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At the very outset I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to two fundamental facts relevant to the whole debate. The first: the Hungarian people has one request - I should say one well-founded demand - to the United Nations. It is to collaborate in extricating Hungary from being used in the cold war. It would be welcomed if all the delegations with friendly feelings towards the Hungarian people could really heed this appeal.

The second fact: there exists a basic contradiction between the present day United States political intentions in Central Europe and the real interests and aspirations of the Hungarian people. This basic contradiction has to be kept in mind during the whole debate.

I do not forget - not for one moment - that in the given situation I have to be modest regarding the perspectives of this issue under discussion and I have to appreciate even modest progress. In this spirit I wish to emphasise that the agenda item we are discussing now was inscribed in the agenda by ten votes less than last year. Taking into consideration the most particular steps much better known to many delegations than to me which preceded the inclusion of this item, we may say that the decrease of votes is rather considerable. I wish to thank those who for any reason did not vote in favour of inclusion. The growing number of such delegations is a hopeful indication that the Charter is being more consistently implemented. My delegation appreciates even the slightest growth in that direction, because we know that many delegations were in a predicament about the true nature of the 1956 events in Hungary and the confusion of those of good faith, together with confusion created by hostile propaganda, was used to blur a truthful evaluation of the real facts. The clarification of such a confusion does not happen overnight, particularly when new confusing elements are being intentionally added. Therefore I am grateful even for the slightest steps forward. I thank those who have contributed to this progress however slight it is nevertheless gratifying.
I have a special word to say to those who voted for the inclusion of this item for any reason but with good feelings towards the Hungarian people. I am not unrealistic. I suppose that at this stage most of the delegations have already received their instructions from their respective governments. In the case of many this debate cannot change the attitude prescribed by their instructions. Nevertheless I ask for open-mindedness and understanding of the real problems of the Hungarian people. If there is still a chance for them to change their position, so much the better. Even if they cannot change their official position but they have come to a better personal understanding of the real problems, this, in perspective, would be a valuable gain not only for the Hungarian people, but for the relaxation of tensions in this Organisation in general.

My intervention will be limited and concentrated on Document A/4364 presented by the honourable gentleman acting on the basis of resolution No.1312/XIII/. It is an analysis of this document that I wish to offer to the General Assembly.

Yes, I am going to deal with this document. Quite a number of distinguished delegates have asked me in the past few days whether my delegation intends to take part in this debate or not. There is no need to mention why such an idea crossed their minds. Actually my delegation would have every ground both legal and political, to ignore this debate, especially this document. Besides referring to Charter provisions, according to which all matters proposed for discussion are entirely within the jurisdiction of Hungary as a Member State, we warned the delegations that the debate on this provocative issue would only empoison the improving situation here and elsewhere. Since that time members of this Assembly may already have experienced the bad effects of this debate not only within the General Assembly. Yes, with much regret I have to say that developments subsequent to such a debate will in all probability prove right our gloomy forecast. So, we would have all legal and moral grounds not to take part in this debate. In spite of this we decided to participate as a sign of respect to the General
Assembly in order to show that we are ready to comply with General Assembly resolutions even in such a case, with the reservation that we shall not yield to attempts at interference in our domestic affairs. We decided to participate also because we did not want to leave any of the delegations under the impact of a malevolent statement made here, as if we wanted any evil to be swept under the rugs. This expression was first used by Sir Leslie Munro in his Montreal speech on 20th November last. Again in the same context it was used a few days later in this hall by the delegate of the United States. Sir Leslie Munro applied it once more in his speech to the Overseas Press Club on 1st December. One might wonder who is the epigone of whom. No, Mr. President, we have nothing to hide under the rugs. On the contrary, we have chosen the document presented as a report by the honourable gentleman acting on the basis of resolution No.1312 as the subject matter for our consideration precisely because it invites us to single out the real evils which ought to be swept not so much under the rugs as out of the relaxing international situation and out of this Organisation at a time when this Organisation is showing greater effectiveness for the sake of international peace and security and fundamental human rights.

In analysing this document, we first have to grasp its principal aims. The author of this document is rather helpful in this respect, because he defined the substance of his whole mission in very concise and expressive terms. We read in paragraph 14, on page 7 of this document: "I have concluded that it is my duty to continue in the office of United Nations Representative on the Question of Hungary as a symbol of continuing United Nations concern to achieve the political independence of Hungary in accordance with the provisions of the General Assembly's resolutions." So, Mr. President, he is a symbol. Symbol of what? The symbol of concern to achieve the political independence of Hungary. This self-introduction may serve as a revelation to many. The definition in this sentence of his function gives a true and comprehensive interpretation not only
of his function but also of all previous resolutions on this subject and of the present debate. Yes, Mr. President, this is a kind of revelation to many. We have not ceased stating from the very beginning of this controversy that the pressure exercised to include this item in the agenda and to fabricate unlawful resolutions against Hungary can be traced to unjustifiable political aims directed against Hungary and not only against her, but also against other Member States with which Hungary is in alliance. What we have said and done in unveiling these political intentions has convinced some, but we have not been as effective in every direction as we ought to have been. Now the concise and eloquent confession is before the General Assembly, presented by the most competent expert. I repeat, all previous actions and the present debate are to be looked upon in the light of this clarification.

Well, Mr. President, what is the concept behind this revealing definition given by the document under debate? What is the value and implication of the political independence for which the honourable gentleman whom I quoted claims to strive? In order to grasp the real content of this concept we have to look for the source of these expressions in connection with Hungary. These expressions are not to be found in any of the General Assembly resolutions concerning Hungary. They reflect recent official United States statements dealing with Hungary. They have been taken from United States utterances. The source provides the meaning.

What do US sources mean when speaking about a long-term policy for achieving political independence for Hungary? These long-term expressions represent the third stage of US policy concerning Europe or, more concretely, concerning Eastern Europe after the Second World War. The professed aims did not change during the transforming stages, only the contemplated methods and these only in some respects.

In the first stage of United States political strategy regarding Eastern Europe the main watchword was expressed as
liberation by military actions. This stage of US political strategy regarding Eastern Europe became bankrupt during the armed deadlock in Korea, when it was known that the Soviet Union also possessed atomic weapons and the Eastern European People's Democracies together with the Soviet Union could spell disaster for any US military venture. At that time the watchword was changed. In the second period of post-war US political strategy the main watchword was: undermining the social and political system in Eastern European states through conspiracies, using mainly elements of the former ruling class adversely affected by many of the social changes. In that period we witnessed this strategy in action in the German Democratic Republic, in Poland and most intensively in Hungary. This stage of US political strategy for Eastern Europe, together with its principal watchword, faded out of existence as these states developed socially and economically, and that with considerable speed during the past few years; and it faded out of existence as the socialist states growing in material and moral strength tilted the scales in their favour. In the present, third period, no official US statements expect any sudden change. New watchwords are being evolved. At this stage, in conformity with US Secretary of State's elaboration in this year's general debate on the policy of peaceful change, the main watchword for Eastern Europe is: it may take a long time to achieve peacefully the independence of these states. In this period all diplomatic, economic and political contacts of the United States with Eastern European countries are being coordinated to this end. Even the United Nations actions are being used for these political aims as is revealed in the document under discussion.

What, then, are these political aims? To tear Hungary out of the alliance with the other socialist states, particularly with the Soviet Union, and then to turn back the clock of history by giving back lands and plants to landlords, bankers and aristocrats, and then to use Hungary as a springboard against
other socialist states, first of all against the Soviet Union. That is the connotation in the political vocabulary of the United States for the watchword "political independence for Hungary". As I stated at the outset of my intervention there is a basic contradiction between United States intentions and the real interests and aspirations of the Hungarian people. In conformity with US policy United Nations actions are being used against the Hungarian people as is revealed in the crucial sentence of the document I quoted.

I hope nobody imagines we attach too much importance to any of these strategic stages. We know that the third stage, with all its watchwords, will fade out of existence as surely as the two previous stages. Not only we, the inventors of the new strategic watchword are also aware how ephemeral these new inventions are, but - until then - much harm may be done to this Organisation, to the general international situation, and to some individuals as well.

At this moment I wish to say a few words in emphasising the harm to individuals involved. In order to beget more confidence in the sincerity of these strategic aims individuals are being senselessly sacrificed. I wish to start with an undeniably US document. As far back as April 1957 the US News and World Report published an article under the heading "Foreign Legion for US?" In that article it was made public that in one of the military centres of the United States young men from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria and so on are being trained for special military assignments against these countries. This in itself is an indication of what is meant in the United States under the term "peaceful intentions". But my main point in this respect is something else. In Fort Jackson and in several other camps in the United States and also in several Western European countries, preparations are being made not only for an eventual, overall military action, but for interim actions as well. From many of these camps individuals and groups have already been transplanted into
Hungary for subversive activities. Some of the names have been made public, several others will be. The Hungarian authorities have seized specialised weapons and equipment either in their possession or en route to them. Some of these people have already been brought to trial. Others will be. Most recently at the Party congress in Budapest my Government's Minister of the Interior made public that a group of subversive elements in possession of instructions and equipment from the United States had been seized. This matter has several aspects. As to the actions themselves, they are absolutely futile and senseless. As to their initiators, they are playing a cynical game if they protest reprisals against such subversive actions. As to the representatives of a government under whose authority such actions are being carried out, they have forfeited all rights, at least in connection with Hungary, to appeal to the ideals of fundamental human rights.

In this context it will be instructive to quote a rather relevant sentence of a press statement of the US delegation in support of the inclusion of this item. The statement was made on 18th November and I already quoted it, but because I wanted to keep myself to the Rules of Procedure I did not comment on it. I will do so now. It reads as follows: "All those responsible in and out of Hungary should work with the rest of us to carry out the overwhelmingly adopted resolutions of the United Nations." This sentence reveals both the political intentions of the US Government and its expectations in connection with General Assembly resolutions. According to US interpretation all the resolutions are directed against the social, political and economic system of Hungary. Consequently the appeal contained in the above sentence cannot be addressed to the responsible leaders of Hungary; on the contrary, it is addressed to elements hostile to the system of Hungary either inside or outside the country. It is an appeal to all who share the same political aims as the US delegation here directed against the political structure of Hungary. That is to say, with reference
to previous General Assembly resolutions such appeals may be made with a view to promoting hostile actions either outside or inside Hungary against the orderly life of society.

It is really helpful that the document under discussion gives a comprehensive interpretation of all previous and present actions. It may help many delegations to a better understanding of the real issue. In the face of all these unjustifiable efforts I have to emphasise that the basic interests and aspirations of the Hungarian people - as an independent nation - are to go ahead as successfully as possible with building the socialist economic, cultural and political life in deep and friendly alliance with all the other socialist states, first of all with the Soviet Union, and to live on good neighbourly terms with all other states. All the previous actions as instruments of United States foreign policy are directed against these basic interests of Hungary. They are, therefore, being used not only for interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary, but also for interference in the domestic affairs of other socialist states with which Hungary is in alliance.

The whole political concept contained in the document and all the political intentions of the United States in this respect, which had remained hidden in previous resolutions, are anachronistic phenomena in the relaxing international situation and they are only fostered to slow down and hamper the process of relaxation. We can all be sure that the trend of events today does not work in favour of these cold war manoeuvres.

The difficulties created by the US Government in the way of relaxation are blackening the reputation of United States foreign policy in the eyes of honest people all over the world. The intensification of tensions is popular only amongst those whose daily bread and career depend on the maintenance of world tension. In this respect President Eisenhower's statement at his press conference prior to his departure will be rather illuminating. When asked about his feelings on his forthcoming mission, he replied: "I think that we can conclude, from all of the reports that come to us from abroad, that there is a
great deal of doubt remaining in the minds of many people, and including our friends, allies and other friends, as to America's real sincerity in pursuit of peace. We have tried to emphasise this point in every possible way, through diplomatic contacts, through speeches of Secretary of State, myself and others, and still it does not seem to come through." Yes, also in the minds of all those who have some insight into the way the United States is using Hungary, amidst the ruins of the cold war period to maintain some of its vestiges, there will certainly remain doubts about the sincerity and seriousness of United States declarations regarding, for instance, the validity of the support of negotiations instead of strength and wars. One could think that all other efforts of the United States for negotiations only seem to be peaceful preliminaries with the intent of creating cold war tensions also in other fields, as has been experienced here in the case of Hungary. Only the United States representative could dispel such doubts.

In the next part of my intervention I wish to analyse the conception presented by the document under discussion regarding the nature of events in Hungary in October-November 1956. On pages 5 and 6 we are given an interpretation of these events with a view to justifying the United Nations concern with those events and their consequences. To those who are not acquainted with what happened that interpretation may even seem convincing. By oversimplifying, completely misunderstanding the real factors, it simply states that as Soviet units were involved, therefore there was foreign intervention. According to this interpretation it is concluded that the United Nations had and still has the right to concern itself with this situation. On the other hand, it is disputed that there was any intervention on the part of Western Powers. Consequently it is questioned why we did not bring our complaint before the United Nations if intervention on the part of Western Powers did take place, as we hold it did.
Let us review the events in a concise way, as briefly and in as clear-cut terms as possible. As I shall not deal here with aspects of the matter which would require thorough-going study by those who are honestly interested in the matter, I restrict myself to publicly known and undeniable facts which can be checked by everybody.

The best way to start seems to me to show the undeniable interest and participation of Western quarters entirely disregarded or even denied by the document under discussion.

1. The United States Government officially offered 20 million dollars in aid to the counter-revolution. This happened on the 2nd of November, at a time when the terror against all sorts of progressive people was at its peak. Several hundreds of them were already massacred and tens of thousands more were on the black list. The offer was made in full awareness of these facts and no objection was raised to the reigning terror.

2. This offer was made in full awareness of the happenings. Indicative of this is the fact that one day before the offer members of the United States legation in Budapest visited the headquarters of the counter-revolution where they were informed about the situation, gave further advice, and promised United States Government support. The public announcement of this was made the following day.

3. A large quantity of arms made in the USA and used as standard arms by US units was captured during and after the counter-revolution. Several Western papers, for instance in Switzerland and West Germany, published reports on these arms shipments.

4. Several groups of subversive elements directed and transplanted into Hungary by official and semi-official US agencies prior to or during the counter-revolution have since been tried and the documents published.

5. The so-called Radio Free Europe with its representatives and relay stations on the spot acted as a sort of
military headquarters giving detailed instructions regarding when and under what circumstances what kinds of arms should be employed and assigning fighting groups. Even Western papers amply criticised these activities. If somebody were to claim that this is a private enterprise, it would be easy to show through official statements the interest of the State Department in this so-called private radio enterprise. It is enough to allude to an article in the New York Herald Tribune of the time when this so-called private enterprise was set up on 3 April 1950.

So much for the time being about Western interests and participation. You may have noticed that I spoke exclusively about United States agencies. It is a matter of course that I could have mentioned actions by other Western powers or various groups of people of Hungarian origin who dissociated themselves and even turned against their native country. I did not do so for several reasons, one of them being that I wished to concentrate the General Assembly's attention on the main, decisive factor in this respect - the responsibility of the United States agencies.

If anybody really wishes to understand the October-November 1956 events in Hungary, he has to take into consideration the special historic background of Central Europe. On this particular territory Hungary has some features peculiar to herself.

After the First World War - come to think of it, not so long ago, - after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Hungary of the Horthy regime became a gathering place for such people escaped from Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia, such as big landowners, members of the old Austro-Hungarian administration, aristocrats and all sorts of people who, either for social or nationality reasons, were hostile to the new states of Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia. With these most incendiary reactionary elements Hungary was the most backward state in Central Europe with the epithet of "country
of the three million beggars", where one third of the popula-

tion lived at starvation level.

After the Second World War social problems had to be
solved to rehabilitate the three million beggars, to benefit
the working people in general. Social reform was bound to be
disadvantageous to some who had lived off the great masses.

Parallel with solving these social problems to raise
living standard and because of an extremely tense world
situation, industrialisation - especially in heavy industry -
had to be as speedy as possible. At that time insufficient
attention was paid to the human side of building a new society.
In spite of the fact that during this period the basic economic
factors of the country developed with unprecedented rapidity,
a certain degree of resentment was accumulated even in those
who belonged to the constructive elements of the socialist
society.

So there were incendiary elements of different values
and character.

At a time when the overcoming of domestic difficulties
had begun in the Government and in the Party in the process
of democratisation, the incendiary elements of the first two
categories, with the help of their international allies,
became more and more active. On 23 October reactionary
forces inside and outside Hungary launched their attack in
connivance with many misled people against all the social
and economic gains of the working people, against the neigh-
bouring countries. The West was involved from the very be-
ginning, as I have said before. The intervention of Western
Powers began long before the Hungarian Government decided in
favour of the most energetic actions against the counter-
revolution by requesting the help of Soviet units.

Hungary was on the verge of an all-embracing civil war,
in danger of being torn into two, repeating the Korean tragedy
in Central Europe, and so in danger of becoming the po\wderkog
of a new European or even world war. We had to choose between life and death, and we chose life. When the Presidential Council recalled Imre Nagy, who had brought the nation to the brink of death, and it appointed the new government under János Kádár, the decision was made to end the terror with the help of Soviet units stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Treaty concluded much earlier. The Soviet units acted under the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Hungarian Government.

To sum up: there was no foreign intervention on the part of the Soviet Union in putting an end to the counter-revolution; exclusive responsibility for these actions rests with the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic. The quelling of the counter-revolution saved the Hungarian people from an all-embracing civil war and from the threat of war. So, those who are blaming the liquidation of the counter-revolution for the lives it cost, wittingly or unwittingly regard as insufficient the loss of life.

As to the question posed in the document under discussion why we did not bring the complaint against Western intervention to the United Nations, our answer is very simple. Our main objective was to heal the wounds inflicted by the counter-revolution and to develop the social, economic and cultural life of the country in a relaxing international situation with the friendly assistance of all the socialist states. We are not seeking in this Organisation causes or pretexts to increase tensions. It is a painful experience having to intervene here today with a statement which inevitably heaps up tensions. It is not our fault that this debate is taking place. Our main demand is, with respect to this Organisation, that the Hungarian people be given help to extricate themselves from being used in the cold war.

Let me quote a few passages from the speech of János Kádár, First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, to the recent Party congress in Budapest. After speaking of consolidation and general progress, he stated: "The 1956 counter-revolutionary uprising will always remain a black day in the
annals of our people. The fact that today, barely three years after those events, we can say that the counter-revolution already belongs to the past, proves also how greatly our people have gained in political experience, how strong was their determination and unity to overcome the wrong and evil conjured up by the counter-revolution - that they were able to bury the counter-revolution." This is the basis for our earnest expectations regarding this Organisation. From the domestic point of view the counter-revolution already belongs to the past and this is beneficial to the Hungarian people and to the international situation. In the same way this Organisation would be acting to benefit the Hungarian people internationally only if it acted as we did instead of using the Hungarian people time and time again for creating new tensions.

As to the presence of Soviet units in Hungary, I have to emphasise that this is in no way connected with the domestic situation. They were there before the counter-revolution under the Warsaw Treaty and they will remain there as long as the States party to this treaty deem it necessary. The very fact that NATO Powers through resolutions of the UN General Assembly are trying in an illegal way to press for the withdrawal of these troops is a further indication that strategically not only for the safety of Hungary, but also for the safety of other socialist states, it is still necessary to have these units in Hungary. Even the resolutions in this respect pressed by NATO powers justify the presence of these units.

After having proved that the interpretation given by the document of the counter-revolution is incomplete, arbitrary, inadequate and after having proved that the foreign intervention described in the document did not take place, I wish to underline the words of the Charter "nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorise the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic
jurisdiction of any state". I underline especially these words: "nothing contained in the present Charter". That is to say no paragraph in the Charter authorises any organ of the United Nations to intervene in the matters discussed under the heading Question of Hungary, because these matters are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Hungarian People's Republic.

I now turn to what the document contains and what it omits regarding judicial actions. It is part of the psychological preparation for this debate that rumours, allegations and phantastic falsifications were invented and spread during the last few months with a view to impressing delegates of good faith to favour inclusion of this agenda item. Some of these allegations are omitted, others are only referred to and alluded to in the document. One can understand why this document was not tabled as a report for inclusion in the General Assembly resolution on inscription. The document does not contain any factual statement which could justify the urgency of this debate, as the explanatory memorandum with its vague allusions to alleged news regarding impending executions tried to justify the state of urgency. Certainly if delegates had been acquainted with this document before deciding on inscription the resolution would have received even fewer votes.

I now intend to give some information to the General Assembly regarding the origin of allegations contained in the document and those to which only allusion is made.

First, about the scandalous invention concerning the alleged imprisonment of 150 young people who were minors at the time of the counter-revolution and who are awaiting execution as soon as they reach the age of 18, when they will be legally adults.

It was a television network in the United States that started spreading this allegation. A distinguished producer hired by two advertising sponsors launched an appeal to the American public to organise mediating actions to save these
fictitious people. Two gentlemen whom I know personally asked
the producer on what grounds he is organising such a campaign.
He then named the person who had supplied him with the informa-
tion and added that he had received the approval of the State
Department as well to his actions. According to a New York
periodical the New York City Board of Education urged student
organisations to undertake similar actions. The periodical
enquired from the Board of Education on the strength of what
information they were organising the students. The answer
was that the State Department had okayed the action saying
that it wanted as much publicity as possible on the matter.

In this connection the document under discussion re-
produces the denial made by János Kádár, First Secretary of
the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party, who spoke about this
slanderous invention at a public meeting. Although the
document claims to welcome the denial, it omits part of it.
János Kádár in his speech added the following words: "The
time is not too far off when the people misled by such
provocative actions will reprimand the provocators asking
them: why did you lie to us?"

I could quote other scandalous inventions contained in
the document. On page 12, paragraph 31 it is stated that a
Hungarian spokesman conceded on 17th October 1959 that death
sentences had recently been carried out. Actually this
Hungarian spokesman had stated the opposite. Two Reuters
correspondents paid a visit on that day to the Hungarian
Government spokesman in connection with the same list of 31
people who - as delegates here have also been told- had been
executed. The spokesman informed Reuters that during the
last three years not one of the people on the list had even
been up for trial or arraignment in Hungary. Probably they
never even existed. Reuters gave a misleading report of
this interview which was followed up by a letter of apology
addressed by the correspondent to the Government spokesman
stating that his teleprinter had gone out of order during the
transmission of the interview to London. The following day Reuters issued a correction. However the document under discussion claims that the Hungarian spokesman actually confirmed the news about the executions.

I could reveal many other inventions. I think for the time being what I said is conclusive enough to show up the malevolent international conspiracy to vilify my country in some parts of the world.

I finish this point by stating that what we declared at the last session of the General Assembly regarding the completion of investigations and legal proceedings connected with the counter-revolution is valid and nothing has changed the validity of this statement since the last session.

On the other hand I have to declare most resolutely that all judicial actions fall entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of the Hungarian People's Republic and we protest against all attempts at interference. I should add that if among the subversive elements transplanted by US and other organs there happened to be anybody who had taken part in the counter-revolution, his share in the counter-revolution would not be qualified as a laissez-passer in his new unlawful undertakings.

As a last point in analysing the document under discussion I would like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to certain rather relevant inconsistencies in the document and in the attitude of its author. In paragraph 15 he states that he exerted himself to bring about "an amelioration of the relationship between the organisation and the present Hungarian authorities." The terminology used in this sentence proves he is not trying to promote amelioration. As a contrast to this declaration if anybody reads reports in the Canadian press about his lecture in Montreal or his speech at the American Dental Convention in New York, or his statement at the Overseas Press Club, then one can but conclude that during the last year he was the most ardent and active propagator
of cold war allegations against Hungary and the Soviet Union. In his last statement on 1st December he even ventured to spread allegations not only against these two socialist states, but against Poland, Albania, Rumania and Bulgaria as well.

I could continue analysing further many other obvious malevolent assertions in his document. What I have shown may indicate that the honourable gentleman acting on the basis of resolution No. 1312 has disqualified himself in many respects and it is absolutely impossible for him to represent the General Assembly in any capacity in connection with Hungary.

After all, Mr. President, I am profoundly convinced that however harmful this debate is in many respects the Hungarian people will continue on their way resolutely and undisturbed.

This year, too, in spite of the false assertions and allegations heaped on us, considerable progress was made in all fields of life. It will be interesting in this respect to quote the 25th October issue of the New York Herald Tribune. The correspondent who visited Budapest gives his impressions in just a few words: "The green flowered parks look very much like the parks in New York or Peoria, filled with children on their seesaws and girls swinging their hoola-hoops. The churches are well filled", he writes, "and shortly after noon the people wander out, dressed not unlike the burghers of Philadelphia or Muskegon. A three-year-old imp of a boy has on a sailor's suit, neatly pressed and looking like Brooks Brothers." Then he describes the whole family and continues: "Throngs of Sunday walkers pass you by, wheeling baby-carriages that surely are the envy of the entire baby-carriage trade with their little windmills and sliding panes all done in a quilted white. About this Sunday morning scene there is an air of genuine benignity", he continues, "an atmosphere that makes the tragedy of 1956 seem ridiculously out of date." So it is in the New York Herald Tribune. Of course the correspondent had to add something sad too, and he describes that in the evening,
Our foreign trade increased by 12 per cent this year.

It is a rather painful experience that at a time when this Organisation could be making such a constructive contribution to benefit the nations and when we in Hungary are seized with the requirements and results of a developing new life - the General Assembly is bound to this debate really detrimental not so much to Hungary as to the international situation in general.

This debate on the so-called question of Hungary is a characteristic phenomenon in the present international context, in the struggle of different trends. Prime Minister Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov stated during his recent visit to Budapest: "We do our utmost to speed up the melting of the cold war. Two tendencies are now distinctly appearing in the international situation: on the one hand, not only the peoples, but also many statesmen and many political leaders recognise the necessity of liquidating the cold war. On the other hand, the desires of certain quarters to halt the process of easing international tensions that has begun and to preserve the state of the cold war." The question of Hungary on the agenda of the General Assembly is a clear-cut reflection of this struggle of opposing trends. We have every reason to say that even in this matter the trends of the cold war are weakening and the trends for relaxation are waxing in strength.

I conclude, Mr. President, on the basis of the analysis I presented regarding the document under discussion. My delegation cannot take notice of it, I consider it a reflection of US policy against Hungary and we shall deal with it accordingly. I wish to emphasise again: the Hungarian people has one request to the United Nations, namely, to help us extricate ourselves from being used in the cold war. With all respect, I ask the delegations not to take notice of this document and not to vote for any action connected with this document. Voting against such action or even only abstaining will be of considerable assistance to the Hungarian people, to the relaxation of world tension.