

The writer of the following letter is the Special Representative of the United Nations on the Question of Hungary. He is a former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations and ~~the~~ former Ambassador of New Zealand in Washington.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

The Soviet Union, which the General Assembly condemned as ~~a~~ aggressor in Hungary, denied the right of the United Nations to deal with the Hungarian question and voted against all resolutions calling upon it to withdraw its forces from that country. In the case of the Congo, however, the Soviet Union has recognized <sup>its duty</sup> the competence of the United Nations to intervene and has voted in the Security Council for the creation of a United Nations force to enter the Congo. <sup>It is</sup> This would appear inconsistent to most people capable of making an independent judgement. <sup>Here appears to be an inconsistency</sup> Mr. Kuznetsov, on behalf of his country, even had the hardihood to urge that Mr. Tshombe and his supporters should be arrested and handed over to the Government of the Congo, on the allegation that they were carrying out the directions of foreigners.

The Hungarian authorities have persistently refused to let the United Nations special representative, my predecessor, Prince Wan of Thailand, equally with myself, enter Hungary. This, when a few days ago the Soviet representative submitted a proposal to send a commission of investigation to the Congo composed of representatives of some countries whose troops, with responsible officers, are already there under the United Nations banner and as a result of a resolution which the Soviet delegation accepted and voted for. ~~On~~ On the other hand, the West as a whole showed consistency in their stand since, as far as the Congo is concerned, they finally urged the Belgians to leave the country "immediately".



In the case of Cuba, the Soviet Union set itself up as the champion of the present regime against which "economic aggression" has been, according to the Soviet delegation, committed by the United States. The Soviet representative referred repeatedly to resolution 626 of the General Assembly, stating that "the right to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources is inherent in their sovereignty and is in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." He proceeded then to make this astonishing statement:

"The policy of the Soviet Union towards Cuba as well as towards all other countries is clear-cut and understandable to all. It is based on the general principles which have always been followed by the Soviet Union in regard to international affairs. We adhere to these principles and we are therefore opposed to aggression, to imperialism, to monopolies, and to domination over peoples achieved by any means whatsoever. We always say that we are on the side of those who are struggling against colonialism and foreign exploitation."

Those who died for Hungary in 1956 and since must stir in their graves at this hypocrisy.

One cannot but wonder at the inconsistency of <sup>the Soviet</sup> ~~the Soviet~~ statement on Cuba with Soviet actions in Hungary, where the Soviet Union so brutally repressed the struggle for independence and continues to maintain its troops in that country and to control its economy. Or can one possibly interpret the attitude of the Soviet Union in the Congo crisis and the Cuban discussion as a change in the line of its policy? Can one hope that in view of recent utterances of its representatives in the Security Council the Soviet Union will show some intention of conforming at least to some parts of the numerous resolutions passed by overwhelming majorities in the General Assembly on the Hungarian question?



Unfortunately, at the beginning of April 1958, Mr. Khrushchev said in Hungary that he "recommended the imperialists not to try to put their pig snouts into the socialist orchard," Hungary ~~was~~ being apparently such an orchard. He wilfully ignores the fact that the Assembly, by its resolution 1005 (ES-II) passed on Nov. 9, 1956, considered "that free elections should be held in Hungary under United Nations auspices as soon as law and order have been restored..."

Nothing that has happened either at or since the abortive meeting in Paris encourages me to believe that the Soviet Union will observe the Assembly's resolution on Hungary. Many of those who took part in the uprising of 1956 still languish in jail. Certainly the Soviet Union has shown no disposition to withdraw its troops from Hungary and to allow the holding of free elections in that unfortunate country. But we must continue our efforts on behalf of the Hungarian people.

Amid Soviet invective over the Congo, I make bold to quote the words of the late Albert Camus, read most tellingly by the French ~~Rex~~ Permanent Representative in the General Assembly on ~~xx~~ Dec. 12, 1958:

"Then let us use the disgust that fills us all in the service of a certain stubbornness. In the face of the Hungarian tragedy we have been and are still reduced to a kind of impotence. But that impotence is not total. The rejection of the fait accompli, vigilance of heart and mind, the decision to outlaw lies, the refusal to abandon innocence even after it has been strangled — these are the lines of action we can follow."

There is sometimes a disposition among us to forget past wrongs and to wipe our hands of recent ills which we believe we cannot cure. The events of 1956 in Hungary have an eternal message which we forget at our peril. To forget is not to cure.

Leslie K. Munro