

Under the general title "a few minutes of foreign politics", Budapest radio on 28th August broadcast a commentary asking "Who has offended the UN organisation" which took up "the reaction in a tone of exasperation" of some Western newspapers and radio stations to the Hungarian attitude towards the convention of the UN General Assembly Extraordinary Session. The following is the text of this commentary:

"In connection with our commentary on the convening of the UN General Assembly to debate the Report of the Committee of Five, some Western papers and radio stations have reacted in a tone of exasperation.

"One of the most important bourgeois papers, the 'Neue Zuercher Zeitung', for example, deems it particularly insulting to the UN that we thought to have detected a certain degree of similarity in the mentality of the members of the Committee of Five and the witnesses they heard. Well, truth is truth, and it is not very flattering to be associated with people such as the members of the Committee of Five, who have hired themselves out to work against our country, and have not been slow to slander the Hungarian people.

"We did not select this 'magnificent' party. The erudite editors of 'Neue Zuercher Zeitung' surely know the old Latin adage: 'Qui bene distinguet, bene docet', which in a literal translation means 'He who is good at distinguishing is good at teaching'. Its practical significance lies in the fact that the secret of success in securing the acceptance of any thesis is to select the right witnesses and arguments, regardless of whether the thesis is objectively right or wrong. This means that one must have a truthful witness for a just cause, and a false witness for a false one. The selection of witnesses thus shows the kind of case, and in this case we concede that the witnesses had to be selected by someone who had had some experience in high treason.

Andersen's High Treason

"Mr. Andersen, the Chairman of the Committee of Five, was a collaborator during the Nazi occupation of Denmark, and this information does not come from witnesses such as those from whom the Committee of Five has secured its information, but from Danish patriots who, by listing the crimes committed by Mr. Andersen publicly state that he is a traitor. The documents of this case are in the archives of the court at Copenhagen.

"It is a matter for the Danish Social Democrat leadership whether they tolerate Mr. Andersen's presence in their ranks in spite of this, and whether he should have been given the post of Chairman of the Committee of Five; but it is for us to draw attention to him as a specialist in high treason in connection with a report directed against us. After all, the question of moral authenticity cannot be irrelevant when judging a document which is so greatly opposed to facts.

"What can be the trustworthiness of an action which results from the co-operation of experienced and casual traitors before the well-meaning people of the world who are in no position to judge, as we are who are in possession of a full knowledge of events and of the facts, between the statements contained in the Report of the Committee of Five and the true facts. A Nazi collaborator is trying to convince the world, and the UN General Assembly, that in October 1956 there was a national uprising and not a counter-revolution in Hungary, and to do this on the evidence of witnesses who themselves had taken an active part in the counter-revolution, and who, on leaving the country, have continued to intrigue against it. This, indeed, is not flattering

for the UN organisation. In this the 'Neue Zürcher Zeitung' is right, but we do not believe that we have given offence; we merely drew attention to these related facts. The offenders have been those who, by these means, want to use the UN organisation for such purposes.

Who Were These Witnesses?

"We are, however, willing to admit that we have slightly exaggerated the significance of the role of the witnesses. Rather naively, we have accepted the statement in the introductory part of the Report that the Committee of Five had heard some 100 witnesses, and had made use of their depositions in its Report. No matter what the moral standing of the witnesses was, it has carried out some sort of investigation to satisfy formalities and appearances. It emerges from certain Western Press reports, for example, a report in the 'Tribune des Nations', that even this statement in the Report is untrue. The Report has not been compiled by hearing a number of people, who appeared suitable for this purpose, and then by making a nice little propaganda bouquet from their stories. No, it has not been done in this way. The Report has been compiled by finding trained witnesses to support the details supplied by various Western, mainly British and American, secret services. In short, the Report is not based on evidence from mainly counter-revolutionary witnesses who have fled from Hungary, but on details supplied by Western intelligence organisations. Of course, it would have been difficult to admit this in the extremely dignified tone of the Report.

"Also, the members of the Committee of Five could not let the cat out of the bag and say that such well-known figures of the American intelligence as Col. William Donovan, whose suspicious activities in various affairs are too well-known to make overt reference to him, have very actively taken part in compiling the Report.

Furthermore, Mr. Cabot Lodge himself, head of the US UN delegation, main instigator in setting up the UN Committee of Five, has also taken a direct part in compiling the Report. By the way, this has not surprised anyone who has read the Report and its so-called basic conclusions, for example, in the question of counter-revolution or national uprising and has contrasted these with the speeches and statements of Mr. Lodge. It must be known that Mr. Lodge's statements have found their way into these so-called final conclusions. The Chairman of the UN Committee of Five had therefore known, already in January, the final conclusions to be drawn by the Committee of Five at the end of its circumspect investigation, lasting several months. It has also become known that, in connection with the Report, Mr. Lodge has been in touch with Cardinal Mindszenty in the American Legation in Budapest, and has carried out modifications to the Report, based on his (?Mindszenty's) views.

A "Pompous" Document: "Poor Propaganda"

"We believe that these few details suffice to show how this so-called Report drawn up under the aegis of, but completely ignoring the principles and prestige of the UNO, has been compiled. If there is anything that can offend the UN, then it is this procedure. The fact that the compilers of the Report were trying to be as scientific and pompous as possible in serving up their not very edifying work, does not alter this. The pompous manner in which they put this very poor work of propaganda before the public does not conceal its very apparent one-sidedness and tendentiousness; on the contrary, it brings these out in relief.

"A striking feature of the report, which according to its compilers has been drawn up with meticulous care, is that it is the most confused and hesitant on those points which have been intended to support its predetermined objectives; for example, the slanders against the Soviet Union and the Hungarian Worker-Peasant Government. On reading through their work attentively, the compilers of the Report themselves must have noticed this, for it is in connection with these details that they claim that their

information is incomplete, and refer to the obstacles they met in carrying out the investigation. In any case, this fact, too, makes the contradiction between the completeness of the so-called final conclusions, their definite wording, and the confusion in proving these, striking.

"After the extremely circumspect methods of collecting data and the principles of drafting the Report referred to in the introductory part, the reader may expect to find in its pages such masses of evidence and convincing arguments as will give a coherent picture of the events, even if this picture is biased, one-sided, and tendentious. Instead, he finds an endless repetition of the same few so-called details. The same details come up in at least 20 different variations, and the same phrases, normally used in leading articles, appear in the most varied titles; just as in old, provincial theatres, in the battle scenes, the same three members of the chorus marched in front of the foot lights to give the audience the impression of an army on the march.

"We do not believe that the UN organisation, which should save the co-operation and friendship between peoples and the safeguarding of peace, has been formed for the purposes of a comedy of this kind. No matter how insulting we think this whole affair is, our belief that the spirit of the UN will triumph over those who try to use the world organisation for ignoble political purposes, remains unchanged". (Budapest 20.00, 28.8.57)