS WHO SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISQUALIFIED FROM SITTING ON THE COMMITTEE "BY VIRTUE OF THE OFFICIAL POSITION THEY HELD AS SUBORDINATES" TO SOME OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

THE TRIBUNAL SAID THIS OBJECTION WAS NOT RAISED UNTIL AFTER THE REPORT OF THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE HAD BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

"HAVING FAILED TO MAKE THE OBJECTION IN PROPER TIME, THE APPLICANT CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO RAISE IT IN SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS," THE TRIBUNAL SAID.
Referring to Mr. Bang-Jensen’s contention that the denial of permission to be represented by counsel before the Joint Disciplinary Committee amounted to a denial of due process, the Tribunal said the staff rules specifically authorised representation of one staff member by another staff member in such proceedings.

Unless it was contented that the staff rule on this point was itself invalid as being contrary to due process, "the applicant must be bound by such rule."

"Limitation of the right of representation in what are known as domestic tribunals is a well established procedure, familiar to jurisprudence," the Tribunal said.

The Secretary-General, in a letter dated March 7, 1958, had conceded to Mr. Bang-Jensen the right to consult with his legal representative in the preparation of the brief to the Joint Disciplinary Committee. "The Tribunal therefore holds that there was no lack of due process as contended by the applicant," the judgment said.

"It went on:

"The applicant also states that the Joint Disciplinary Committee acted illegally in proceeding with an inquiry into the charges against him when an appeal by him to the Joint Appeals Board was pending.

"The applicant himself concedes that the filing of an appeal does not operate as a stay of proceedings."

Moreover, Mr. Bang-Jensen was informed by the Joint Disciplinary Committee, in two communications, that it would proceed with the examination of the case in accordance with the staff regulations and rules.

"The Tribunal finds nothing illegal in the Joint Disciplinary Committee proceeding with the inquiry," the Tribunal said.
THE TRIBUNAL'S JUDGMENT CONTINUED:

"THOUGH THE APPLICANT ARGUES THE SEVERAL POINTS SET OUT ABOVE, THE APPLICANT RESTS HIS CASE SQUARELY ON THE DENIAL OF ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS REQUESTED BY HIM IN HIS MEMORANDUM DATED APRIL 9, 1958.

"THE ADMINISTRATION BY ITS LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 19, 1958 STATED AS FOLLOWS: 'YOU WILL OF COURSE HAVE FREE ACCESS TO YOUR FILES AND PAPERS IN YOUR OFFICE AT HEADQUARTERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PREPARATION OF YOUR ANSWER AND YOUR APPEARANCE BEFORE THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE.'

"THE APPLICANT ALSO RELIES ON A LETTER DATED MARCH 7, 1958 BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO THE APPLICANT WHICH STATES AS FOLLOWS: 'SHOULD ANY OTHER PARTICULAR DOCUMENT, RELEVANT TO THE CHARGES, BE NECESSARY IN THE PREPARATION OF YOUR CASE, YOU SHOULD ADDRESS A SPECIFIC REQUEST TO MR. CORDIER. HE WILL, SUBJECT TO NECESSARY PROTECTION OF SECRET MATERIAL, MAKE ANY SUCH PAPER AVAILABLE TO YOU OR YOUR COUNSEL.'

"THE APPLICANT CONTENTS THAT THE ADMINISTRATION CHANGED ITS POSITION AND DID NOT AFFORD HIM ACCESS TO THE DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN HIS MEMORANDUM DATED APRIL 9, 1958 AND THEREBY DENIED DUE PROCESS TO THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE.'

"THE TRIBUNAL SAID STAFF RULES DID NOT SPECIFICALLY PROVIDE FOR ANY ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS OR FOR PROCEDURES FOR INSPECTION AND DISCOVERY OF DOCUMENTS.

"NEVERTHELESS, THE TRIBUNAL CONSIDERS THAT RULES OF EQUITY AND JUSTICE DO REQUIRE ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION WITHIN THE EXCLUSIVE POSSESSION OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO THE STAFF MEMBER CONCERNED AND IS RELEVANT TO THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CONSIDERATION. UNLESS ACCESS IS GIVEN TO 'RELEVANT' DOCUMENTS TO THE APPLICANT, IT WOULD AMOUNT TO LACK OF DUE PROCESS IN THE PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION OF HIS CASE."
AT ITS MEETING ON NOVEMBER 26, 1938, THE TRIBUNAL WAS ASSURED THAT THE APPLICANT WAS GIVEN THE DOCUMENTS AND ANNEXES TO THE CROSS COMMITTEE REPORT ON WHICH THE CHARGES WERE BASED.

"THE TRIBUNAL IS OF THE OPINION THAT THE NORMAL REQUIREMENTS OF DUE PROCESS ARE MET WHEN THE APPLICANT IS GIVEN THE MATERIAL ON WHICH THE CHARGES ARE FRAMED. IF THE APPLICANT WANTED FURTHER MATERIAL, HE SHOULD SATISFY THE AUTHORITIES BEFORE WHOM PROCEEDINGS ARE PENDING, WITH REGARD TO ITS RELEVANCE TO THE PROCEEDINGS."

THE TRIBUNAL'S JUDGMENT CONTINUED: "THE APPLICANT WANTED SOME OF THESE DOCUMENTS IN ORDER TO DEAL WITH THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE STAFF MEMBERS OF THE SECRETARIAT REGARDING THE WORK OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HUNGARY.

"THE TRIBUNAL HAS ITS DOUBTS WITH REGARD TO THE DUTY OF JUNIOR SECRETARIAT OFFICIALS TO TRY TO PRESS THEIR POINT OF VIEW AGAINST THAT OF THEIR SUPERIORS AND TO CARRY ON A CAMPAIGN FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE SAME.

"MOREOVER, THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HUNGARY WAS APPOINTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE CHAIRMAN AND RAPPORTEUR WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REPORT AND THE CONCLUSIONS CONTAINED IN THE REPORT.

"IT APPEARS TO THE TRIBUNAL THAT THE DUTIES OF THE SECRETARIAT STAFF WOULD STOP WITH BRINGING VARIOUS FACTS TO THE NOTICE OF THE COMMITTEE.

"IN ATTEMPTING REPEATEDLY AND PERSISTENTLY TO PRESS THE APPLICANT'S EDITORIAL POINT OF VIEW BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN AND RAPPORTEUR EVEN AFTER THEY HAD INDICATED THAT THEY HAD PERSONALLY SATISFIED THEMSELVES ON THIS SUBJECT, THE APPLICANT STRAYED BEYOND THE SCOPE OF HIS ORDINARY DUTIES AS A SECRETARIAT ASSISTANT TO THE COMMITTEE.

"HOWEVER, THE TRIBUNAL DOE: NOT EXPRESS ITSELF ON THIS QUESTION ON MERITS AS IT IS NOT DIRECTLY BEFORE IT. SUFFICE IT FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS CASE TO STATE THAT THE DOCUMENTS BEARING ON THE QUESTION WOULD HAVE TO BE CAREFULLY SCRUTINISED AND SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE CHARGE. THE JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE IS THE APPROPRIATE ORGAN TO DO IT UNDER
In its judgment on the list of Hungarian witnesses, the Tribunal said it was obvious that the applicant came into possession of the list as an official of the Committee on Hungary.

"As soon as the assignment was terminated, he should have handed over the papers to the appropriate authority," it said.

Mr. Cordier had testified before the Tribunal that "the normal secretariat practice was that when an assignment was over, the papers relating to that assignment were handed over to the United Nations. The applicant was asked during the oral proceedings what he would have done with the list of witnesses if he had requested to resign from the United Nations. The applicant stated in answer that he would have handed over the papers to the Chairman of the Committee on Hungary. This clearly acknowledges that the papers in question were not his personal property," the Tribunal said.

"In view of the fact that the Secretary-General is, under the Charter, the Chief Administrative Officer of the Organization, the applicant could have no valid excuse whatever for declining to deliver the documents to the Secretary-General."

The Tribunal found that 14 documents requested by Mr. Bang-Jensen dealing with the lack of internal security measures and procedures of the United Nations generally and in particular as applied to the work of the Committee on Hungary, were irrelevant for the purpose of the presentation of his case.

The Tribunal also found that 11 documents required by him dealing with the charge that he had "persisted in bringing irregularities to the attention of his superiors after, allegedly 'inquiries' or 'investigations' repeatedly had proved that his allegations were 'entirely baseless' and 'totally unfounded'." were such that the Joint Disciplinary Committee should have gone into the relevance and decided whether they should have been produced.

The Tribunal consisted of Madame Suzanne Bastid, of France, President;

Lord Crook of Britain, Vice-President; Mr. R. Venkataraman, of India; and Mr. Omar Loufifi of Egypt.
United Nations, New York, July 4th (Reuters) -- (follows UN-129 of July 3rd)—

Bang-Jensen, who was suspended from duty last December after he declined to hand over certain documents, said the letter from the secretary-general, Mr. Hammarskjöld, had been sent by messenger to his home at Great Neck, Long Island.

He told Reuters, "I shall continue the efforts I have been making to get copies of the testimony which witnesses have made before a committee concerning my actions.

I shall ask for a public hearing before a tribunal, and when the facts become known I am certain I shall be vindicated and reinstated."

He added that he was "surprised" at the secretary-general's decision, "In view of the fact that I have not had an opportunity to answer the charges against me."

Mr. Bang-Jensen said he had repeatedly asked for copies of the testimony against him so that he could answer the charges and maintained that his requests had not been answered.

The secretary-general suspended Mr. Bang-Jensen from duty last December after the Danish official had declined to turn over to him documents which included a list of names of witnesses who appeared before the Hungarian committee at hearings here and abroad.

Mr. Bang-Jensen argued that to hand over this list would be a breach of trust, because the witnesses, he said, had given him their names on condition that he did not disclose them to anyone else.
later Mr. Hammarskjöld appointed Mr. Ernest Gross, former United States Deputy Permanent Representative, to head a special three-member inquiry committee for the case. This body recommended that the list, in a sealed envelope, be burned in Mr. Bang-Jensen's presence.

This was done.

A United Nations disciplinary body is understood to have submitted recommendations to Mr. Hammarskjöld stemming from the case.

Among the questions understood to be involved was whether Mr. Bang-Jensen should receive several thousand dollars compensation if the suspension were carried through to dismissal.

Later a spokesman for the Secretary-General said: "Mr. Bang-Jensen has today received a communication from the Secretary-General terminating his services as from today."

The Secretary-General acted upon the recommendations of the joint disciplinary committee of the United Nations regarding various charges considered by the committee.

The joint disciplinary committee and the Secretary-General have given Mr. Bang-Jensen every opportunity on repeated occasions to reply to the charges against him dealing with his conduct, but he has not availed himself of these opportunities.

No request for appeal has been filed by Mr. Bang-Jensen with the Administrative Tribunal.

The official statement was prefaced by the remark: "The secretariat does not usually comment on personal actions, but in view of Mr. Bang-Jensen's remarks to the press the following statement is made:"
UNITED NATIONS, N Y, JULY 20 — A DANISH OFFICIAL OF THE SECRETARIAT WHO WAS DISMISSED FOR MISCONDUCT AFTER HE HAD DECLINED TO GIVE HIS SUPERIORS NAMES OF WITNESSES TO THE HUNGARY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE, AGAIN INSISTED TONIGHT THAT HE HAD BEEN AUTHORISED TO KEEP THE LIST SECRET.

THE FORMER OFFICIAL MR. POUL BANG-JENSEN ISSUED A STATEMENT ON CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING HIS DISMISSAL, ORDERED EARLIER THIS MONTH BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, MR. DAG HAMMARSKJOELD, AFTER A DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY.

REFERRING TO A CHARGE THAT HE GAVE PROMISES TO THE WITNESSES IN EXCESS OF HIS AUTHORITY, BANG-JENSEN SAID HE HAD A MEMORANDUM DATED FEBRUARY 8, 1957, FROM HAMMARSKJOELDS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT, STATING THAT BANG-JENSEN WOULD "BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING A SECRET REGISTER SHOWING THE NAMES OF THE WITNESSES."

THIS MEMORANDUM, HE SAID, WAS FOLLOWED BY AN ADDITIONAL ONE AND DURING TWO MEETINGS WITH THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO GO INTO HIS CASE HE WAS ASSURED THAT THESE WOULD BE PRODUCED.

"TODAY, SIX MONTHS LATER, THEY STILL HAVE NOT BEEN MADE AVAILABLE TO ME," BANG-JENSEN STATED.

(MORE)  DH/K  0933
THE FORMER OFFICIALS MEMORANDUM WHICH WAS CIRCULATED AMONG A NUMBER OF ACCREDITED CORRESPONDENTS HERE REFERRED TO HIMSELF AS "A KIND OF TRUSTEE FOR THE SECRET LIST OF THE ANONYMOUS WITNESSES."

HE SAID THAT SINCE LAST OCTOBER 9, WHEN HE WAS FIRST ASKED TO HAND OVER THE LIST TO DR DRAGOSLAV PROTITCH, THEN UNDER-SECRETARY FOR POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS, HE HAD ASKED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO DENY THAT HE WAS AUTHORISED TO KEEP THE LIST SECRET BUT NO REPLY HAD BEEN FORTHCOMING.

NOT UNTIL FEBRUARY 19, WHEN HE RECEIVED A COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATION GROUP DID HE LEARN THAT PROTITCH "DENIED OUTRIGHT THAT I WAS AUTHORISED AS I CLAIM."
BANG-JENSEN WROTE.

HE REPEATED "A PROMISE WAS GIVEN TO THE WITNESSES ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY AN OFFICER OF THE ORGANISATION. THERE WAS NO REASON FOR THE WITNESSES TO DOUBT THAT HE WAS AUTHORISED TO DO SO. WHETHER HE ACTUALLY WAS AUTHORISED OR NOT IS OF NO LEGAL CONSEQUENCE. IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES, ALL LAWYERS, I SHOULD THINK, WILL AGREE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS AND I, LEGALLY, AS WELL AS MORALLY, ARE BOUND BY THIS PROMISE, AND THAT IT CANNOT BE MODIFIED WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE WITNESSES THEMSELVES."

(WATCH EMBARGO) DH/K 20 JUNE 0938
BANG-JENSEN SPOKE OF "UNTRUTHFUL ACCUSATIONS" PUBLISHED BY HAMMARSKJOELD. HE SAID HIS STATEMENT, WHICH RUNS TO SEVERAL THOUSAND WORDS, PRESENTED "ONLY PART OF THE MANY FACTS REGARDING THE SERIOUS IRREGULARITIES AGAINST THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HUNGARY."

HE SAID HE WAS PREPARED TO PRESENT ALL FACTS WHEN A PROPER INVESTIGATION IS UNDERTAKEN."

BANG-JENSEN SAID OF THE REPORT OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDING HIS DISMISSAL FOR "MISCONDUCT" THAT HAMMARSKJOELD HIMSELF KNEW PERSONALLY THAT "THE CHARGES AGAINST ME ARE NOT TRUE."

NOR COULD THE SECRETARY-GENERAL BE UNAWARE THAT THE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND OF THE EARLIER SPECIAL INQUIRY COMMITTEE CONTAINED "MANY STATEMENTS WHICH ARE IN CONFLICT WITH FACTS KNOWN TO YOU, BANG-JENSEN SAID."

(WATCH EMBARGO) DH/K 20 JULY 0943
BANG JENSEN - VICTIM OF A CLEAR CONSCIENCE

How the missing Danish diplomat won and lost his battle at the United Nations

Information Department News Background No. 55
Munich 26 November 1959 (1am)

News peg: The body of Mr Povl Bang-Jensen, former senior political officer in the UN secretariat, was found in a New York park Thursday. The body showed signs of violence. Mr Bang-Jensen had not been heard of since last Monday. His wife said he might be suffering from amnesia, partly due to worry since his dismissal from the UN in July 1958. He was one of the key UN officials in the first investigations of the events in Hungary. His death comes a day after the United Nations General Assembly decided to place the Hungarian question on its agenda again.

The "Bang-Jensen affair" caused worldwide interest during the one year or so, when he was fighting his battle of conscience against all attempts to make him go back on his refusal to reveal the names of Hungarian witnesses, whom he had interrogated in connection with the original UN investigation of the Hungarian uprising and the Soviet suppression of it. He morally won the battle on one bleak January day in 1958, when a sealed envelope containing the lists of witnesses was burned in his presence on the roof of the United Nations headquarters. But he lost the legal proceedings concerning his "unsubordination" as a member of the UN staff and was finally dismissed.

Still hoping to be rehabilitated one day, he stayed on in New York and attained a job with the Committee for American Relief Everywhere (CARE) which is active in supporting refugees all over the world.

Bang-Jensen, now 50, has been an idealist all his life. As a young Danish law student he was active in the fight against Nazism and later became an emissary of the Danish underground movement, helping from Washington to coordinate allied aid to partisans fighting the German occupation at home. He broke off a diplomatic career to join the international staff of the United Nations in 1949 and soon became engaged in the work of the committee appointed to carry out General Assembly decisions.
When it was decided after the suppression of the Hungarian revolt to set up a 5-member Investigation Committee Bang-Jensen was once more called upon. As its Deputy Secretary he had special responsibilities for the interrogation or witnesses, mainly Hungarian refugees, who could provide evidence on what had happened in a country that was now again completely sealed off.

In this capacity he spoke to more than 300 eye-witnesses and statements from 111 of them were finally included in the Committee’s report, which amounted to a forthright condemnation of the suppression. Most of the witnesses appeared before the full committee, but Bang-Jensen kept their names secret in accordance, he claimed, with instructions given.

Nobody objected to this procedure during the hearing itself, but several months later, when the report had already been published, the office of the Secretary General demanded the lists for filing. Bang-Jensen refused, claiming he had given his word of honor to all concerned and referring to his previous instructions. He did not conceal the fact that his objections were connected with his lack of confidence in the Secretariat’s ability to prevent Communists or sympathizers among the staff of 4,000 from gaining access to the secret lists and revealing their contents to the Soviets, with possible disastrous effects for the persons concerned or their relatives in Hungary.

Bang-Jensen was suspended for insubordination and even physically removed from the United Nations building, but the documents remained in a safety box at his bank and from there they were finally brought out by himself to be burned unsee. This was done according to a decision by a special investigation committee after Bang-Jensen had given a solemn assurance that no other copies existed.

But the insubordination charge remained, and he was dismissed shortly afterwards by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöeld, who felt that Bang-Jensen’s continuous presence would threaten the principle of discipline in the whole staff. Bang-Jensen answered by starting a legal battle, which he lost at all levels, leaving him an embittered man. He claimed that his aim was not reinstatement in his lost job, only rehabilitation, but lost a good deal of sympathy by publicly indulging in personal attacks on former colleagues and superiors.
Morally, he was once more fully rehabilitated, when the International
League for Human Rights, an institution accredited to the United Nations although
not fully recognized as one of its subsidiary organs came to the conclusion after
an examination of his case by an independent panel of jurists, that his dismissal
had been unjustified. The panel cited in this connection the International War
Crimes Court in Nuremberg, which had ruled that conflicts between obedience to
superiors and moral obligations towards the life and liberty of third persons must
always be resolved in favor of the latter criterion.

Bang-Jensen himself, asked whether he felt like the "Dreyfus of the
United Nations" answered a correspondent of the Swiss "Weltwoche": "I am no martyr
and do not want to become one. I am only a man who does his duty. Had I given in
no one in the United Nations would ever dare to defend the liberty and those
fighting for it.... It may take months or even years before the truth has been
established, but I shall finally be rehabilitated."

In the case of Dreyfuss it took 12 years....
Daily morning Social Democratic (coa. Government) AKTUELT of
COPENHAGEN, dated 22.10.61, carried the following interview
with former Minister Ernst CHRISTIANSEN on the possibility of
the Danish UN-official Povl BANG-JENSEN being murdered or whe-
ther he committed suicide. Mr. Ernst CHRISTIANSEN was a member
of the Danish UN delegation in 1947, 1953 and 1954 and chairman
of the delegation in the years 1955 - 1960. He was also a friend
of Povl BANG-JENSEN. The interview is by Preben HANSEN.

DID BANG-JENSEN COMMIT SUICIDE?
MORE AND MORE REASON FOR DOUBT

"Was it murder or suicide?"

"I dare not give a definite reply", says Ernst CHRISTIANSEN.
"I do not think that there is sufficient proof of that it was
suicide. But on the other hand, it has not been clearly proved
that it was not suicide. I doubt if we shall ever know for cer-
tain. Do not forget, that if it is murder arranged as suicide,
it is done by experts."

"Why should anyone wish to kill him?"

"If we knew that it would be easier to judge the case. Last
time I met BANG-JENSEN was 2 - 3 weeks before he died. He looked
me up, and he was very occupied by two things. He was going to
build up a new existence and he was very grateful for what was
being done in various quarters, by for example the Foreign Secre-
tary J.O. KRAG, to give him the possibility of having a new career.
He also thought that his case ought to be re-tried. He said that
he had some new items, new facts to present, and asked if I
believed the Danish Government would do anything to support the
case. I told him that if he really had something new to tell,
then New York was the place where to tell it. I did not think
that the Danish Government should take an initiative like that.
He maintained that he had very important new facts. But he could
not tell what they were. Only that they were of real importance,
he said. That was one of his mistakes, his tendency never to tell
anything. Too often he just said that he had something to tell.
We had a very long talk which ended in the most friendly manner. We agreed to meet again before I left New York. But I never saw him again. He died while I was still in New York. Also in 1957 when he was so dramatically suspended from his post, it happened when I was in New York.

"You knew BANG-JENSEN rather well?"

"I met him the first time when I in 1953 was a member of the UN delegation. I believe it was in 1950 he was employed by the UN Secretariat after having been posted to the Danish Embassy in WASHINGTON for about 10 years. He was an outstanding jurist and had a rather high-ranking post in the UN. He was working in close connection with the Political Committee, where also much of my activity was. I always liked him much. He was very helpful, always got the information that was wanted, and he could be trusted. I feel very moved about his fate."

"When his case was tried, many had the impression that he was somewhat hysterical?"

"That he was not. Far from it. He was, on the contrary, very quiet; one might call him gentle. But it was most peculiar that this friendly man was able to cause the most violent passions. There were people, whom I appreciated very much, but who could not stand him. I personally maintained my friendship for him without regard to his suspension and dismissal. I had nothing directly to do with his case; it was on the administrative level and I was a political representative.

"During the case - and also after - there was much talk about Communist infiltration in the United Nations. But is that anything peculiar that there are Communists in an organisation of which also the East Bloc are members?"

"On the contrary, that is natural, that the Communist countries have got their people occupying both important and less important posts in UN. I do not know what BANG-JENSEN referred to. I do not know what he talked about when he said that he had new facts in the case, when I talked to him last. But it has made a certain impression on me, that in these few years after his death, two Russian UN officials have been exposed as spies. Last
year a UN-Russian was arrested, he had a second or third rank position, but he was released on bail. It was a very large sum of money that had to be paid. And then he disappeared out of New York harbour onboard a Russian ship. I do not say that these things have got anything to do with BANG-JENSEN's death. But it does make one a little uncertain about what may have happened that we do not know of - and also about what BANG-JENSEN may have known and never got told.

"Could BANG-JENSEN's conflict with UN have been avoided?"

"It could have been milder if Alsing ANDERSEN in the Hungarian Commission had had a majority for letting the lists be burned. It would have been the only right thing if that had been done at an early stage. Alsing ANDERSEN fought very energetically for it, but, unfortunately, in vain. In that connection it may be of interest that the official to whom BANG-JENSEN should have delivered the lists was a Yugoslav, who in February 1958 was replaced by a Russian. But at that time then papers were burnt - although the Hungarian Commission rejected this proposal in December 1957.

"Were you surprised about BANG-JENSEN's death?"

"Yes, completely. I did not at any time get the impression that he contemplated suicide. There was nothing in our last conversation that indicated any such thing. It was also a surprise to everybody else. From the two days when he had disappeared and nobody knew about his fate, I remember a remark from one of those who did not like him: "That is just a trick BANG-JENSEN has made to cause sensation." Nobody imagined that he could be dead. And as time passes, there is more and more reason to doubt the theory of suicide. One of the peculiar items is that nobody has been able to find out where he was during the two days when he had disappeared, before he died. I do not expect that we shall ever find out. When I express my opinion in the case, it is because I think we owe BANG-JENSEN and his family the utmost consideration. When criticising BANG-JENSEN's possible mistakes, possible incorrect behaviour, then we should not forget - and that is to me decisive to me - that it is all born out of his eagerness to help the Hungarian resistance people. The possible wrongs he has done are placed in a light of their own by being done in the fight on the right side."